I. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Kyoto, Japan, on 27 and 28 November 1998. The following members of the Bureau attended: Mr. Francesco Francioni (Italy), Chairperson, Representatives of Benin, Ecuador, Japan, Morocco and the United States of America as Vice-Presidents and Mr. Noël Fattal (Lebanon) as Rapporteur.

I.2 Representatives of the following States Parties attended as observers: Australia, Austria, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan and Zimbabwe.

I.3 Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of 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 full list of participants is given in Annex I.

I.4 The Chairperson warmly welcomed the members of the Bureau, representatives of States Parties who were observing the meeting, and the advisory bodies. He briefly outlined progress achieved in the implementation of the Convention during the last five months since the twenty-second ordinary session of the Bureau was concluded in June 1998. He recalled the fact that the Bureau had requested in June 1998, the Director-General of UNESCO to provide a report on the rôle of the World Heritage Centre in UNESCO and the Centre’s relationship to other UNESCO Sectors and units, and informed the Bureau that he had not yet received a formal response from the Director-General on this matter. However, he noted the Green Note DG/Note/98/53 of 23 November 1998 issued by the Director-General on decisions he had taken with regard to the future of UNESCO’s implementation of activities for the preservation and enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage, and congratulated Mr. M. Bouchenaki, Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage of the Sector for Culture, who will be in charge of the World Heritage Centre from 1 February 1999, under the authority of the Director-General, until further notice. The Chairperson expressed the regret that the decision of the Director-General contained in the Green Note referred to above, had been taken without consulting the Committee. The Chairperson wished that the Director-General of UNESCO had consulted the World Heritage Committee in advance to discuss the steps he was intending to take following the departure of the current Director of the Centre on 1 February 1999.

I.5 The Chairperson consulted with the members of the Bureau and obtained their approval for the following non-governmental organizations to observe the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau: The International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW); Environmental Diplomacy Institute (EDI) of USA; The Wilderness Society (Australia); and Pro-Esteros (Mexico). The Bureau approved the participation of the four above-mentioned NGOs under the condition that only two observers per NGO would be
permitted to be in the meeting room at any given time and that they would be allowed to speak only at the invitation of the Bureau.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA, ANNOTATED AGENDA, AND THE TIMETABLE

II.1 The Chairperson requested the Bureau to consider the Provisional Agenda (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.202/1). The Bureau decided to include the consideration of proposals for the amendments to paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines, introduced by the Delegate of Italy, as part of Agenda item 6. With this addition, the Bureau adopted the agenda. Furthermore, the Bureau adopted the Provisional Annotated Agenda (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.202/2Rev.1) and the Provisional Timetable (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.202/3) without any changes.

III. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL HERITAGE

a) Natural properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Bureau did not recommend any natural sites for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

b) State of conservation reports of natural properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for action

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

Since the Committee decided to remove this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-first session, the Centre has received a brief status report on the site’s protection. A seven-member Administrative Council is responsible for the management of the site. The Park has statutes and rules of procedures, with regulating principles for residents, staff and visitors. Further positive results have been achieved with the efforts to limit traffic through the Park by the construction of a detour around the Park. The authorities had provided a map showing the extension of the Park’s boundaries by about 100 km². The map has been returned to the Croatian authorities requesting them, in accordance with the recommendation of the last session of the Committee, to nominate the extension of the 100 km² using standard nomination procedures set out in paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines.
The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee commends the authorities for their continuing efforts to enhance the protection of Plitvice Lake National Park and urges them to nominate, as soon as possible, the 100km$^2$ extension, using standard nomination procedures set out in paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines.”

**Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)**

The Committee at its twenty-first session invited the Government of Ecuador to notify the Chairperson of the Committee of the final enactment and entering into force of the Galapagos Special Law. The Committee decided that if, by the opening date of the twenty-second ordinary session of the Bureau, the Government of Ecuador had not notified the Chairperson of the enactment and entry into force of the “Special Galapagos Law”, the Galapagos Islands be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At its twenty-second ordinary session in June 1998, the Bureau was informed that the «Special Law on the Galapagos» was published, on 18 March 1998, by the Official Registry of Ecuador as Law No. 278, and that the Chairperson of the Committee had been officially notified of the enactment and the entry into force of the Law. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee not consider Galapagos Islands for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau noted that the Law, if implemented, would greatly strengthen conservation in both the Galapagos Islands as well as in the marine waters surrounding them. The Law provides for the extension of the outer boundary of the marine reserve from 24 to 64 km offshore and for the establishment of a significant 130,000 km$^2$ Reserve for the conservation of marine biodiversity where only tourism and artisanal fisheries will be permitted. The Bureau was satisfied to note that the Law addresses most of the major issues relating to conservation and sustainable development of Galapagos, including:

- regulations for the control and eradication of introduced species and the establishment of a quarantine inspection system;
- appreciation of Galapagos by local people and their participation in its conservation through environmental education;
- building local skills and conservation institutions, including the strengthening of the GNPS and improving inter-agency co-ordination through the work of a revived INGALA (Instituto National de Galapagos);
- immigration and residence control measures to stabilise the rate of growth of human population size; and
- a participatory planning process for marine resources conservation.

The Bureau commended the Government of Ecuador and all agencies, groups, local residents and experts for reaching a consensus on this new Law. The Bureau urged the Ecuadorian authorities to ensure the effective implementation of the Law and invited
them to re-nominate the Marine Reserve, deferred by the Committee in 1994, to be a part of the World Heritage site as soon as the management plan for the Marine Reserve is finalized in 1999.

The Charles Darwin Research Station (CDRS) and the Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS) have jointly implemented a project, partly financed by the World Heritage Fund, to gather basic information needed for the establishment of an ecological monitoring system for Galapagos. The final report of the project has been submitted and includes an exhaustive list of introduced species belonging to a number of animal and plant taxa. The Bureau was informed that an Inter-American Development Bank Project is being developed for Galapagos and, if approved, could facilitate the effective implementation of the Special Galapagos Law, particularly with regard to the conservation of marine resources and for ensuring sustainable tourism development. The Bureau learned that the UNESCO Office in Quito has entered into agreement with the Ecuadorian Ministry for the Environment for providing legal assistance on the implementation of the Galapagos Law and that the volcanic eruption of the Cerro Azul on Isabela Island did not have any major impacts on the wildlife of Galapagos.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following

“The Committee commends the Ecuadorean Government for ensuring the passage of, and entry into force of the Special Galapagos Law and decides not to consider including the Galapagos Islands in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee urges the State Party to re-nominate, in 1999, the Marine Reserve as an extension of the World Heritage site. The Committee draws the attention of the State Party to the Bureau’s recommendation, made at its twenty-first ordinary session in June 1997, that the State Party submit annual reports on the state of conservation of Galapagos until the end of the year 2002. The Committee invites the State Party to submit the first of the requested series of annual reports to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.”

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a number of laws for the national protection of the Lake existed and that the Duma had adopted the Federal Law on “The Protection of the Baikal Lake” which was, however, vetoed by the President. The Federal Law had been tabled for a third reading in the Duma, taking into account comments made by the President’s intervention. In addition to the legal concerns, the authorities had not come to any conclusions regarding the re-profiling of the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill at Baikalsk, one of the main polluters of the Lake. The Observer of the Russian Delegation attending the Bureau session in June 1998 pointed out that the situation at Lake Baikal is of major concern, due to its unresolved legal status, continuing and increasing pollution, lack of resources for management and monitoring, and logging and other negative factors. The Observer was of the view that the site is under serious threat and that the State Party would not oppose inclusion of the site in the List of World Heritage Danger.
The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal, and urged the State Party to inform the Centre, before 15 September 1998, of the status of the Baikal Law and its adoption as well as a time-table for its implementation. The Bureau drew the attention of the Russian authorities to paragraphs 82-89 of the Operational Guidelines (“Procedure for the Inclusion of Properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger”) and invited them to prepare a programme of corrective measures for submission to its twenty-second extraordinary session.

The Bureau was informed that the State Committee for the Environment had indicated, on 17 November 1998, that the Law is currently being revised and that, according to the UNESCO Office, Moscow, the reason for the revision was the need to include financial measures to implement the Law. The revision has been done both by the Region of Irkutsk and the Buryat Republic and has been through the Duma. It is expected that the Law will be approved by the end of the year. Concerning the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill the Minister for Economy proposed an international competition to transform the mill. The State Committee however, indicated that there is no solution yet and the closing the mill would aggravate the social problems of the region. Monitoring of the site is underway, despite financial problems. IUCN informed the Bureau that it does not recommend the inclusion of Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following

“The Committee takes note of the information provided by the State Committee for the Environment and IUCN. It expresses its serious concerns about the problems of the site as indicated in the report of the twenty-second session of the Bureau. The Committee re-iterates its requests made at the time of the inscription of the site, in particular the urgent need to re-profile the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and the adoption of the Baikal Law. The Committee notes that IUCN does not recommend to include the Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.”

**Donana National Park (Spain)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a giant holding pool of the Aznalcollar mine owned by the Canadian-Swedish Boliden-Apirsa Company burst resulting in an ecological disaster. Although the main toxic flow had been diverted away from the National Park, the adjoining areas have been badly damaged. The Bureau was informed that the spill could spread into the World Heritage area as pollutants dispersed more widely. The State Party had submitted a number of technical reports on the situation and on actions taken to mitigate the threats. The President of the Spanish MAB Committee had proposed the organization of an international conference to review actions taken and rehabilitation plans elaborated for the conservation of the site and provided an outline for a project entitled “Donana 2005”. The State Party had welcomed UNESCO involvement and suggested that financial support be considered for this
purpose. The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns on the long-term restoration of the property and urged the State Party to undertake all possible measures to mitigate the threats. Furthermore, the Bureau had requested the State Party to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to prepare an international expert conference to develop a long-term vision, and to compile a detailed report in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau was informed that at the invitation of the Spanish Government, the Centre carried out a mission from 10 to 13 November 1998 reviewing the situation at the site and the area affected by the toxic spill. The Centre received a number of documents presented by the Spanish authorities on the actions undertaken since the last session of the Bureau, including the Donana 2005 project. The project “Doñana 2005 - hydrological regeneration of the watersheds and river channels flowing towards Doñana National Park” has been prepared by the Ministry for the Environment. It mainly proposes: (a) to avoid the influx of contaminated water into the Doñana marshes; (b) to restore the flow of waters towards Doñana in the long term (drinking water; original hydrological dynamism); (c) to maintain the hydrological system of the connection between Doñana and the Guadalquivir Estuary. The Bureau noted that the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve are currently little affected whereas the Natural Park around the site has been impacted by the toxic spill. The actions taken by the Spanish authorities have been substantial. The Bureau suggested that great caution should be taken in re-starting mining activities and requested that EIAs be carried out for each step.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following

“The Committee reiterates the Bureau’s request that the State Party, UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention collaborate and submit to the Bureau's twenty-third session a detailed plan for the organization of an international expert conference. The Committee also invites the State Party to submit details concerning the financing plan and a timetable for the implementation of the project “Donana 2005”. The Committee commends the State Party for the actions taken to prevent impacts to the World Heritage site by the toxic spill. It requests the State Party to proceed with great caution with regard to re-opening the mine and to monitor long-term impacts for both the World Heritage site and the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.”

**Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

The Committee at its twenty-first session expressed its concern with regard to the integrity of the Canaima National Park due to considerable threats posed by a proposal to erect a series of power transmission lines across the Park. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that the Director-General of UNESCO had transmitted the Committee’s concerns and recommendations to the President of Venezuela. In his response, the President of Venezuela had re-affirmed the commitment of his Government to protect the World Heritage site and welcomed the possibility of a UNESCO mission to the site to evaluate the project and determine the boundaries of the World Heritage site.
An IUCN-Centre mission to Venezuela, including a site visit to Canaima, planned for late August 1998, had to be postponed due to a deterioration of security conditions in and around Canaima. In the meantime, IUCN has received several reports from indigenous people living in the Gran Sabana and the Imataca areas expressing their strong concerns over the future of the Canaima National Park. Although the Committee’s deliberations have revolved around the construction of the power line, IUCN has pointed out that serious attention should be given to plans to open up the fragile ecosystem of this Park and the Imataca rainforest to large-scale mining, tourism and logging concessions.

On 28 September 1998, the Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO invited the Centre and IUCN to field a site visit as soon as possible. The Bureau was informed that the UN Resident Representative in Caracas, Venezuela, is unable to provide security clearance for the mission until 9 December 1998. A mission is foreseen for early 1999. IUCN has suggested that the Committee’s recommendation, made at the time of inscription of the site (December 1994), that the Government of Venezuela co-operate with the Centre and IUCN to “initiate a process to review the boundaries of the site, taking into consideration the interests of the local people and the need to focus the nomination on the Tepui portion (approximately 2 million ha) of the Park”, be used as a basis for establishing the terms of reference for the mission.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee calls upon the Centre and IUCN to field a mission to Canaima as soon as security clearance from the UN Resident Co-ordinator for Venezuela is available. The Committee agrees with IUCN that the terms of reference for the mission be derived from the recommendations of the Committee made at the time of the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List in 1994. The Committee requests that the findings of the mission and its recommendation concerning whether Canaima needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999.”

c) State of conservation reports of natural properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for noting

Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

The Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session requested the Australian authorities to provide specific information on the results of the financial review of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). At its twenty-second session, (June, 1998) the Bureau was informed that the Australian authorities have set rigorous environmental conditions on development activities in the Hinchinbrook region, and have implemented several other measures to strengthen the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. Since then, the Australian authorities have informed the Centre that they have acted on the findings of the financial review. In accordance with the review’s key recommendations, the Australian Government has reorganized the GBRMPA to assist the Authority to meet critical challenges in protecting and managing the Great Barrier Reef. The Bureau noted
that the Australian authorities are unable to provide the Centre with a copy of the financial review of the GBRMPA since it is considered an internal working document of the Government.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN has received reports on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, GBRMPA and the Australian NGOs and it is in the process of reviewing all those reports.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the reports from IUCN Australia and the Australian NGOs to the State Party for review and comments. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

**Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)**

The Committee, when it inscribed this property on the World Heritage at its last session (Naples, 1997), had requested documentation on the marine resources surrounding this property. The Australian authorities have informed the Centre that the Australian Antarctic Division has recently granted Commonwealth funding to collate and analyse existing data on the benthic environments surrounding this property, including the territorial sea. In accordance with Australia’s plans to establish a marine protected area in the region, the project aims to assess whether the 12 nautical miles territorial sea provides a representative sample of marine biodiversity in the region. To enable such an assessment, a comprehensive research programme will be undertaken to clearly identify the marine values of the area. A report on the project is expected within six months.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report, before 15 April 1999, on the findings of the project to establish a marine protected area so as to enable it to review the report at its twenty-third session in 1999.

**Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a petroleum exploration permit had been granted by the State Government of West Australia (WA) for an area located within the World Heritage site. The Observer of Australia assured the Bureau that no development that threatens the World Heritage values of the site would be allowed to take place. IUCN however, voiced its concern about the issue of the granting of prospecting licences by State Governments of WA, and Queensland for locations within World Heritage areas, and called for closer liaison between Commonwealth and State Governments on this matter.

Since the conclusion of the Bureau session in June 1998, the State Party has provided a detailed report describing the administrative structure established, and the resources committed for the conservation of this property. In addition, the Australian authorities have informed the Centre that a mining lease of the Shark Bay Salt Joint Venture (SBSJV) had attracted public comment but is outside of the property and that levee
construction occurred outside the World Heritage area. The levee is 5.6 km long and was constructed across Useless Inlet to enclose 2,600 ha of marine waters, adjacent to SBSJV’s existing primary concentration pond, and as part of the expansion of the company’s operations. Approval for the levee construction was granted under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act of 1986 and construction works complied with the environmental requirements set by the Minister for the Environment. The WA Department of Environment conducted two environmental compliance audits and concluded that SBSJV had satisfactorily implemented environmental conditions during the construction phase. Furthermore, in accordance with a post-construction environmental requirement, marine mega-fauna, namely 13 bottlenose dolphins, six loggerhead turtles and 23 green turtles, which were trapped behind the levee, were transferred to open marine waters by SBSJV with the help of professional assistance provided by the Department of Conservation and Land Management.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN has received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, and that it is in the process of reviewing that report.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from IUCN Australia to the State Party for review. The Bureau furthermore recommended that IUCN provides an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

**Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)**

The Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June, 1998) learnt that the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment had investigated concerns that vegetation clearing may have occurred within this property and determined that World Heritage values were not at risk and that no further action was needed on this matter. Since then the Australian authorities have re-affirmed that the arrangements for the management of this site are now fully effective and meet with the full confidence of their Government. They have pointed out that the Management Plan, effective as of 1 September 1998, had been prepared with the full involvement of all stakeholders, including Aboriginal groups. The Plan provides the Wet Tropics Management Authority with a full suite of powers to act in the interests of the World Heritage values of the property.

IUCN informed the Bureau that it had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, and that it is in the process of reviewing that report.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from IUCN Australia to the State Party for review. The Bureau furthermore recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.
**Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)**

The Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session was informed that sustainable forestry operations in the Polish side of this trans-border site were restricted to forests outside of the World Heritage area. The Bureau had invited the Polish authorities to inform the Centre as to whether they plan to extend the World Heritage area to conform to the new boundaries of the 10,500 ha Bialowieza National Park, as established in 1996.

The Polish authorities submitted, on 10 September 1998, an extension of the Bialowieza Forest. The proposed extension is substantial and will be evaluated by IUCN in 1999 in accordance with paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines and recommendations submitted to the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau. The Bureau noted the publication entitled “Belovezhskaya Pushcha Forest Biodiversity Conservation” produced by the Belarus authorities which focuses on strengthening forest and wildlife conservation and improving land-use management. The publication is based on results of the “Belarus Forest Biodiversity Protection Project” financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The Bureau commended the Polish authorities for nominating an extension to their part of the World Heritage site. The Bureau reiterated its previous request that the two States Parties co-operate to prepare a management plan for the Belarus part and consider removing the fence separating the two parts.

**Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

Since 1997, the Bureau and the Committee have repeatedly called for the permanent closure of the 18 km road traversing this Park which had been illegally opened by local people. The Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June, 1998) requested the Centre and IUCN to undertake a joint mission to review the situation and to assist the State Party to mitigate the threats to the Park and asked the State Party to provide by 15 September 1998: (i) a copy of the revitalisation programme and a time frame for the rehabilitation of damaged areas; and (ii) a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and actions taken with regard to the permanent closure of the road.

The Bureau was informed of a new threat to Iguacu’s integrity, arising from plans to fill a hydropower reservoir in Southwest Brazil that would divert a considerable volume of Iguacu’s waters for seven to eight weeks every year.

The Bureau reiterated its request that the State Party provide information on items (i) and (ii) as described above and on plans to divert Iguacu’s waters to fill a hydropower reservoir in South-west Brazil. The Bureau also noted that a Centre/IUCN mission to the site could be scheduled in March 1999 in order to determine whether the site needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.
**Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

The Committee, at its twenty-first session, had expressed its concern that logging activities, carried out under commercial, as well as sustainable forestry schemes, are contributing to the growing biological isolation of the Reserve and are not welcome by local people. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau noted the findings and recommendations of the Regional Training Workshop, organized with the support of a US$ 29,900 grant from the World Heritage Fund. It suggested that Cameroon take urgent measures to act on the Workshop recommendations and present to the twenty-second session of the Committee, a statement of actions to be implemented, particularly in order to:

(a) strengthen law enforcement against poaching and improve management of hunting and trade in wildlife products; and
(b) halt the issue of new licences for forest exploitation in areas immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate in designing and launching a rapid bio-diversity assessment to evaluate the impacts of on-going forestry activities on the contiguity of habitats and gene pools in and around the Dja World Heritage site. The Centre is currently discussing possible financial support for such a study with UNDP, Cameroon, and bilateral donors, such as the Netherlands.

The Bureau was informed that the Cameroon authorities have implemented some of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop; e.g. establishment of an inter-ministerial and a multidisciplinary working group, strengthening of infrastructure and the launching of a programme to build environmental awareness among local communities. However, the Bureau noted that further actions are needed for the implementation of all of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop.

The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a report by 15 September 1999 concerning progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop. Based on the review of such a report, the Committee, at its twenty-third session, may consider calling for a Centre/IUCN mission in the year 2000, possibly in co-operation with other international partners.

**Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

At its twenty-first session, the Committee expressed its serious concerns over the potential threats posed by the Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 2.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this site. A case filed by conservation groups challenging the EIA of the Federal-Provincial Environment Assessment Panel in favour of the mining project was dismissed because the judge decided that the Panel report is not subject to judicial review. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau had requested the State Party to provide a status report on the proposed mining project, including information on any proposed start-up date for the
The Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks Canada, via his letter of 15 September 1998, has informed the Centre that it is unlikely that construction work on any component of the mine will begin before the spring of 1999. On 27 August 1998, the Government of Alberta announced the creation of Whitehorse Wildland Park between Jasper National Park and the proposed mine, to help protect the ecological integrity of Jasper National Park and its surrounding area.

The Bureau reiterated its concerns over the impacts of the proposed Cheviot mining project on the integrity of the site and is pleased to be informed that other alternatives may be considered. The Bureau welcomed the initiative of the Government of Alberta to establish the new Whitehorse Wildland Park to improve the ecological integrity of the Jasper National Park and its surrounding areas. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide the Centre and IUCN with an up-date for the proposed mining project and provide a status report on the project to the Centre, before 15 April 1999, for review at its twenty-third session.

Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site undertaken in September 1998. The mission found that the management authorities of this site has been effective in restricting hotel construction to areas outside of the property. Within the site, visitors have no option other than staying in small-scale tourist facilities established in the homes of the Tibetan villagers resident there. The mission found that the management authorities and the local people have entered into an effective partnership, material and social conditions of the villagers have considerably improved, and economic benefits accrued through tourism has eliminated the need for natural resources exploitation. The State Council of China has issued a directive to completely halt illegal logging in the site. Despite these positive features, the mission team found the site to be congested with tourists; the management has made it too easy for the visitors to enter the site en-masse and in vehicles that drive through the core area. Increasing visitation appears to be leading to mushrooming of several new hotels immediately outside the boundaries of the site.

The Bureau commended the Chinese authorities for their effective management of the site and encouraged them to establish a “park-and-drive” system and to limit travel within the site to smaller, environment-friendly vehicles. Visitors should be accompanied by trained guides who have the capacity to interpret the natural and World Heritage values of the site. The Bureau drew the attention of the Chinese authorities to the need to improve training of site staff so that they can better monitor and mitigate tourism impacts on the site. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.
Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site in September 1998 that was favourably impressed with tourism management there. The site is located within the same Minshan Mountain range as the Jiuzhaigou World Heritage area described above. Tourist accommodation facilities in Huanglonggou are limited and future development of facilities is being confined to the town of Chuan Zhu Si, in Songpan County, 40 km from the Huanglong World Heritage area. The 7km boardwalk within the site is well managed and a visitor centre is currently under construction at Huanglonggou.

The mission team urged the Chinese authorities to implement the recommendation of the Committee, made at the time of inscription of this site and Jiuzhaigou in 1992, to link the two sites into a single Minshan Mountain World Heritage Area. The Bureau learned that the Chinese authorities had pointed out the need for undertaking scientific studies to link the two sites into a single World Heritage area nomination and the difficulties in coordination between two different County administrations. After the mission team had provided information on cluster nominations submitted by other States Parties, the Chinese authorities expressed an interest in taking the necessary steps to implement the Committee’s 1992 recommendation. The mission also urged the Chinese authorities to explore possibilities for linking the Jiuzhaigou-Huanglong cluster with a selected number of reserves set aside for the protection of the giant panda in Sichuan.

The Bureau commended the State Party for effectively managing tourism in Huanglong. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to undertake necessary studies for preparing a Minshan Mountain Range World Heritage area nomination linking Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong World Heritage sites and other giant panda reserves as appropriate. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.

Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site in September 1998. The mission found this site to be overrun with tourist facilities, having a considerable impact on the aesthetic qualities of the site. The Chinese authorities have not taken any steps to implement the recommendation of the Committee, made at the time of the site’s inscription in 1992, to prepare a species status conservation report in order to determine whether the site would qualify for inscription under natural heritage criterion (iv). At present the site is inscribed under natural heritage criterion (iii) only. The mission found that several buildings and roads have been damaged as this site has been severely impacted by the recent floods in China. The site management has been encouraged to consider submitting a plan for rehabilitation of damaged areas within the site and a financial assistance request to the World Heritage Fund for emergency assistance. The site requires enhanced support from the Central and Provincial Governments of China owing to its location in a relatively remote region with a poorly developed economy.
The Bureau invited the Provincial and Central Government authorities to augment the resources for the management of the site. Co-operation with the Chinese Academy of Sciences and other such institutions may be needed in order to assess the World Heritage values of the site’s biodiversity. The Bureau drew the attention of the State Party to manage tourism development in and around the site on a sustainable basis. Furthermore, the Bureau urged the State Party to assess the extent of damage caused to the site by the recent floods and prepare a rehabilitation plan for implementation with financial support from Provincial and Central Governments, the World Heritage Fund and other sources. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.

Los Katios National Park (Colombia)

In November 1997, a representative of Colombia's Ministry of Environment informed IUCN that the security situation in this site was threatened by conflicts between armed groups. A significant portion of the Park area was off-limit to staff due to the presence of such armed groups and tourism to the area had come to a halt. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau requested IUCN to review a report submitted by the Colombian authorities to the Centre and submit its findings to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Bureau was informed that a major restructuring of Columbia’s conservation administration was currently underway, for devolving responsibilities for the management of Los Katios to the provincial level. On 24 September 1998, the Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO confirmed this fact. IUCN has been gathering further information on the decentralisation process to assess its implications for the conservation of Los Katios, but was of the view that the site is under serious threat and should be considered for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed of a new report submitted by the Colombian authorities on 23 November 1998. This report notes that the Park was affected by the confrontation between guerrilla and paramilitary groups and during that time four sectors of the Park received only limited attention from the authorities. In 1997 and 1998, however, a number of activities were carried out, including the strengthening of the protection of the Park through control units, inter-institutional meetings, collaboration with communities living in the Park, work on the definition of the buffer zone of the Park and the elaboration of the management plan. Support for the creation and consolidation of the Darien Special Management Area (DSMA) to co-ordinate the management of the two World Heritage sites (Darien of Panama and Los Katios of Colombia) has been provided and actions will be taken to create a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. In addition, a number of meetings of the Bi-national Commission of Colombia and Panama took place and a US$ 500,000 project for a rapid ecological evaluation of the area, funded by the Mac Arthur Foundation, is being implemented by the NGOs from both countries.

The Colombian authorities have concluded that although there have been impacts on the Park, it had not been invaded by colonists and the pressure on the Park and its natural
resources had reduced considerably. Preventive measures have been taken for the security of the personnel and the Park has returned to a certain normality and calm, allowing the staff to control the area and to implement operations. The State Party does not see any need for inclusion of Los Katios on the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

The Bureau took note of the report provided by the Colombian authorities. It requested the Centre and IUCN to keep in contact with the State Party to monitor progress made and to report back to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau commended the Mac Arthur Foundation for its support for a conservation project in the “Darien Gap Region”. The Bureau reiterated the Committee’s recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site to establish a single World Heritage site linking Darien (Panama) and Los Katios (Colombia) World Heritage sites.

Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed of a cable car construction project through the centre of this Park, proposed by a private individual concerned with tourism development. The feasibility of the project is questionable due to the heavy rains, high winds and the steep-terrain that characterises this site. The construction of major access facilities in this area is not consistent with the management plan of the Park, and the Bureau was in agreement with IUCN that the Dominica authorities need to exercise great caution when evaluating the feasibility of this proposal. The Director of the Centre visited the site during his participation in the International Conference on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Caribbean (2-5 August 1998). He observed that the project foresees the “sky-train”, taking visitors to the heart of the core area and was of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to be compatible with Dominica’s obligations under the Convention for conservation of this site. The Government of Dominica, via its letter of 7 July 1998, informed the Centre that the terms of reference for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the proposal have been prepared and reviewed by the Natural Resource Management Unit of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. The terms of reference have also been forwarded to the proponent of the cable way system. The Government informed the Centre that the report of the EIA would be submitted to the Centre for review as soon as it is available.

The Bureau noted that the State Party is carrying out an EIA on the cable car construction project. The Bureau drew the attention of the State Party to IUCN’s view that the location foreseen for the cable car construction would be inappropriate and inconsistent with the management plan. The Bureau invited Dominica to submit a report on the outcome of the EIA and the status of the cable car development proposal before 15 April 1999.

Nanda Devi National Park (India)

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted that the management of this site is based on enforcing a policy of strict protection. An Indian Supreme Court ruling of 1996
suspended, until further review by concerned authorities, rights of the local people to collect forest produce in protected areas, including in their buffer zones. This ruling has been applied to the “Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve”, including in its buffer zone surrounding the Nanda Devi National Park and World Heritage area. The enactment of the Supreme Court ruling has led to a rise in conflicts between the management and local people. Co-ordination between the Ministry of Tourism and site management also needs to be improved; site-staff had to apprehend tourists who had entered the Park with permits issued by tourism authorities without informing site management. Furthermore, the Deputy Director of the Park was of the view that the boundaries of the World Heritage site could be extended to include the Valley of Flowers National Park and the Khedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary.

The Bureau invited the State Party to review site management policy with a view to minimising conflicts between management and local people and to seek the cooperation of local people in the protection of the site. Co-operation between conservation and tourism authorities also needs to be strengthened in order to define a policy for visitor entry and use of the site. The Bureau suggested that the Indian authorities study the feasibility for enlarging the World Heritage area by including the Valley of Flowers National Park and the Khedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary.

Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaino (Mexico)

The Bureau recalled that during 1996-97, the State Party, by establishing a Scientific Committee which set up stringent environmental conditions on the proponents of an industrial salt production facility, successfully averted threats which the construction of that facility could have posed to the integrity of this site. However, the Bureau was informed that IUCN and the Centre have received a large number of messages about threats to this site arising from a renewed consideration of the project for constructing an industrial salt production facility. Several of these messages include calls for declaring El Viscaino a World Heritage site in Danger. Moreover, IUCN has pointed out that new settlements are occurring in the area; increasing pollution and over-fishing are crowding out endangered and endemic species. There are indications of a decline in the populations of various marine mammals, shellfish, and sea turtles that are unique to the area. IUCN has recommended that a mission to the site be planned in 1999 to evaluate various threats to the integrity of the site and assess whether or not this site should be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed that a report had been received on 26 November 1998 and that IUCN and the Centre were not able to review this new information; however, the summary of that report indicates that the Government does not consider the site to be in Danger.

The Observer of Mexico informed the Bureau that it was the Mexican Environmental Agency (SEMARNAP) which established an International Scientific Committee that set up stringent guidelines for the environmental impact assessment for a salt production
facility. He stated that there are no indications of a decline in the populations of various mammals, shellfish or sea turtles in the area.

The Observer of Mexico also informed the Bureau that the El Viscaino Lagoons are not in danger and that Mexico has a strong environmental legal framework, which regulates any activities in the site. His Government continues to take actions to reinforce environmental regulations to preserve the marine resources of the site and in particular, that the management programme has been concluded and that the reserve is included in the GEF programme for ten Mexican priority areas. He furthermore informed the Bureau that the grey whale population is recovering and that it has not been affected by the salt extraction. The Mexican Government has not authorised any construction project or extension of the salt production facility. The International Scientific Committee will review the EIA as soon as it is completed. This assessment will be essential for the final decision. In conclusion, the Mexican Government states that the site is not in danger, no proposal will be authorised which would jeopardise conservation of the site and that the World Heritage values will be conserved. In accordance with Article 11, par.4 of the Convention, there is no reason to include the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He indicated that an invitation of his Government to carry out a mission would be provided.

The Bureau noted that the State Party has provided new information and requested the Centre to transmit it to IUCN for review. The Bureau was pleased to note that the State Party, upon receipt of IUCN’s comments on the report would invite a mission to the site as soon as possible. The Bureau requested that the mission should prepare an up-to-date state of conservation report on the Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaino, and submit it to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

**Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted this site’s success in conserving the great one-horned rhinoceros. The Park celebrated its 25th year anniversary in 1998. However, the management of the Park is faced with problems of pollution of the Narayani River due to industrial sewage discharged into that River by private enterprises located outside the Park. An increase in the natural rate of mortality of the rhinoceros in 1998 remains unexplained and is perhaps attributable to the possibility that the population consists of a considerable number of older individuals. The National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act has been recently amended to ensure that 30-50% of the tourism revenues from the Park are used for development projects benefiting local communities. The Bureau was informed of the interest of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation of Nepal to use the large volume of scientific data available on ecological and managerial aspects of Royal Chitwan for setting up a systematic monitoring regime for the Park.

The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN co-operate with the State Party to design and implement international assistance projects for mitigating the impacts of the pollution of the Narayani River. The Bureau urged the Centre and
IUCN-Nepal to co-operate with the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation to establish a systematic monitoring scheme for tracking long-term changes in the ecology, and the management regime of Royal Chitwan.

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal)

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted that supplying the energy needs of the growing number of tourists, staff and the Sherpa community is the most critical management issue in this site. At present, site staff and a considerable number of the Sherpa families resident in lower elevations have shifted to the use of kerosene and micro-power plants to meet their energy needs. However, tourist installations in the higher alpine zones continue to exploit the juniper bushes to meet their fuel-wood needs. The site management is initiating a project for which the Chairperson, based on a request submitted by the State Party, approved a sum of US$ 15,000 from the Fund, to update information-displays at the interpretation Centre at the Park entrance and in the Namche Bazar Visitor Centre. New displays are to be designed in order to inform visitors of the growing energy demands of the tourist industry and to suggest possible ways and means by which tourists could help the management to find solutions. Restrictions to the number of visitors to the Park is likely to be resisted by the Sherpa community who derive about 75% of their income from tourism; at least one member of each Sherpa household is employed in the tourism industry. The site management intends to start a process for revising the management plan of the site, in connection with the commemoration of the site’s 25th anniversary in 2001. As part of that process detailed analyses of trends in the growth in the numbers of visitors and local population and associated energy demands will be undertaken.

IUCN informed the Bureau about a seminar held on the Impacts of Tourism Development on Sagarmatha in August 1998. A research project to revise the management plan, prepare a tourism development strategy and undertake relevant training is also under consideration by protected landscape and development agencies of the United Kingdom.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party to seek a long-term, strategic approach for managing the increase in the growth of the numbers of visitors and local people and the parallel rise in energy demands. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN Nepal to co-operate with the State Party and the relevant agencies of the United Kingdom to ensure that visitor rates, tourism infrastructure development and energy demand planning become an integral part of the process to revise the site’s management plan in connection with the commemoration of Sagarmatha’s 25th anniversary in 2001.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

In 1997, the authorities of Oman submitted an interim zoning plan that foresaw a new outer boundary, and provisional boundaries for five management zones. In addition, they
provided brief descriptions of their plans for implementing several projects and a report on the population status of the Arabian Oryx in the Sanctuary.

At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau agreed with IUCN’s position that it would be better to review the zoning plan and other associated proposals after the overall management plan and the boundaries for the site are finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre about progress with regard to the finalisation of the management plan and submit the plan to IUCN and the Centre for review. The Centre informed the Bureau that no response from the authorities of Oman has been received.

The Bureau noted with concern that the boundaries of the site remained undefined since the inscription of the site in 1994. The Bureau requested the Oman authorities to expedite the finalisation of the management plan, including the boundaries of the site and its management zones. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit the finalised plan for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit the findings of their review of the management plan to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

Huascaran National Park (Peru)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a Canadian/Peruvian mining consortium is in the final stages of obtaining approval to develop one of the world's largest copper and zinc deposits found at Antamina, located 20km east of this Park. Mining is expected to commence in 2001 and have a life span of 20 years. The Bureau noted that the concentrates may be transported from the mining site to the coast, either via a Central Road that traverses the Park, or an alternative Southern Road circling around the Park. The mining company had agreed to take the Southern Road, which is completely outside the Park, but traverses the buffer zones of the Huascaran World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve. No EIA has been carried out for the use of the Southern Road so far. The Central Road would however, be used for bringing heavy equipment to the mining area for approximately one year, until the construction of a bypass along the Southern Road is completed to allow for the transport of such heavy equipment along that road. IUCN underlined the importance of monitoring all impacts of the use of the Central Road during the one-year period. The Bureau took note of the different options for accessing the mining area and the preference expressed by INRENA to use the Southern Road. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational. The Bureau suggested that a future mission to this site may be useful, and requested the State Party to provide a status report on the mining project to its twenty-second extraordinary session. The Bureau recommended that the State Party consider inviting a Representative of IUCN to be part of the “Working Group” being established by INRENA on the management of the site.

The Bureau agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson to establish a Study Group to reconcile environment and development needs and to use Huascaran as a case study.
which could provide guidance and lessons to other World Heritage sites whose integrity is threatened by potential mining projects. The Centre has proposed names of a number of experts, who may be included in the Study Group to be established for the consideration of the Chairperson. The Centre and IUCN had been invited by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) to a working session on “Mining and Protected Areas and other Ecologically Sensitive Sites” on 20 October 1998 in London, UK.

On 14 September 1998, INRENA informed the Centre that several meetings regarding the establishment of the “Working Group” on the management of the site were held. Representatives from the IUCN Office in Peru participated in the INRENA meetings. On 28 September 1998, additional information on the state of conservation of Huascaran National Park and the Huascaran Biosphere Reserve was submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO to the Centre. In addition, the Centre informed the Bureau that INRENA provided an update on the situation on 20 November 1998, indicating that the “Working Group” on the management of the site, (in particular to oversee the use of the Central Road) has been established. A meeting of the Working Group was held on 13 November 1998 with INRENA, IUCN Peru, MAB, Mountain Institute, Ministry for Energy and Mining and members of the consortium on “Mining, conservation and sustainable development”. The Group will work independently from the Antamina Mining Company and will invite local participation. Antamina confirmed to complete the construction of the bypass along the Southern Road by July 1999, provide traffic estimates and expressed an interest in the use of the Central and Northern Roads for vehicles transporting personnel. It also committed itself to road maintenance and reaffirmed its support to the Park. An up-to-date report by Antamina was also provided concerning the agreement with the Government of Peru concluded on 16 September 1998 to develop the Antamina project. This project will create 4,000 jobs during the construction and 1,000 jobs during the twenty years of the mine. Antamina will provide information on the use of the Central Road including an addendum to the EIA, and the revised mine plan with rearrangements of waste storage.

The Bureau commended the Government of Peru regarding actions taken to implement the recommendation of the Bureau to establish a Working Group on the management of the site and to control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational. However, the Bureau expressed concern over the permanent use of the Central and Northern Road for the transport of the mine personnel. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a copy of the additional EIA on the impacts of the use of the Central Road and the Northern Road to the Centre and IUCN and to provide a status report on the project by 15 April 1999.

Concerning the Study Group, the Chairperson pointed out that his intention was not to create a permanent group, which would involve financial costs. He suggested that a small and informal contact group during World Heritage Committee and Bureau meetings might be established. This suggestion was supported by a number of Bureau members. The Centre and IUCN informed the Bureau that a dialogue with the mining industry has
commenced. IUCN’s World’s Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has prepared a “Draft policy on mining and protected areas” which is currently being reviewed within the WCPA network and that consultations with UNESCO’s Division for Earth Sciences and the International Union for Geological Sciences have been undertaken. The Bureau requested that the Draft policy document be circulated prior to the next session of the Bureau. ICOMOS stressed the need to review impacts of mining on cultural sites as well.

Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau recalled that a proposed mining project, located at about 5 km outside of the Bystrinsky portion of this site, if executed would disrupt migratory wildlife in the region and impact fisheries resources. The Bureau was informed of communications from the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation and the Governor of the Province of Kamchatka reiterating their commitment to the site’s protection. The Governor of Kamchatka supported the controlled development of the Aginskoe gold deposit and pointed out that a formal EIA of the mining project had been carried out. Nevertheless, the Bureau expressed its concern to the Russian Government and the Kamchatka Administration over the potential consequences of the proposed mine, and requested the Centre to obtain more information, particularly on details of the EIA carried out.

Since the conclusion of the last session of the Bureau in June 1998, IUCN has informed the Centre that a GEF-funded project for this site could significantly strengthen biodiversity conservation in the area and that WWF has also initiated projects for the conservation of the site. Furthermore, IUCN was informed by the Kamchatka authorities that they intend to extend the World Heritage area by including an additional volcano within the region; IUCN has recommended that the Bureau encourage the State Party to proceed with their plans to extend the World Heritage area.

The Centre informed the Bureau that a letter, dated 17 November 1998, from the State Committee for the Environment indicates that there would be no impact on the World Heritage area as the gold deposit would be outside the Bystrinsky park. The Governor of Kamchatka, in his letter of 4 November 1998, underlined that the Aginskoe Gold Mining project is subject to rigid environmental requirements by the Kamchatka Province. Following the IUCN mission in 1997 indicating that the mine would not be visible from the site and would not affect any drainage system, the Governor came to the conclusion that the mine could start subject to the fact that it meets all environmental conditions.

The Bureau noted the activities of GEF and WWF for the conservation of Kamchatka. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contact with the State Party and the Kamchatka Administration in order to obtain detailed information on the EIA carried out, and to systematically monitor the status of the proposed gold mining project. The Bureau welcomed the possibility that the Kamchatka authorities may be considering extension of the area of the site to include another volcano within the region and encourages the State Party to proceed with such plans in consultation with the Centre and IUCN.
Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)

At its twenty-first extraordinary session, the Bureau had expressed its serious concerns over a proposed gold mining project in this site and requested detailed information on the project, including any environmental impact studies that may have been carried out. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau noted that letters from different Federal and State Level authorities seem to imply that changes to the boundaries of the World Heritage site were under consideration and that the gold mining project may have been suspended. Hence, the Bureau urged the State Party to provide to the Centre, full information on any proposal to change the borders of the site, and confirm whether the gold mining project had been withdrawn.

IUCN has informed the Centre that following a Federal Government inspection of the site in the context of the proposed gold mining activities, the local authorities were ordered to cancel all activities related to mining. However, the Government of the Komi Republic is taking legal action against this Federal Government Order and the Duma is in the process of considering a law, despite objections from the State Committee on Ecology, which would allow mining in Russia’s national parks.

The Russian State Committee for the Environment informed the Centre on 17 November 1998 that the site is under regular inspections from the State Committee and that the last inspection was carried out in June/July 1998. It revealed violations of the national legislation by enterprises specialised in gold mining on the site. All companies were given orders to suspend their illegal activities. The administration of the Yugyd Va National Park was obliged to register all affected lands and to prepare a land re-cultivation programme. IUCN informed the Bureau that WWF is carrying out a five Million Swiss Franc project for the conservation of the site.

The Bureau commended the Russian authorities on the actions taken to halt the mining activities at Virgin Komi Forests, and WWF for initiating a conservation project. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a report on the rehabilitation of impacted areas. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the authorities in the Komi Republic to discuss any boundary issues relevant to the Virgin Komi Forests.

Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)

IUCN has informed the Centre that the Regional Vice-Chair of IUCN’s World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) attended a meeting in May 1998 for the preparation of a management plan for this site. The Regional Office of the Park, established in 1997, has completed the first phase of the management plan; however, the May 1998 meeting identified several problems, including the need to improve visitor facilities and training new rangers. WCPA and EUROPARC Federation offered to provide expert advice on park facilities and proposed to organize workshops in the
Regional Park for training personnel on cave and karst protection. The Park has also invited IUCN to provide advice on the preparation of the management plan.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a request for organizing an in-situ training activity focusing on the conservation of European World Heritage sites with cave and karst features for possible financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to provide any assistance needed in the preparation and finalisation of a management plan for the site.

**Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)**

The Bureau was informed that this site has been severely damaged by fires that had affected Thailand and other countries in the region. Forest fire prevention was identified to be the major management issue in this site by IUCN, Centre and other experts and managers who visited the site as part of a World Heritage workshop hosted by Thailand during 19-23 January 1998. Most participants to the workshop identified the need for greater involvement of local people in the management of the site, including the prevention of forest fires. Following that workshop, the Chairperson has approved a sum of US$ 20,000 for a project, designed and submitted by the National Committee for the Protection of the World Heritage of Thailand, for research, training and raising awareness of local people on forest fire prevention and control. The results of the project will be used to review and revise the fire management policy of the site. The project foresees the implementation of joint activities by site staff and representatives of local communities in forest fire prevention and control during the next dry season that will begin after November 1998.

The Observer of Thailand informed the Bureau that he would make a statement on this property at the time of the twenty-second session of the Committee. A representative of IUCN pointed out that IUCN’s Forestry Programme was developing an initiative focusing on forest fires in Asia and that IUCN will explore possibilities to launch actions that could assist forest fire prevention and control in this site.

The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate to ensure timely implementation of the project to review and revise the forest fire management policy in this site and to elaborate a forest fire management policy that solicits the co-operation of local people. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report on the outcome of fire management practices that may be tested out during the forthcoming dry season for the consideration of the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

**St. Kilda (United Kingdom)**

The Centre transmitted the report entitled “Threats to St. Kilda World Heritage Site from Proposed Oil Exploration and Production in the Atlantic Frontier”, prepared by Greenpeace International, to IUCN for review. This report has raised serious concerns on
potential impacts to this site, particularly in the event of a possible oil spill that may result from the use of the Floating Production, Storage and Offloading Facilities (FPSOs). There are important threats associated with pollution derived from by-products of oil exploration and drilling activities. IUCN has informed the Centre that the State Party is currently considering the establishment of a special Area of Conservation for the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago under the European Union’s Habitats and Species Directive. IUCN has welcomed this initiative and expressed the hope that it would lead to the eventual extension of the World Heritage site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago.

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that his Government is in the process of preparing a detailed response on the issues raised. Any licence is subject to a thorough review, which is co-ordinated by Scottish Heritage.

The Bureau invited the State Party to take all possible measures to protect St. Kilda from potential adverse impacts of oil exploration and production in the Atlantic frontier and to consult with all interested parties before proceeding with such activities. The Bureau welcomed the State Party’s initiative to extend the boundaries of the site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago.

**Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

At its twenty-second ordinary session (June 1998), the Bureau noted that the study on environmental management for Ha Long Bay designed and implemented by Vietnam and JICA, commenced in February 1998 and is expected to proceed until October 1999. This study will run parallel to the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Cailan Port construction project. The Bureau was also informed of negotiations between Vietnam and Japan for the construction of the Bai Chay Bridge, expected to link Bai Chay Beach to Ha Long City across the Bai Chay Bay. A loan agreement for providing engineering services for the construction of this bridge was signed, in March 1998, by OECF, Japan, and the Government of Vietnam and includes a feasibility study as well as an environmental impact assessment of the bridge construction project.

The Vietnam authorities have provided an “explanation report” of the Bai Chay Bridge construction project, a detailed technical study outline report on the environmental management for Ha Long Bay, a report on Engineering Services and EIA for the Bai Chay Bay Bridge construction project; and a report on the feasibility study on the Bai Chay Bridge construction project. Furthermore, a report of a project, jointly implemented by the UNESCO National Commission and IUCN Vietnam on a study of the geomorphology of Ha Long Bay, focusing in particular on karst features, has also been received. The Bureau furthermore noted that an East Asia meeting on impacts of limestone quarrying on biodiversity and cultural heritage (23-29 January), and a national conference on the development of the Quang Ninh – Hai Phong Region (April) are planned for 1999. They are expected to generate new information relevant to the conservation of Ha Long Bay. In addition, preliminary results of the JICA/Vietnam
Environmental Study on Ha Long Bay are also expected to be released before the end of 1998.

The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN to liaise with donors and international agencies in order to obtain all information resulting from on-going studies and proposed conferences and meetings scheduled for 1999 and undertake a thorough review of the large volume of data contained in the reports submitted by the Government of Vietnam. The Bureau requests the Centre and IUCN to provide a state of conservation report on Ha Long Bay to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

**Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a map showing the 40 ha area to be excised from the Park is under preparation. The Park authorities have transmitted other information requested by the Bureau in November 1997 to the Federal Ministry for the Protection of the Environment (FMPE). The Bureau noted that there is a global protection regime for the Tara River and its Canyon. The Centre has requested the Permanent Delegation of the State Party to UNESCO to obtain the documentation sent by the Park authorities from the FMPE. No information was received from the State Party.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party submit to the Centre, before 15 April 1999, the map showing the 40 ha area to be excised from the Park to enable the Bureau to review the map at its twenty-third session. The Bureau requested the Centre to continue its efforts to obtain the information transmitted by the Park authorities to the FMPE.

The Bureau furthermore decided to adopt the UN official name for the State Party as follows: **Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.**

**Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)**

The Bureau was informed that IUCN had reviewed the “Scoping Report: Potential impacts associated with the proposed development of the Mosi-Oa-Tunya Hotel Complex”, prepared by the Division of Water, Environment and Forestry Technology, CSIR, South Africa. This report was commissioned by Sun International, the company that would like to develop this hotel complex on the Zambian side of this trans-border World Heritage site. From IUCN’s point of view, the key issues of concern are that: (a) the location of the proposed development is within the boundaries of the site and particularly close to the banks of the rivers; (b) institutional support that should be provided by the Zambian Government to address environmental problems is not defined; (c) given that the site belongs to two States Parties, the Government of Zambia needs to discuss the project with the Government of Zimbabwe, to seek the latter’s agreement on implementation policies, procedures and schedules.
The response of the Zimbabwean Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (ZDNPWLM) to the hotel development proposal of Sun International has been transmitted to the Centre, on 25 September 1998, by the Zimbabwe National Commission for UNESCO. ZDNPWLM has emphasised the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and stressed that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures that invite full public involvement. ZDNPWLM has pointed out that it lacks details and information on the hotel development proposal. Hence, ZDNPWLM is unable to make specific and constructive comments or endorse the development proposal.

The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa to organize a bi-national meeting to bring representatives from the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe together. The meeting should be designed and organized in a manner so as to clarify issues concerning this development project in accordance with the joint responsibility of the two States Parties to conserve and properly manage this trans-border World Heritage property. The Bureau also supported the ZDNPWLM’s position to emphasise the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures with full public involvement.

MIXED (CULTURAL AND NATURAL) HERITAGE

a) Mixed properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Bureau did not recommend any mixed sites for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

b) State of conservation reports of mixed properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for action

Kakadu National Park (Australia)

The Chairperson recalled that Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List for its cultural and natural values in three stages - Stage I in 1981, Stage II in 1987, and Stage III in 1992.

The Chairperson recalled that the twenty-first sessions of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park from the Australian authorities and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in 1997. Reports were also examined by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 1998. The reports from IUCN noted potential threats from the proposal to commence construction of a uranium mine on the Jabiluka Mineral Lease within one of the three enclaves in the World Heritage property. The Commonwealth Government of Australia provided reports to demonstrate its commitment to the
conservation of World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The reports detailed the assessment and approvals process that has allowed development of the Jabiluka uranium mine site to proceed. The reports also outlined the assessment process being conducted to determine the milling and tailings management options for the Jabiluka mine. The Chairperson also noted that the World Heritage Centre had received many protest letters concerning the Jabiluka mine from around the world.

The Chairperson recalled that the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998, requested that he lead a mission to Kakadu National Park. The Bureau requested that the mission present a report to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and the twenty-second session of the Committee.

The Chairperson referred to the mission’s work as having been conducted in accordance with the Terms of Reference (Annex II of WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.3 Rev) prepared in full consultation, and with the final agreement of, ICOMOS, IUCN and the Australian authorities. The Chairperson informed the Bureau of the other members of the mission - Bernd von Droste (Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre), Patrick Dugan (IUCN), Patricia Parker (ICOMOS), John Cook (US National Park Service) and two Australian nationals, Jon Altman and Roy Green. The mission was assisted by a Rapporteur from the World Heritage Centre.

After first acknowledging the sensitivity of the issues to the domestic politics in Australia, the Chairperson expressed the mission’s gratitude to the Australian authorities for having prepared the mission itinerary (Annex III of WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.3 Rev.), their considerable assistance and hospitality during the mission and for the provision of briefing materials to all mission members prior to and during the mission. He also thanked all the stakeholders with whom the mission met for the high degree of disclosure of information and the quality of oral and written submissions. The Chairperson recognised the presence at the Bureau session of Ms Yvonne Margarula, the senior traditional owner of the Mirrar Aboriginal people who are the traditional owners of the area covered by the Jabiluka and Ranger Mineral Leases. Their traditional land, while covering the area of the mining leases, also extends into sections of Kakadu National Park.

The Chairperson referred to the mission report (WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.3 Rev.) noting that it focused primarily on threats from the Jabiluka mining proposal posing ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The report presents 16 recommendations concerning mitigating measures. The Chairperson outlined details of how the report was prepared and the opportunity all mission members had to comment on drafts. In the final stage of drafting, all mission members were invited by the Chairperson, to append personal or qualifying statements if they so wished. The statement prepared jointly by the Australian national members of the mission, Jon Altman and Roy Green, is included in the mission report (Annex I of WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.3 Rev.). The other five members of the mission agreed to and supported the report.
The Chairperson outlined a brief chronology concerning the preparation of the report. He noted that the mission was originally scheduled for 4 to 10 October 1998, had been indefinitely postponed by the Minister for the Environment, Australia in September and then rescheduled for 26 October to 1 November 1998. He noted that the first draft of the report was prepared on 1 November 1998, the second on 16 November and the final comments were received on 23 November and were immediately incorporated and the final report sent to the Australian authorities on 24 November. He informed the Bureau that the Terms of Reference had foreseen the preparation of a report over a period of a full month but that this had not been possible because of the postponement of the mission.

The Chairperson informed the Bureau that he had received a request from the Minister for the Environment and Heritage in Australia dated 24 November 1998 that ‘the item be withdrawn from the agenda of the Bureau and Committee’. His request refers to the lateness of receipt of the report which he regarded as making it now ‘physically impossible for the Australian Government to read and reach a considered view on the report’ prior to the Bureau and Committee sessions.

The Chairperson referred to his reply to the Minister’s letter in which he stated ‘it is imperative that the mission fulfills its mandate by presenting the Bureau with the report which was requested last June’. Furthermore he had noted that ‘the Australian Government has been privy to the work of the mission since its inception’ and that the mission met with the Minister and the Secretary of Environment Australia in Canberra and expressed ‘in an open and candid manner what trends were emerging from the hearings and briefings that the mission was entertaining’. He informed the Bureau that he had also reminded Senator Hill that he himself had asked for the delay in the mission being fielded and noted ‘this certainly made the preparation of the report much more difficult time-wise. In fact, I believe we could not have produced such a report any faster’.

The Chairperson also informed the Bureau that he had received a copy of a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs in Australia which repeated the request of the Minister for the Environment and Heritage for ‘the item to be withdrawn from the agenda of the Bureau and Committee to enable the proper processes to be followed’.

The Chairperson said that he had noted and carefully considered these requests but was of the opinion that as Chairman of the Committee, he should fulfill the mandate provided at the last session of the Bureau, to present the report requested in June 1998. He also expressed the view that the report should be examined by the Bureau and that recommendations be made to the Committee.

Finally, he drew the attention of the Bureau to the fact that, whilst having noted and considered the request for the report not to be examined, the Bureau is faced with an urgent situation as the construction of the mine at Jabiluka, located within an enclave excised from the World Heritage property, is proceeding.
The Chairperson then asked the members of the Bureau whether they wished for him to proceed by presenting the report and its recommendations prior to opening the matter for discussion. In noting that some Bureau members may not have read the report, he offered the Bureau the opportunity to defer the discussion until the following day.

The Delegate of Japan expressed his appreciation and thanks to the Chairperson and to the mission for their dedicated work and for the submission of the report despite time constraints. He suggested that the views of the Observer of Australia be heard.

The Delegate of the United States of America commented that he recognised the serious situation at Kakadu National Park and the need to reach a reasoned and decent decision respectful of the rights of the State Party and of the Convention. He suggested a two-step process whereby the report would be presented and then the decision taken on the following day as to the wording of the Bureau’s recommendation to the Committee.

The Delegate of Italy acknowledged the sensitivity of the matter to the Australian Government and asked to listen to the report of the Chairperson. The Delegates of Benin and Lebanon were in agreement. The report of the mission was noted by the Bureau.

IUCN presented a position statement that had been approved for presentation to the Bureau by the Director-General of IUCN. The statement referred to the Kakadu mission report and to the Resolution on ‘Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia’ adopted by the World Conservation Congress in Canada in 1996 which had been presented to the twenty-second session of the Bureau. The Bureau agreed to include IUCN’s statement as an annex to its report (see Annex II). IUCN believes that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN believes that the failure to recognise the dangers would seriously undermine the standards for which the World Heritage Convention enjoys such high international respect.

ICOMOS stated that whilst awaiting a detailed statement from Australia ICOMOS on the content of the mission report, he noted that the recommendations made in the report seem to coincide closely with the submission made by Australia ICOMOS to the mission. ICOMOS therefore gave general support to the mission report.

The Observer of Australia was then invited to make a presentation to the Bureau. In summary, he stated that Australia has been, and continues to be, a strong supporter of the World Heritage Convention and is committed to meeting its obligations under the Convention. He referred to the lack of time for Australia to respond to the mission report. Australia’s initial reading of the report suggests it contains errors of law, fact and analysis, and recommendations that are flawed and unacceptable to the Australian Government. In noting that the Australian Government is of the opinion that the property is not in danger, he asked the Bureau to recommend to the Committee that Australia be given the opportunity to provide its considered comments on the report in a timely way as well as a full report to the next Bureau. Furthermore he asked that the Bureau
recommend to the Committee that it defer its consideration of the report until its next meeting.

The Chairperson replied by referring to the responsibility of the Bureau to implement the Convention as an instrument of international co-operation not through narrow national interpretations. He recalled the responsibility of States Parties to protect outstanding universal values and to maintain and conserve our common heritage. He pleaded as Chairperson of the Committee for reinforcement of the spirit of co-operation and fiduciary responsibilities. He referred to the need to reach decisions that will have legitimacy to the community at large.

The formulation of recommendations was then discussed in several closed sessions with Bureau members prior to being brought back to the full session for final deliberation and approval.

The Delegate of the United States of America commented that all members of the Bureau had thought about the proposed recommendations. The Bureau had tried to respect the needs and rights of the State Party and at the same time had recognized that it should do all that it could to protect the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. He suggested approval of the recommendations and its transmission to the Committee. The Delegate of Benin expressed his agreement with the comments and suggestion of the Delegate of the United States of America.

The Observer of France said that he recognised the difficulty experienced by the Bureau in drafting recommendations that gave due consideration to both the rights and interests of the State Party, and the obligations of the Bureau and the Committee to protect the outstanding natural and cultural values of Kakadu National Park. However, he said that he did not understand why a six-month period is referred to in paragraph (iii), because it does not correspond to the timetable of the Bureau or the Committee in 1999.

IUCN, speaking on behalf of both IUCN and ICOMOS, noted the urgency of the issues being considered in light of the ongoing construction of the Jabiluka mine. IUCN recalled that the statements of IUCN and ICOMOS to the Bureau on 27 November 1998, which had endorsed the recommendations of the Kakadu mission report, and drew particular attention to the recommendations for ‘application of the Precautionary Principle’ and that ‘the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed’. IUCN expressed the view of IUCN and ICOMOS that the failure to implement the recommendations of the mission report would diminish the standards, and risk the credibility of the World Heritage Convention. They noted that this was a particular concern at a time when the pressures and impacts from mining on several World Heritage sites are growing. The Bureau agreed to include the text of the joint IUCN and ICOMOS statement as an annex to the report (see Annex III).

The Chairperson said that he was aware that in the process of reaching agreement on the recommendations of the Bureau, a solution had had to be found to accommodate conflicting views and to take into consideration the rights of the State Party. The Bureau is committed to the application of the Precautionary Principle but had accepted a certain
latitude in terms of the timeframe for the implementation of its recommendations. He noted that the recommendations and the joint IUCN/ICOMOS statement would be transmitted and taken up by the Committee. The following recommendations were adopted by the Bureau.

**Recommendations:**

The Bureau recognised the report of the mission to Kakadu National Park as being both thorough and credible and recommends that the Committee receive and examine it at its twenty second session. The Bureau:

(i) expresses grave concern at the ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park which, as noted in the mission report, are posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka;

(ii) notes with concern that in spite of the dangers to the World Heritage values, construction of the mine at Jabiluka began in June 1998 and is currently progressing;

(iii) has been informed by the Australian authorities that construction of the mine decline and site will proceed; however in the next six months no mining of uranium will take place, the construction of the mill will not commence and an export permit for the Jabiluka uranium will not be issued. The Bureau has also been informed that the Australian authorities will act to complete the cultural heritage management plan with independent public review, and they will accelerate the implementation of the Kakadu Region Social Impact Study;

(iv) notes that there is significant difference of opinion concerning the degree of certainty of the science used to assess the impact of the mine on the World Heritage values of Kakadu (notably hydrological modeling, prediction and impact of severe weather events, storage of uranium ore on the surface and the long-term storage of the mine tailings);

(v) notes that the associative cultural values, and the archaeological and rock art sites, on the basis of which Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and the ability of affected Aboriginal communities to continue their traditional relationships to the land, are threatened by the Jabiluka mine proposal; and,

(vi) emphasizes the fundamental importance of ensuring thorough and continuing participation, negotiation and communication with Aboriginal traditional owners, custodians and managers in the conservation of the outstanding heritage values of Kakadu for future generations.

In view of the ascertained and potential dangers posed by the Jabiluka uranium mine that are noted in the report of the UNESCO mission to Kakadu, and have again been noted with concern by the Bureau, IUCN and ICOMOS, the Bureau recommends the following:
1. In light of the concerns expressed by the Observer of Australia, the Australian authorities be requested to provide, by 15 April 1999, a detailed report on their efforts to prevent further damage and to mitigate all the threats identified in the UNESCO mission report, to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park, Australia. The report should address these threats posed by the construction of the Jabiluka mine, by the mining of uranium ore at Jabiluka, and the alternatives for milling the ore at Jabiluka and Ranger. The report submitted by the Australian authorities should include a detailed update on the implementation of the cultural heritage management plan referred to in (iii) above and in the mission report.

2. Immediately upon its receipt by the Secretariat, the report referred to in Recommendation 1 above, be provided to ICOMOS and IUCN, who will ensure that the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee be provided with a written independent expert review concerning the mitigation of threats posing ascertained and potential dangers to Kakadu National Park by the Jabiluka mine. The expert opinion of ICOMOS and IUCN will be provided to the Secretariat by 15 May 1999 for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau and the Australian authorities.

3. The Australian authorities be requested to direct the Australian Supervising Scientist Group to conduct a full review of the scientific issues referred to in Paragraph (iv) above, to be provided to the Secretariat by 15 April 1999. The review will be submitted to peer review by an independent scientific panel composed of scientists selected by UNESCO in consultation with the International Council of Scientific Unions and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The report of the peer review will be provided to the Secretariat by 15 May 1999 for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau, IUCN and the Australian authorities.

4. The reports referred to in Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above be examined by the twenty-third session of the Bureau, and if the Bureau considers that the threats described in the mission report persist, the Bureau is authorized by the Committee to immediately inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)

The Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session recalled that over the last three years the Committee and the Bureau examined the state of conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu at several occasions, particularly with reference to adequate management arrangements and comprehensive master planning. It also recalled that the Committee and the Bureau had reiterated that no actions should be undertaken on the implementation of a cable car system, or to that effect any other major works, until an adequate master plan is in place.

In response to the concerns expressed by the Committee and the Bureau, the Government of Peru has prepared, as a joint effort between several institutions, a Master Plan for the Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. This was adopted by the National Institute for Natural
Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC) at the end of October 1998 and received at the World Heritage Centre on 17 November 1998.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee commends the Government of Peru for the actions it has taken to respond to the concerns expressed by the Committee and its Bureau, particularly the adoption of the Master Plan for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. It requests IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth examination of the Master Plan and to submit its findings to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June/July 1999.

It requests the Peruvian authorities to transmit all relevant documentation and provisions with regard to the management structure and Master Plan for the Sanctuary, the cable car system (Environmental Impact Study, detailed plans etc.), as well as other works or projects that are or will be considered for implementation within the boundaries of the World Heritage site as soon as they become available, to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS and IUCN and examination by the Bureau and/or the Committee.

The Committee furthermore requests the Bureau at its twenty-third session to consider whether it is appropriate for IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake a second mission to Peru to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the Master Plan, the project of the cable car system, the eventual hotel extension and other major works that may be planned. The Committee urges the Government of Peru not to take any decision on projects that could have considerable impact on the World Heritage values of the Park prior to a possible IUCN/ICOMOS mission. Prior consultations with the World Heritage Committee as recommended in paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines should also be envisaged.

Finally, the Committee commends the Finnish Government for its interest in the preservation of the park and the implementation of a major debt-swap project to this effect.”

c) State of conservation reports of mixed properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for noting

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau had requested the State Party to provide a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA), including possible boundary extensions to the World Heritage site. The Australian authorities have informed the Centre that negotiations between the Tasmanian and the Commonwealth Governments for setting a timetable, potentially involving the extension of the boundaries of the World Heritage site, are underway. They have undertaken to provide the timetable when the two Governments reach an agreement.
The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from the Australian NGO’s to the State Party for review. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contacts with the Australian authorities to obtain information on the timetable for the implementation of the RFA once an agreement between the Tasmanian and Commonwealth Governments is reached.

Mount Taishan (China)

The Bureau was informed that a Centre-IUCN mission which visited the site in September 1998 was concerned by the management’s stated desire to open up three new scenic spots in Heavenly Candle, Rear Rock Basin and Jade Spring scenic spots. The number of vendor stalls along the walking route may also have to be considerably reduced. Furthermore, the management needs to place an emphasis on learning more about the natural heritage values of the area and on educating visitors on the cultural and natural values of the area of World Heritage significance.

The Bureau invites the State Party to take steps to determine the tourism carrying capacity of the World Heritage site and on the basis of that determination elaborate a visitor management and a tourism development plan for the site. Furthermore, the Bureau urged the management of the site to place more emphasis on learning more about the natural heritage values of the area and on educating visitors on the cultural and natural values of the area of World Heritage significance. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities, and for review by ICOMOS.

Mount Huangshan (China)

The IUCN-Centre site mission in September 1998 found Mt. Huangshan’s management of visitors and tourism development to be exemplary. However, the mission team urged the management to consider implementing a “one-way” walking route for visitors moving across and around peaks in order to further minimize congestion. Even if site management proceeds with its plan to develop a long distance path to the Nine Dragon Peaks to alleviate pressure on the more popular scenic spots, it should not permit the development of any new hotels in the vicinity of those Peaks. The natural heritage values of this site are receiving increasing attention and the team welcomed the management’s interest to promote research on biodiversity of the area and to communicate the findings to visitors. The State Party needs to be encouraged to support the management’s concern to combat the pine-wilt disease that appears to be infesting the legendary Huangshan pines.

The Bureau commended the State Party for its effective management of visitor and tourism development in the site and invites all concerned authorities of the State Party to: (a) establish a “one-way” walking route for visitors moving across and around peaks; (b) not permit the development of new hotels in the vicinity of popular scenic spots, including the Nine Dragon Peaks; (c) promote research on
biodiversity of the site and communicate the findings to the visitors and (d) take all necessary measures to combat the pine-wilt disease infesting the legendary Huangshan pines. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities, and for review by ICOMOS.

**Ohrid Region with its Cultural and Historical Aspect and its Natural Environment (Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of)**

A joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-IUCN monitoring mission was carried out in September 1998 for the first time since the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1979.

The mission report draws particular attention to the fact that at the time of inscription of this mixed property on the List, the well preserved old towns of Ohrid and Struga were set in an almost untouched natural environment on the shores of the Lake Ohrid. As to cultural heritage, only specifically listed monuments are inscribed on the World Heritage List. These monuments are very well preserved. The natural heritage includes part of the Lake which is territory of the country (and excludes the part on the territory of Albania) and part of the Galicia National Park. Now, the enormous increase in constructions and settlement activities has seriously altered the original balance in the region: for example, the town of Struga has incorporated ten new sub-communities.

The mission observed that the authorities undertake great efforts for the preservation of the natural and cultural heritage of the site. However, economic and demographic developments pose threats to the values of the site that can only be addressed through an integrated approach and protective measures that link the cultural and the natural heritage preservation.

The mission report includes a set of recommendations calling for a special legal framework for the World Heritage site (integrating culture and nature), the strengthening of the management, the preparation of Spatial Plan for the area and the towns, and the extension of the site to include the whole of the Galicia National Park.

The Bureau took note of the report of the joint UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission to the mixed World Heritage site of Ohrid Region with its Cultural and Historical Aspect and its Natural Environment (Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of). It commended the Government of the country for the efforts taken for the preservation of the monuments and environment in Ohrid. It recommended the Government to consider the recommendations of the mission carefully, particularly with regard to integrated planning and legal protection of the natural and cultural heritage. It also requested the authorities to review the definition of the cultural heritage, to define and propose revised boundaries, if appropriate, and to establish adequate buffer zones. It requested the Government to provide a response to the report by 15 April 1999, for consideration by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.
Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) (Mali)

A cultural heritage inventory programme, financed by UNESCO’s World Heritage Fund in 1995-96, was the starting point of an important work of identification, diagnostic and ad hoc interventions that the Cultural Mission and other partners (Konstanz University and Mali research architects) carry out to improve the conservation of this heritage, which is both cultural and natural.

The Cultural Mission, with funding from the State of Mali, carries out in a continuous manner an awareness campaign throughout the 289 villages of the site, concerning the protection and the enhancement of the heritage elements. The «cities and historical sites» comprising the project «Urban Development and Decentralization» (UNDP), Land of the Dogons, are: the creation of a Documentation Centre on the Dogon Culture at Bandiagara, the rehabilitation of the Songo encampment and the management of the trails in the Sangha region.

The Bureau congratulated the Mali authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve this site inscribed on the World Heritage List. It invited the Mali authorities, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the «Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention» to: (i) co-ordinate international assistance, and (ii) inform the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intentions to undertake or to authorize, in an area protected by the Convention, major restoration works. The Bureau also encouraged the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population.

Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

The New Zealand authorities in their letter of 11 September 1998, have pointed out that an eruption of the Mt. Ruapehu in 1953 caused one of the country’s major civilian disasters and that there is an inevitability of a lahar from the crater following the present eruption. The Minister for Conservation has called for a comprehensive environmental and cultural assessment identifying the risks and assessing impacts of options for their mitigation. The New Zealand authorities consider the following three as the most practical options at present:

(a) installing an alarm and warning system;
(b) building structures off the mountain to contain the lahar expected when the ash-dam fails; and
(c) bulldozing a trench through the ash-dam itself, although the sub-option of hand digging a shallow trench has not yet been entirely dismissed.

The Park management is in regular consultation with the Ngati Rangi and the Ngati Tuwharetoa Tribes to exchange information and views and it appears very clear that they do not like the idea of engineering works at the Crater Lake. Ngati Rangi consider that the excavation at the crater “challenges the indigenous integrity and strength of the
cultural World Heritage status” of the Park. However, both Tribes understand the risks to public safety and infrastructure (e.g. bridges and roads) and the Paramount Chief of Ngati Tuwharetoa intends to convene a consultation group to work through the issues with Park management. When the draft report on the environmental and cultural assessment is ready to be released, both Tribes will be consulted. The Department of Conservation is committed to a consultation process that will support an exemplary code of ethical conduct and field conservation practice that emphasise social responsibility and cultural sensitivity. The Director of the Centre, who attended the World Heritage celebrations in Tongariro National Park during the weekend of 21-22 November 1998 confirmed this extremely sensitive approach taken by the management in searching for solutions to this issue.

The Bureau commended the New Zealand authorities for the ethically and culturally sensitive manner in which they are addressing this issue. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit a status update on the management of the ash build up at the Crater Lake outlet on Mt. Ruapehu to its twenty-third session in 1999.

C. CULTURAL HERITAGE

The Bureau examined state of conservation reports on forty-two cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

a) **Cultural properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

The Bureau did not recommend any cultural sites for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

b) **State of conservation reports of cultural properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for action**

**Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)**

At the request of the authorities of the Dominican Republic, an expert mission was undertaken in August 1998 to assess the state of conservation of the World Heritage site of Santo Domingo. The report states that, compared to the previous monitoring mission in 1993, the situation is stable and does not present major problems. It emphasises, however, the need to balance interventions in the physical-environmental recuperation of the area, tourism development and the socio-cultural development of the local population (housing, services etc.). It furthermore stresses that the effective control by the Office for the Cultural Heritage depends very much on the adoption of the Master Plan for the City which establishes an extended protection zone and norms for land-use. It also points out that several buildings in the city had collapsed recently, not caused by natural disasters but by the lack of maintenance.
On 22 September 1998, Hurricane George caused severe damage to the Dominican Republic. The Secretariat received reports from the Office for Cultural Heritage of the Dominican Republic and the national ICOMOS Committee through the Vice-President of ICOMOS for Latin America and the Caribbean. It was reported that serious damage was caused to residential buildings, churches and to the Casa de Juan de Herrera at the Plaza de Colon.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee expresses its concern about the damage caused by Hurricane George to the World Heritage site of Santo Domingo and encourages the national authorities to take the necessary measures for the consolidation and safeguarding of the damaged buildings. It expresses its readiness to assist in undertaking emergency measures for the consolidation and recuperation of damaged buildings.

At the same time, however, the Committee notes that part of the damage could only occur due to the lack of maintenance and preventive measures. It stresses the need for risk preparedness and preventive planning and conservation measures, particularly in hurricane prone areas such as the Caribbean. It strongly recommends the authorities to develop a risk preparedness plan for the City of Santo Domingo and to give priority to maintenance and preventive measures.

The Committee requests the authorities to submit, by 15 April 1999, a progress report on the actions taken in response to the report of the monitoring mission of August 1998 and to the damage caused by Hurricane George.

The Committee requests the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to look into the possibilities to develop specific activities for the Caribbean to promote and implement risk preparedness schemes.”

**Aksum (Ethiopia)**

In 1996, a report on the state of conservation of Aksum was submitted to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee which underlined that: "The site management should be strengthened by providing and collecting scientific documentation at the site level as the basis for management and conservation planning, particularly in view of the master plan that is being prepared."

In 1998, the Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage deemed it necessary “to foresee an urban plan to protect the site threatened by construction projects envisaged by the religious authorities”.

In November 1998, a staff member of ICCROM during a pre-appraisal mission for the World Bank in Ethiopia noted that:
1. A wooded site directly across from the main Stele had been cleared of its trees, and that the Ethiopian Orthodox Church had plans to build a residence for the Patriarch of the Church. However, no construction work had yet commenced.

2. The Director of the Centre for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (CRCCH), while aware of the planned construction, had not been shown the plans of the proposed building nor was he informed that work was about to begin. The attached map illustrates this information.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“...requests

1. the Centre to send a letter to the Centre for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (CRCCH) and the Patriarch of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church drawing attention to the significance of the World Heritage values of the site and underlining the need to preserve it, which would require the postponement of any further work in the proximity of the Stele,

2. that the mission on the state of conservation planned by the World Heritage Centre in June 98, which was postponed for security reasons, be carried out as soon as possible with the purpose of drawing a clear definition of the boundaries of the World Heritage site.

3. due support and consideration be given by the Ethiopian institutions and UNESCO to the preparation of a comprehensive town plan of Aksum with a clear conservation component which balances the conservation constraints with the need for the continued growth and development of the city and the communities of Aksum.”

Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that, in response to a request made by the Bureau at its twenty-second session in June 1998, it had received a letter from the French authorities on the media library and the planning for the surroundings of the Cathedral. The authorities informed that a commission had been established to study the preservation and planning of the immediate surroundings of the Cathedral (the ‘Parvis’) and that it invited ICOMOS to participate in this commission. The Secretariat also informed that it had received information from a non-governmental organization that the demolition permit for the existing buildings on the location of the media library had been delivered and authorization for the building of the media library would have been given.

ICOMOS reported that it had sent an expert mission to Reims and that it was of the opinion that the scale of the building of the media library is too large, that its height and form will not provide a balanced townscape, that the monumental scale of the building is
wholly out of context with the building’s immediate surroundings and can, therefore, not be properly integrated in it. ICOMOS also expressed the opinion that a clearly defined buffer zone around the monuments inscribed on the World Heritage List should be established and that a management plan for the monuments and their buffer zone should be prepared.

The Observer of France informed that an expert would be present at the Committee session and would be able to provide detailed information to the Committee.

The Bureau expressed concerns about the media library project, but decided to transmit the dossier to the Committee for examination so that the French expert can provide complementary information.

**Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

The Minister of Science, Research and Culture of the Land of Brandenburg has submitted the fourth state of conservation report as per the request of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session which was made available to the Bureau as an information document.

The report refers to the proposed extension of the World Heritage site, the Planning Guidelines, town planning competitions for the Green centre – Alter Markt/Lustgarten and the Quartier am Bahnhof, as well as other specific building projects.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“**The Committee takes note of the fourth state of conservation report on the Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin. It commends the authorities of the Land of Brandenburg for the actions taken in response to the recommendations made by the Committee at its twenty-first session.**

The Committee welcomes the submission of the proposed extension to the World Heritage site and requests the Bureau to examine this proposal at its twenty-third session in the light of the discussions and recommendations made by the Committee at its twentieth and twenty-first sessions.

The Committee notes the completion of the urban competition for the green centre – Alter Markt/ Lustgarten. As to the town planning competition for the Quartier am Bahnhof, the Committee regrets that the reconsideration of the building blocks 9 to 12 in the context of the results of the competition has not led to a major revision of the programme or design of these blocks and has therefore not resulted in an entirely satisfactory solution. It notes, however, with satisfaction the information provided by the Observer of Germany that the height of the building had been reduced and no longer interferes with the sight-lines of the components of the World Heritage site. It considers that their volume and monotony constitute a negative element in the urban context. A revision of their design could still diminish their negative impact.”
The Committee encourages the municipal authorities to continue the process of urban planning and the development of planning guidelines to this effect. It appreciates the commitment of the authorities to transmit the planning guidelines for the Potsdam cultural landscape to the World Heritage Committee by the end of 1998. It requests ICOMOS to examine these guidelines in the context of the evaluation mission it will undertake to Potsdam in early 1999 and to submit its findings to the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

With reference to the ‘German Unity Transport Project No 17’ (improvement of waterways), examined by the Committee at its twentieth session, the Committee commends the Federal Government for the efforts to find an alternative solution that would avoid any interference in the Babelsberg Park or other components of the Potsdam cultural landscape.

In conclusion, the Committee requests the State Party to submit by 15 September 1999, a fifth state of conservation report on the following matters:

- Final version of the planning guidelines and information on their adoption and enforcement;
- Progress in the implementation of the winning project for the Quartier am Bahnhof as well as on measures taken to diminish the negative impact of building blocks 9-12 on the architectural and urban environment;
- Results of the consideration of alternative routes for the waterways under ‘German Unity Transport Project No 17’ and their possible impact on the integrity on the World Heritage site.’

Forts and Castles of Ghana (Ghana)

The Forts and Castles of Ghana, as inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, consist of three castles, 15 forts in a relatively good condition, 10 forts in ruins and seven sites with traces of former fortifications. All sites are protected monuments in the custody of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB), with the exception of James Fort, Accra and Fort William, Anomabu, which are still being used as prisons. The sites are periodically inspected, however, their regular maintenance and conservation is severely affected by the limited financial resources of the GMMB.

During the period 1992 – 1997 major conservation works were carried out on Cape Coast Castle in Cape Coast, St. George’s Castle and Fort St. Jago in Elmina within the scope of the Historic Preservation component of the “Central Region Integrated Development Programme” funded by UNDP and USAID.

The main threats to the sites can be confined to three principal areas:

(i) **Environmental pressures.** The maritime tropical climate with its strong winds, heavy rainfalls and corrosive salt-laden atmosphere is a primary cause of the
deterioration of the physical fabric of the buildings. In addition, some of the sites are affected by the encroachment of the sea and the erosion of the ground on which the structures are located.

(ii) **Lack of buffer zones and development pressure.** None of the sites included in the World Heritage property have a buffer zone or fully defined boundaries. The encroachment of human settlements and activities on the areas in the direct vicinity of the World Heritage sites, and the subsequent erosion and pollution of the surroundings, create a serious threat to the safeguarding of the properties. The most serious issue is the on-going illegal quarrying of sand and soil around the forts, which can eventually undermine the stability of the structures. The waste dumping and contamination of the beaches around the forts are another disturbing practice.

(iii) **Lack of adequate funding for the regular maintenance and conservation of the sites.** Apart from the above-mentioned assistance provided by UNDP and USAID, practically all finance for the sites is provided by the Government of Ghana through its annual budget. However, the level of funding is far too inadequate to meet the basic needs of maintenance and conservation. As a result, some of the structures have deteriorated so badly that an urgent intervention is needed to prevent them from collapsing.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee:

- thanks the national authorities in Ghana for their efforts in preservation of the World Heritage sites in Ghana and congratulate them on the recent conservation works carried out in Cape Cost and Elmina;
- urges the national authorities to ensure that all the Forts listed as World Heritage are not used for unrelated purposes and that their World Heritage values are preserved;
- recommends that action be taken urgently to define buffer zones around the properties, as well as other protective measures to stop further environmental degradation of the areas in the direct vicinity of the World Heritage sites;
- recommends that the national authorities in Ghana submit an Emergency Assistance request with regard to the urgent conservation works on some of the Forts;
- encourages the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population."

**Island of Mozambique (Mozambique)**

Thanks to a contribution from the World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage site - Ilha de Mozambique, has been the object of the World Heritage Centre’ s “Programme for Sustainable Human Development and Integral Conservation”. The programme, prepared in 1996, is funded by: UNDP – US$ 300,000 (over the period 1997-1999), UNESCO –
US$ 100,000, European Union – US$ 100,000 and the Finnish Government, which is financing a post of an Associate Expert for the 2-year period (1997-1998). Currently, a number of micro-projects in such areas as: water and sanitation, tourism development and heritage restoration, are being developed. These projects will be presented to potential donors during the donor meeting scheduled for February 1999.

In addition, works have already started on the restoration of the Casa da Cultura building to be used as the project office. The restoration is progressing relatively quickly and is expected to be completed by January 1999.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“ The Committee congratulates the Mozambique authorities for their efforts to preserve the Ilha de Mozambique by taking into account the social and economic aspects of the site” and calls upon the potential donors to support this endeavour.

The Committee requests the authorities to report at its next session on the results of the donor’s meeting and on the progress made in the implementation of the “Programme for Sustainable Human Development and Integral Conservation”.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

The Committee, at its seventeenth session, expressed deep concern over the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley site and considered the possibility of placing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, following discussions on the findings of the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission (hereafter referred to as the 1993 Mission).

At its twenty-first session, the Committee examined the state of conservation report of this site, and in view of the continued deterioration of the World Heritage values in the Baudddhanath and Kathmandu Monument Zones, affecting the integrity and inherent characteristics of the site, the Committee requested the Secretariat, in collaboration with ICOMOS and His Majesty’s Government (HMG) of Nepal, to study the possibility of deleting selected areas within some Monument Zones, without jeopardizing the universal significance and value of the site as a whole. This review was to take into consideration the intention of HMG of Nepal to nominate Kokhana as an additional Monument Zone.

The Committee authorized up to US$ 35,000 from the World Heritage Fund technical co-operation budget for a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal team to conduct a thorough study and to elaborate a programme for corrective measures in accordance with paragraphs 82-89 of the Operational Guidelines. Based upon the information of this study and recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee, at its twenty-first session, decided that it could consider whether or not to inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-second session. Following this decision, a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission (hereafter referred to as Joint Mission) was organized in March-April 1998.

The Bureau, while noting concern over the gravity of the situation, recognized that HMG of Nepal had made considerable efforts in implementing ten out of twelve actions within the Action Plan, with deadlines of 30 November 1998. Furthermore, the Bureau members and observer States Parties remarked on the positive actions taken by HMG of Nepal in the past five months to enhance management at the Kathmandu Valley site. It was noted that the results of the Joint Mission and the possibility of the site’s inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger had encouraged the authorities concerned to take concrete actions to implement the 16-point recommendations of the 1993 Mission. Therefore, the Bureau concluded that the positive momentum achieved should not be undermined by immediate inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS stated that it had strongly recommended inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and 1993, in view of the urgency to redress the situation endangering the integrity of the site. However, ICOMOS supported the Bureau’s positive view to allow more time for the current momentum to lead to tangible results in the preservation of the site.

The Observer of HMG of Nepal, representing the Honourable Minister of Youth, Sports and Culture, thanked the Committee, Bureau, and the Secretariat for their continued support since 1993 for preserving the Kathmandu Valley site. He expressed appreciation to the Bureau for its understanding of the difficulties being encountered by HMG of Nepal in the context of the rapid urban development since the site’s inscription in 1979. He underlined the very positive developments which had taken place since July 1998, especially the creation of the inter-ministerial Heritage Conservation Unit within the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, and the participation of the local municipalities and communities concerned, as well as NGOs in the conservation process. The Observer assured the Bureau, that within the next six months, the threats on the Kathmandu Valley site would be seriously addressed and mitigated.

The Chairperson referred to a letter addressed to the Director-General of UNESCO from the Honourable Minister of Youth, Sports and Culture reporting on recent measures taken to safeguard the Kathmandu Valley site, which had all been mentioned in the Information Document WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.6.

The Bureau decided to defer consideration of inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its twenty-third session in June 1999. It decided to transmit the Joint Mission report presented in WHC-98/CONF.202/INF.6 to the Committee for examination, and to recommend the following for adoption:

“The Committee examines the findings and results of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission, the 55 recommendations and Time-Bound
Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal. The Committee commends HMG of Nepal for its efforts in strengthening the management of the Kathmandu Valley site with the creation of the Heritage Conservation Unit. The Committee takes note of the special efforts made by the local authorities to raise awareness amongst the private home owners to prevent further illegal demolition and inappropriate new constructions, which destroys the essential historical urban fabric of the Kathmandu Valley site.

The Committee decides to defer consideration of inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its twenty-third session. However, the Committee requests HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission and to respect the deadlines of the Time-Bound Action Plan. In addition, the Committee recommends that HMG of Nepal adopt the three additional ICOMOS recommendations presented in Annex 1 of Chapter 12 of the Joint Mission report. Moreover, the Committee requests HMG of Nepal to submit a report on the progress made in implementing the 55 recommendations before 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June 1999.

Finally, the Committee requests HMG of Nepal to take measures to ensure that adequate protection and management are put into place at Kokhana, prior to its nomination as an additional Monument Zone to the Kathmandu Valley site.”

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)

Having taken note of information provided by the Secretariat and the Observer of Poland, the Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee recalls that on 5 March 1997 a ‘Declaration Concerning Principles for Implementation of Program Oswiecimski’ was initialed by the Polish Government Plenipotentiary for the Government Strategic Plan for Oswiecim, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, the International Council of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau and the Mayor of Oswiecim in the presence of the President of Poland. The Committee takes note of information provided by the Secretariat on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration, particularly through an expert meeting that was held on 2 and 3 June 1998 on the spatial management of the area around the two Concentration Camps. It takes note, furthermore, of the information provided by the Observer of Poland that further consultations are taking place with the participants of the expert meeting and that the Government of Poland will present a progress report. It requests the Polish authorities submit this report by 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

The Committee confirms its support for the principles laid out in the Declaration of March 1997 and also confirms its support that this process continues in a consensual manner among all parties involved. It expresses the belief that no steps should be made unless consensus is reached.
The Committee expresses its readiness to contribute to the implementation of this process, if required."

Central Zone of Angra do Heroismo in the Azores (Portugal)

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-second ordinary session, was informed about a marina project that seriously threatens the characteristic features of the waterfront of the World Heritage site. Following a letter sent by the Chairperson asking the Portuguese authorities for information on the project, extensive information consisting of an environmental impact study, a legislation decree and information on the project was received by the World Heritage Centre and transmitted to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS undertook a mission to the site in October 1998 and reported to the Bureau that its expert recognised the economic need for a marina, but that ICOMOS opposes this particular project for the negative impact it would have on the World Heritage values of the site. It recommended that an alternative location be sought for the marina.

The Observer of Portugal informed that an expert from Portugal would be present at the Committee session for detailed information on the project, particularly the matter of the underwater heritage in the Bay of Angra de Heroismo.

The Bureau endorsed the concerns expressed by ICOMOS, but decided to transmit the case to the Committee for examination so that the expert from Portugal can provide complementary information.

Burgos Cathedral (Spain)

The Bureau, at its twenty-second session requested the Spanish authorities to submit by 15 September 1998 a report on the plans for the hill and fortress of Burgos, which it considered as one of the main elements of the cultural landscape of Burgos. This request was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Spain on 16 July 1998.

The Observer of Spain informed the Bureau that a Spanish expert might be present at the Committee session.

The Bureau, therefore, decided to refer the examination of the state of conservation of Burgos Cathedral to the Committee.

The Rock Carvings in Tanum (Sweden)

At the invitation of the Director of Monuments and Sites of the County Administration of Västra Götaland, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, undertook a mission to Tanum in September 1998 to discuss the E6 road upgrading project, funded by the European Union.
The current E6 passes through the central-eastern part of the World Heritage site. The Swedish Road Administration presented various options for the location of the E6. Three of the possible road corridors would to a large extent pass through the World Heritage site. These suggestions were considered unacceptable by the mission team. However, it was felt that one alternative solution, developed during the mission, although passing into the World Heritage site, would have a minimum impact on the continuity of the landscape of the World Heritage site and would not affect the rock carving sites as such.

As to options that would not touch the World Heritage site, it was recognized that the impact of the so-called Green Route on the natural and scenic values of the area to the east of the World Heritage site would be such as to render it unacceptable. However, ICOMOS/WHC requested that further in-depth studies be carried out on the so-called Blue Route (to the west of the World Heritage site, near the coast), which would be the optimum solution since it would avoid any incursion into the World Heritage site.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee expresses its appreciation of the fact that it was consulted on this project at such an early stage of its implementation. It recommends this consultation as a desirable precedent to other States Parties. Furthermore, it requests the State Party to study further the possibility of utilizing the Blue Route, passing to the west of the World Heritage site. In the event that this had to be precluded for engineering, social, and/or financial reasons, the Committee requests the State Party to carry out further study on the alternative route through the World Heritage site as developed during the mission.

The Committee requests the State Party to present a progress report on the E6 project, by 15 April 1999, to be examined by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.”

**World Heritage sites in Central America**

The Secretariat reported that Hurricane Mitch swept over Central America during the final days of October 1998, causing heavy rains and storms and inundating important parts of Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador. The region has a number of World Heritage sites, including:

- **El Salvador:** Joya de Ceren Archaeological Site
- **Guatemala:** Tikal National Park
  - Antigua Guatemala
  - Archaeological Park and Ruins of Quirigua
- **Honduras:** Maya site of Copan
  - Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (on the Danger List)
- **Nicaragua:** The site of Leon Viejo, recognised by the Bureau as having World Heritage values, but not inscribed as yet.
The Secretariat informed that heavy rains and storms have caused serious flooding in the excavated areas of the extremely fragile site of Joya de Ceren in El Salvador as well as damage to the roofs that protect the excavated structures. A request for emergency assistance for an amount of US$ 35,000 was under consideration by the Chairperson.

Serious damage was also reported to Leon Viejo in Nicaragua. No information had been obtained as of yet on the properties in Honduras and Guatemala.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

“The Committee expresses its sincere regrets and serious concern about the loss of life and destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch in the countries of Central America. It expresses its readiness to collaborate with the authorities in the States Parties concerned in assessing damages that may have been caused to the World Heritage in the region and in taking remedial actions that may be necessary for their preservation or restoration.

The Committee requests the Secretariat to transmit the above to the States Parties concerned and to provide, jointly with the advisory bodies, a full report on the conditions of the World Heritage in the region to the twenty-third session of the Bureau.”

c) **State of conservation reports of cultural properties which the Bureau transmitted to the Committee for noting**

**Rapa Nui National Park (Chile)**

Early 1998, the Secretariat received information about the possible construction of a new harbour within the World Heritage site, the extraction of stone and problems in the management of the Park. In response, the Chilean authorities informed that the harbour project was indeed considered some years ago but that this project at present was not being pursued; and that the extraction of stone is strictly controlled by the Council of National Monuments in accordance with what is foreseen in the Management Programme for the Natural Heritage and the Master Plan for the Rapa Nui National Park. A close collaboration has been established between the Council for National Monuments and the National Forestry Agency (CONAF) and consultations with the local authorities are taking place. No new authorisations have been given for archaeological excavations, awaiting a specific ordinance for excavations and research.

As to the management of the Park, the authorities informed that a Management Plan for the Rapa Nui National Park was adopted in February 1998, copy of which was made available to the Secretariat and ICOMOS.

A comprehensive programme for the preservation of Rapa Nui has been prepared by the National Conservation Centre, the University of Chile and the National Forestry Agency (CONAF) and submitted for consideration under the Japanese Funds-in-Trust. The
programme would include items such as: the preservation of stone, cultural anthropology, the environment and equipment.

The Bureau thanked the Chilean authorities for the information provided on the management of the Park and the adoption of the management plan. It requested the Chilean authorities to keep the Committee informed of future planning, infrastructural works and excavations that might be planned for the Park.

The Mountain Resort and its Outlying Temples in Chengde (China)

The Bureau, at its twentieth extraordinary session in 1996, recommended that the Chinese authorities adopt a development plan for the town of Chengde in line with World Heritage conservation needs. The Chinese authorities reported to the Secretariat, in a state of conservation report on this property submitted in July 1998, that the city planning department has included World Heritage protection in the historic city’s urban development plan.

According to this report, conservation work has continued since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1994. A 10-year Renovation Plan of the site was prepared by national experts and approved by the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Chengde City in 1995. An “Overall Management Plan for Chengde City” was adopted by Hebei Provincial Government in 1995. Afforestation measures have been taken for the gardens and the surroundings of the site, with vegetation coverage currently exceeding 90%.

Training and education activities carried out by the site administration have enabled the training of more than 3,500 persons. Promotion “week” and “month” were organized by the City Government to increase the understanding and application of the Law on the Protection of Cultural Relics. Chengde Research Institute of Cultural Properties was established in 1995. Over 30 on-site staff have been trained at other institutes or universities. With assistance from the World Heritage Fund, a Training Course for Site Managers of Cultural World Heritage Properties in China was organized in September 1997 by the State Bureau of Cultural Relics. In addition, the Mayor of Chengde participated in the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union in April 1998 (Suzhou) organized by the World Heritage Centre and exchanged experiences with counterparts from China and the EU.

Security conditions at the site museum have improved, thanks to the technical and equipment support made available from the World Heritage Fund. The security staff has increased from 200 to 300 persons since 1995. 3.4 million RMB Yuan (US$411,600) was invested in the restoration project of Xu Mi Fu Shou Temple and the conservation of artifacts in the site museums.

The management of the site has been strengthened with the Vice-Mayor of Chengde City assuming the responsible supervision of all administration work. A decision was taken to further intensify the protection of the site by the City government so as to strengthen the implementation of the Management Plan.
The Bureau was informed by the World Heritage Centre of reports received concerning increasing urban and tourism development pressures negatively affecting the historical setting within the buffer zone of this site.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and commended the local authorities for their efforts in enhancing the management of the site. The Bureau, however, expressed concern over the rapidly increasing urban pressure within the buffer zone and encouraged the relevant authorities to take appropriate measures to integrate tourism development and urban heritage conservation issues in the Management Plan of the site.

The Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)

In approving the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List at its eighteenth session in 1994, the Committee recommended the Chinese authorities to extend the boundary to include Jokhang Temple and the surrounding historic quarters. This point was discussed at the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau and the Delegate of China informed the Bureau that the Chinese authorities were in favour of this extension as recommended by the Committee. A report was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of China in July 1998, which indicated that the Government of the Tibetan Autonomous Region would be formally requesting the inclusion of Jokhang Temple within this site, and that the responsible Chinese authorities would proceed accordingly. On 18 August 1998, the World Heritage Centre requested the Director-General of the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of China to provide further information on the progress of the extension before 1 October 1998. No written report was however been received by the Secretariat.

To protect the setting of the site, modern residences and shops around the square in front of the Palace, which were not in harmony with the historical monuments, were removed by the local authority. The use of traditional building material and methods in the restoration work is being promoted so as to preserve the original architectural features of the site. Publications concerning the architectural styles, paintings, sculptures and the contents of all the cultural properties of the Potala Palace were issued by the local authorities to raise awareness amongst the general public.

The Bureau was informed that the World Heritage Centre has received numerous reports on the demolition of historic buildings and new construction activities in the Barkhor historic area which encircles the Jokhang Temple in the religiously symbolic urban form of the “mandala”.

The Bureau took note of the efforts made by the responsible Chinese authorities to prepare the extension of the Potala Palace World Heritage site to include the Jokhang Temple. The Bureau also noted the efforts being made by the local authorities in safeguarding the essential historical setting of this site. It requested the State Party for additional information concerning Barkhor historic area which is also part of the extension area recommended by the Committee at the time of the inscription of this site.
Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu (China)

According to a state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities in July 1998, efforts have been made to conserve the authenticity of the site. To improve the setting of the site, the Divine Road connecting the monumental sites was restored by using traditional building material and the protection of ancient trees was strengthened. A computerized management system has been put into place to monitor all the cultural properties, ancient trees and the ancient monuments within the site. Lighting facilities in the ancient buildings were replaced and electricity wiring was placed underground. Safety and fire prevention measures have also been strengthened.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and encouraged the responsible authorities to undertake further actions to enhance the management of the site, especially taking into consideration development issues such as land-use, sustainable tourism, and vegetation management.

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China)

According to a state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities in July 1998, a commission of experts for the preservation of this site was established by the local authorities. Subsequently, legal measures which strengthen the protection of Wudang Mountains have been put into effect. The transfer of the local residents inhabiting the ancient buildings to areas outside the site has been undertaken. Restoration work has been carried out to repair the Purple Cloud Hall and a number of ancient buildings. An Administration Bureau was established to enhance the management and preservation of the site. Increased financial resources have been made available towards the preservation of the ancient building complex. A “Master Plan for the Development of Wudang Mountains” has also been formulated. The local authorities have included the protection, presentation and restoration of cultural properties as one of the top priorities within their programme for social development.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and of the efforts made by the local authorities to implement adequate management measures to protect this site. The Bureau requested the national and local authorities to incorporate sustainable tourism development strategies within the site management plan to ensure that the integrity of the site’s cultural and historical setting is protected.

City of Quito (Ecuador)

The UNESCO Representative in Quito, informed the Secretariat on 7 October 1998 that the Volcano Pichincha, in the vicinity of the western part of the City of Quito, had become active after three hundred years. An eruption (most probably stones and acid ashes) could seriously imperil the lives of the inhabitants of villages and the City of Quito and could affect its historic centre and its monuments. The National Geophysical Institute has established a scientific committee with experts from the United States of America to
monitor the situation. The Mayor of Quito, who has been assigned by the Government with the responsibility for the crisis management, has approached UNESCO for immediate support for:
- preventive measures at the historic monuments of Quito;
- expert advice on planning and management of this type of crisis in urban areas.

At the time of preparation of this document, the Secretariat is in contact with the national authorities, the UNESCO Office in Quito and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee about the appropriate response to this situation.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and requested the State Party to keep the Secretariat informed on the situation.

**Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)**

In 1995, a mission from the World Heritage Centre visited Egypt to prevent the construction, within the boundaries of the protected zone, of a portion of the Greater Cairo “Ring-Road”. A joint declaration was then issued and the project cancelled. A proposal for the diversion of the Ring Road was then suggested. On 6 September 1998, the Secretariat received a letter from the President of the Supreme Council of Antiquities requesting UNESCO to send a mission of specialists to study details of the diversion plan and provide them with technical advice.

On 3 October, a mission from UNESCO proceeded to Cairo and worked on this issue with the Supreme Council of Antiquities and the concerned ministries. A joint communiqué, signed by the Supreme Council of Antiquities, the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction and UNESCO urged for a full implementation of the Convention and reconfirmed the alternative route selected during the previous UNESCO mission in 1995 (diversion through the Maryoutiyah and Mansouriyyah canals). At the request of the authorities, the Centre will start co-operation for the improvement of the management of the site.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to continue co-operating with the Egyptian authorities on this issue as well as on the overall management of the site and to report on the progress of the work to the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

**Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt)**

The Secretariat has received from various sources, mainly scholars involved in research work, detailed information about renewed plans by the authorities to transfer the inhabitants of the old village of Gurnah to a new location, outside the boundaries of the site. This plan of relocating Gurnah has been considered for decades, the first attempt having seen the involvement of the reputed Egyptian architect, Hassan Fathi in the conception of the new village of “Gurna El-Gadidah”. The inhabitants of Gurnah, who have always been involved in the archaeological excavations as workers or specialized manpower have opposed their displacement to a new village. The reasons for the decision
of the authorities are that the village is built on an archaeological land, that the inhabitants are looting the sites surrounding them and that the waste water created by the village is destroying some archaeological sites.

The Secretariat is of the opinion that this issue be taken in a broader manner and that a full-fledged study of the situation in the site be undertaken (encompassing geological, archaeological and geographical surveys and mapping, anthropological studies, assessment of the historical and cultural landscape qualities of the foothills and of the presence of Gurnah in the site). A comprehensive management plan could then be prepared to include the concept of a separate cultural landscape nomination for the villages of Gurnah and their environment.

After having taken note of the information provided, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to study with the Egyptian authorities the possibility of launching a co-operation programme encompassing geological, archaeological and geographical surveys and mapping, anthropological studies, assessment of the historical and cultural landscape qualities of the foothills and of the presence of Gurnah in the site. The Bureau also recommended to the Egyptian authorities the postponement of any further transfer of the population of Gurnah until these investigations have taken place, and urged the authorities to establish an awareness campaign among the local community.

**Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

Based on the recommendation of the Bureau at its twenty-second session and on a request of the Minister of Culture addressed to the Director-General of UNESCO endorsing the results of the brain-storming session of June 1998, the Centre has sent from 3 to 11 October a mission of specialists to Cairo to prepare a three-year strategy and conservation programme for Islamic Cairo. This co-operation programme is submitted for consideration to the World Heritage Committee under requests for international assistance.

Regarding the issue of Al Azhar Mosque, the Centre received a technical report containing the architectural standards applied for the work on the monument from the Supreme Council of Antiquities in Egypt. The Centre transmitted the report to ICOMOS and ICCROM on 23 November 1998.

Regarding awareness creation among concerned parties in the Arab Region in favour of the built religious heritage, as suggested by members of the Bureau, the Centre is proposing to organize in 1999 a meeting on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and architectural standards in religious sites and monuments. During the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau, the representative of Lebanon suggested that the meeting cover different types of monuments and not only religious ones, considering the diversity of the monuments in the Arab Region. He also offered to host the meeting in Lebanon.
After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau thanked the Egyptian authorities for their co-operation with the Centre and requested the Secretariat to do its utmost in the implementation of the co-operation programme in favour of Islamic Cairo.

The Bureau took also note of the report submitted by the authorities on the works at the Al-Azhar Mosque. It requested ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth evaluation of the report for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to organize as soon as possible the seminar on monuments and properties in the Arab Region.

**Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia)**

On 13 October 1998, the Secretariat received an urgent request from the UNESCO National Commission of Estonia for advice on a project for a new theatre in medieval buildings within the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Tallinn. ICOMOS was able to respond immediately by sending an expert to Tallinn.

Having listened to the report by ICOMOS, the Bureau expressed its concern about the adverse impact of the proposed theatre project on the medieval centre of Tallinn. It requested the State Party to give urgent consideration to the selection of an alternative location for this important cultural project and alternative uses for the medieval buildings concerned.

**Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town in Quedlinburg (Germany)**

A comprehensive state of conservation report has been submitted by the German Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt which focuses on the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee in Naples 1997. In order to guide and assist with conservation, preservation and development of Quedlinburg a number of activities have been carried out. These refer to measures taken to strengthen and improve planning, legal protection and control mechanisms.

ICOMOS advised the Secretariat that this report is very encouraging. The City authorities have taken energetic and positive steps to take account of the points made by the recent expert mission.

The Bureau commended the German authorities on this extensive and very encouraging report and requested the State Party to submit a progress report by 15 September 1999 for examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.
**Historic Centre of Florence (Italy)**

The Secretariat and the Chairperson informed the Bureau that they had received a number of letters of concern about the possible impact of the construction of a high tension power line through the landscape surrounding the city of Florence. The Delegate of Italy confirmed that such a project exists and that, although outside of the World Heritage site, it could be visible from some location in the city. He informed that a review was being undertaken to identify measures to minimise the impact of the project on the city and the landscape.

The Bureau requested the Italian authorities to consider this matter and to submit a report on it by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

**Quseir Amra (Jordan)**

In August 1998, the Centre received a letter from the Director-General of the Antiquities in Jordan stating that the Jordanian authorities in co-operation with IFAPO had already completed the alternative plan of the Visitors’ Centre at Quseir Amra. The proposed location is East of the ancient Roman bath within the fenced area and at a good distance from the monument. The Director-General of the Antiquities also stated in his letter that the idea to divert the Visitors’ Centre to the other side of the highway would be unrealistic and would threaten the safety of the visitors in crossing the highway.

The Centre requested the authority to send a detailed plan to be forwarded to ICOMOS for evaluation.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau endorsed the views of the Jordanian authorities concerning the location of the Visitors’ Centre. However, it requested the authorities to do their utmost to minimize the impact of the Visitors’ Centre on the landscape and to provide the Secretariat with a proposal in this respect. Moreover, the Bureau requested the Jordanian authorities to continue preserving works of the mural paintings of the Roman bath.

**Luang Prabang (Laos)**

The Heritage House (*Maison du patrimoine*), a conservation and development advisory service for inhabitants which is a service of the Provincial Authorities of Luang Prabang that reports to the Local Provincial Committee for the Protection and Development of Cultural and Natural Heritage, initiated the second phase of the Safeguarding and Development Plan of Luang Prabang. Architectural surveys of 1000 buildings owned by private individuals or religious groups located within the centre of the World Heritage site were completed and surveys of all Government-owned buildings and public space are currently being undertaken. The elaboration of this Plan and other related activities, such as the restoration of the traditional timber buildings and colonial buildings through on-site training activities are being carried out within the framework of the Luang Prabang-
Chinon (France) decentralized co-operation agreement signed in August 1997 under the aegis of UNESCO. Following the study tour to France by the Governor of Luang Prabang in September 1997, the four Lao architects of the Heritage House visited France in July 1998, both financed by the French Foreign Ministry.

Following the Luang Prabang-Chinon-UNESCO technical meeting held in April 1998, the Governor of Luang Prabang was presented with a list of buildings recommended for protection. Upon approval by the Governor of the list of all scheduled buildings, it will be submitted to the national authorities for official legal protection.

In addition to the daily work of advising on building permits and field inspection of ongoing construction works, the Heritage House with support from the town of Chinon and UNESCO, developed two major project proposals. One on the protection of the urban humid zone prepared by the Institute of Aquatic and Fluvial Research of Chinon (IMACOF/Tours University), under funding from the World Heritage Fund and Chinon, was co-funded by the European Commission for ECU 350,000 (US$ 380,000). The second, aimed to strengthen local capacity in urban management and to conduct a number of demonstrative rehabilitations of public space, has been funded by the French Agency for Development, for the sum of FF 10 million (US$ 1.95 million) over a 3-year period. Co-operation with Region Centre (France) has continued with the confirmation of their second earmarked contribution to the World Heritage Fund for the sum of FF 300,000 within the total amount of FF 1 million pledged in the Agreement with UNESCO in 1997 for the rehabilitation of the former French customs building being converted for re-use as the Luang Prabang Site Information Centre. Close collaboration has been established between the Heritage House and the project team executing the Asian Development Bank project on road and riverbank upgrading, and with the German development aid agency, KFW, implementing the drainage and sewage improvement project. Both these being important infrastructural projects that would greatly benefit the inhabitants, but could have a negative impact on the cultural heritage of the town if carried out without adequate care and sensitivity to the fragile patrimonial value of the site.

The 1998 World Heritage grant of US$ 25000 has enabled the preparation of pedagogical tools to inform the local population of the Safeguarding and Development Plan and its implications to the inhabitants, which include a video film, panel exhibition and information leaflets. A community-based meeting foreseen under this WHF project is scheduled to commence in January 1999 upon the completion of the educational tools.

The draft law on Protection of National Cultural and Natural Heritage which was prepared in 1996 with legal assistance from UNESCO and the French Government, was issued as a Decree of the Council of Ministers in May 1997 but has not yet been officially enacted as law by the National Assembly.

The Bureau commended the efforts of the Luang Prabang Provincial authorities, particularly the Heritage House as well as the national authorities in the substantive and rapid progress made in strengthening the legal and administrative framework to protect and conserve this site. The Bureau, also commended the Heritage House-Chinon-UNESCO project team for having successfully mobilized
close to US$ 4.5 million from bilateral and multilateral donor sources in less than three years by using financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund in a catalytic manner to generate other co-operation projects. The Bureau however, recommended the national and local authorities of the State Party to remain vigilant in co-ordinating the numerous aid and investment projects, particularly those of the Asian Development Bank and German KFW to ensure that these infrastructural development projects are carried out without undermining the World Heritage value of the site. The Bureau requested the State Party to make all efforts for the enactment of the national law on cultural and natural heritage protection by the National Assembly which is presently a decree, and to approve an official list of protected buildings and to forward a copy of these to UNESCO.

Baalbek (Lebanon)

Expressions of concern have been received by the Secretariat about extensive rehabilitation works being undertaken by the Lebanese Department of Antiquities contrary to established procedures. After the twenty-second session of the Bureau, the Centre received letters from the Lebanese authorities explaining the waterproofing works of the “crypto-portico”, which was to be used as an exhibition area for the celebration of the centenary of the German excavations in Baalbek (November 1998). The German Archaeological Institute has confirmed to the Secretariat that the waterproofing works were technically sound and reversible.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the clarification stated by the Lebanese authorities, the Bureau thanked the authorities for the information received. It also thanked the German Archaeological Institute for its assistance in this matter, and congratulated the Lebanese authorities for the protective actions taken for the site by expropriating plots in front of the main entrance. Finally, the Bureau reminded the Lebanese authorities of the necessity to prepare a long awaited management plan for the site.

Tyre (Lebanon)

In September 1998, the Minister of Public Works of Lebanon was invited to a meeting with the Secretariat and with the President of the International Association for the Safeguarding of Tyre. At this meeting, which was also attended by a UNESCO consultant working on the Master Plan of Tyre, the Minister presented the work undertaken and planned by his Ministry and requested UNESCO to provide assistance to secure the proper integration of archaeology in the Master Plan and in his Ministry’s works. The Division of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO, in charge of the international campaign launched in March 1998, had already started this technical support by sending an expert in urban planning in July 1998, whose report has now been transmitted to the Lebanese authorities.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau welcomed the request of the Ministry of Public Works to be advised by UNESCO and recommended that the co-operation between the Lebanese authorities and
UNESCO in preparing the Master Plan of Tyre be reinforced. The Bureau also requested:

- that the safeguarding of the archaeological and historical areas of Tyre be considered by the Lebanese authorities as a top priority in the preparation of this Master Plan
- and that any infrastructural work within the site be suspended until the adoption of this Master Plan.

**Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)**

The Bureau recalled that considerable assistance had been provided since 1995 for the revitalisation of Vilnius Old Town, not only from the World Heritage Fund, but also from others such as the Canadian Urban Institute, Edinburgh, the Nordic World Heritage Office, ICCROM, UNDP etc. With this assistance, meetings and a donors’ conference were organised, training and expert advice has been provided as well as consultant services.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that a major achievement had been obtained by the creation of the Old Town Revitalisation Agency (OTRA), a joint agency between the Ministry for Culture and the Municipality of Vilnius. An Old Town Revitalisation Fund would be established shortly. Both OTRA and the Fund will concentrate on the development of specific projects and programmes. To this effect, a technical assistance programme will be drafted by UNESCO and UNDP.

A request for international assistance for US$ 20,000 was received for consideration by the Chairperson, to support this programme.

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the considerable progress made in setting up the institutional framework for the revitalisation of the Vilnius Historic Centre. The Bureau commended in particular the Government of Lithuania and the Municipality of Vilnius on the creation of the Old Town Revitalisation Agency (OTRA). It encouraged the authorities to continue its efforts to develop and implement policies, programmes and projects for the revitalisation of the city.

**Old Towns of Djenné (Mali)**

In close co-operation with the village populations adjacent to the archaeological sites, and the administrative offices, the Cultural Mission of Djenne has carried out, since 1994, information, awareness-building and education activities with the local population, stressing the imperative need to preserve and promote cultural heritage.

Following an inventory of the conservation of the monuments of the Town of Djenne, the Cultural Mission had undertaken the restoration of some monuments, and, thanks to support from participants of the international youth workshop, held in December 1996, the inner walls of Konofia were restored.
Co-operation between Mali and The Netherlands resulted in a project comprising the restoration of 168 dwellings in the old quarter, which began in October 1996. This project, for a duration of six years, has the following essential objectives:

- safeguard of cultural heritage
- strengthen cultural identity through the promotion of the significance of earth architecture
- ensure training in the field of the restoration of historical monuments, whilst respecting the local construction techniques,
- contribute towards the economic development of the populations.

At the request of the Minister for Culture, a project entitled « Reappropriation and improvement of the urban area of Djenne » with the objective of an integrated and concerted development of cultural tourism, will permit the implementation of harmonized action. This would concern the improvement of solid and liquid waste management and their co-ordination with other conservation projects carried out through co-operation between the Cultural Mission of Djenne and The Netherlands. The project, which is decentralized to Dakar, will be financed up to 100 million CFA, in the framework of a shared phase with local populations. The project is part of the network of activities implemented by the « Human Habitat » Unit of the Social Sciences Sector of UNESCO.

In the framework of the Third Urban Project, the execution of a global plan for the conservation of the old Town of Djenne is foreseen. This plan will comprise activities to improve sanitation, the construction of the Museum, and the construction of green areas, all of which will contribute towards the development of sustainable tourism to benefit the local population.

The Bureau:

(i) congratulated the Mali authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve this site inscribed on the World Heritage List;
(ii) invited the Mali authorities, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the « Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention » to: i) co-ordinate international assistance, and ii) inform the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intentions to undertake or to authorize, within the area protected by the Convention, major restoration work;
(iii) encouraged the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population.

City of Cusco (Peru)

The Bureau, at its twenty-first session, reiterated the need for appropriate planning mechanisms for the Historic City of Cusco. At that occasion, the Bureau welcomed the initiative to establish a Master Plan for the City but emphasised that in the process of its preparation and application arrangements should be made for the adequate co-ordination
and collaboration between all institutions and authorities involved, particularly the National Institute for Culture and the Municipality of the City.

In November 1997, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved an amount of US$ 20,000 under Technical Co-operation for the preparation of the Master Plan. A contract to this effect was established with the National Institute for Culture. To date, however, this assistance could not be implemented due to the lack of appropriate co-ordination between the Institute and the Municipality. Concerns about this situation were brought to the attention of the Permanent Delegation of Peru on 2 October 1998. In the meantime, the Secretariat has received expressions of concern about the lack of planning, the lack of application of the urban ordinances for preservation and new constructions that are considered inappropriate.

The Bureau expressed its concern about the state of conservation of the City of Cusco and urged the national and local authorities to make adequate arrangements for the preparation and application of a Master Plan for the city. It also urged to consider interventions in public spaces as well as new construction and rehabilitation works in full respect of the urban, architectural and historic values that are represented in the city as well as international standards of intervention in historic urban areas.

The Bureau requested the Peruvian authorities to inform the Secretariat of the actions taken in response to the above by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru)

In 1998, Emergency Assistance was provided to the Peruvian National Institute for Culture for taking protective measures at the archaeological site of Chavin against the possible impact of the El Nino phenomenon. The Emergency Assistance has enabled to improve the drainage system at the site and to improve the stability of the galleries in the temple, preventing their possible collapse.

The works at the site and a preliminary technical report from the expert who supervised the execution of the works show that this site had never been the subject of a specific conservation and maintenance programme and that the state of conservation of the major structures was very bad. The report identifies a great number of factors that possibly affect the site, such as climatic conditions, structural instability, topography, characteristics of the materials used in the construction, badly managed tourism etc.

The Bureau took note of the successful implementation of the Emergency Assistance for the site. It expressed concern, however, about the overall state of conservation of the site and encouraged the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to provide expertise to update the monitoring report prepared in 1993. This should enable the Peruvian authorities to draw up a project for the preparation of a comprehensive master plan for the site, making use of the expertise that has been
obtained in the preparation of similar plans for other archaeological sites in Peru, such as Chan Chan.

**Historic Centre of Lima (Peru)**

On 2 August 1998, a serious fire destroyed the municipal theatre of Lima located within the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Lima. The theatre was inaugurated in 1920.

In response, the Secretariat fielded an expert mission in order to assess the situation and to advise the municipal authorities on setting up a programme and action plan for the recuperation of the theatre.

The Bureau expressed its concern about the serious damages caused by fire to the municipal theatre of Lima. It recommended the national and local authorities to develop a rehabilitation scheme that respects the architectural and historical values of the building and that can serve as a catalyst for the recuperation of the urban surroundings of the theatre. It requested the authorities to keep the Secretariat informed about the progress made in this respect.

**The Baroque Churches of the Philippines (The Philippines)**

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its the twenty-first extraordinary session, took note of the report of the Secretariat on the state of conservation of the San Agustin Church in Paoay and the request for international assistance submitted by the Government of The Philippines to organize a training workshop to raise public awareness and to ensure proper conservation measures to be undertaken to preserve the authenticity of the Baroque Churches. The Bureau recommended that the Government continues its efforts to safeguard this site and to report on the Government’s restoration plan of the Church of San Agustin in Paoay, to the Committee at its twenty-second session. The requested report had not been received by the World Heritage Centre.

At the request of the Government, the World Heritage Centre sent an expert recommended by ICOMOS in July 1998 to the San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila, one of the four Baroque Churches composing this World Heritage site. The purpose of this mission was to evaluate whether or not a proposed plan for building an ossuary by the custodians of the San Augustin Church of Intramuros would affect the integrity and authenticity of the monument. The plan proposes to replace the original 159 crypt burials within the Sala de Profundis to a new ossuary to be built outside of the Church. According to the expert, this plan if implemented, would alter the original and authentic condition of the rear space of the monument. Furthermore, the displacement of the crypt burials of Sala de Profundis would change a historical event and evolution of the Church and was therefore discouraged.

The expert also analyzed the conservation practice at San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila and recommended that a long-term solution to control the flow of heavy rain
water and appropriate conservation practices using traditional construction material be adopted by the custodians of this monument to ensure the structural stability of the Church.

The Bureau took note of the report of the expert, and expressed concern regarding the plan to remove the original crypt burials from the Sala de Profundis and to build a new ossuary at the San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila. The Bureau requested the national authorities to reconsider the proposed plan in order not to change the historical evolution of the Church, and that new design and land-use within the protected World Heritage site be carefully considered by all authorities concerned to ensure the authenticity of this important historical monument and the integrity of its setting. Furthermore, the Bureau advised the State Party to work with the World Heritage Centre to consider requesting international expertise on appropriate conservation practices using traditional building material to ensure the structural stability of the historical monument. Finally, the Bureau requested the national authorities to report to the Committee on the results of the training activities held at the Churches of Paoay and Santa Maria, the restoration plan for the Church of San Agustin of Paoay, and on the measures taken to ensure the integrity and authenticity of the San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila, by 15 September 1999.

**Historic Centre of Porto (Portugal)**

The Bureau at its twenty-second session took note of a report on the impact of infrastructural works at the River Douro on the World Heritage values of the site of Porto.

In response, the State Party by letter dated 16 November 1998, informed that:

- the works would be undertaken at three kilometres distance from the World Heritage site
- due to the distance and the geography of the area they would not be visible from the World Heritage site
- at this moment no finances have been allocated and no date has been established for its execution.

The Bureau took note of the assurance from the Portuguese authorities that the works that would be undertaken in the River Douro in the vicinity of the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Porto would not have any impact on, nor would be visible from the World Heritage site.

**Island of Gorée (Senegal)**

The International Campaign for the Safeguarding of the Island of Gorée has as its objective the rehabilitation of the heritage and the socio-economic revitalization of the Island, the principal tourist destination in Senegal.
The preservation of the architectural heritage is linked to the protection of the natural environment (coastal areas) and the improvement of the infrastructure (water, sewers, refuse disposal, etc.). Specific priority projects have been identified for implementation.

The Bureau congratulated the Senegalese authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve the Island of Gorée and its rehabilitation and socio-economic revitalization, taking into consideration the natural environment and the improvement of infrastructure; it also invited the international community to support the efforts undertaken by the Senegalese authorities.

**Sacred City of Anuradhapura (Sri Lanka)**
**Ancient City of Polonnaruwa (Sri Lanka)**
**Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)**

ICOMOS monitoring missions to these three World Heritage sites in Sri Lanka were undertaken in November – December 1994. The final and comprehensive report of this mission was submitted by ICOMOS in July 1998, due to a series of unavoidable events which led to the delay in the completion of the report. The preparation of the report was also considered by ICOMOS as a process for the establishment of general parameters for future monitoring reports, which could possibly serve as guidelines for the World Heritage Committee. The report will be made available upon request by the World Heritage Centre for consultation at the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. The report was submitted to the Government of Sri Lanka by ICOMOS in July 1998.

The report of the ICOMOS monitoring mission recommends a 10-point general recommendation for enhanced management and adequate protection of the three World Heritage sites, with a final recommendation that the concerned authorities refer to the 10 points as a guide in structuring periodic monitoring activities. The report also presents numerous recommendations concerning issues of management, planning, legal protection, conservation practice, training, tourism development, documentation, monitoring and presentation, as well as site-specific recommendations.

Amongst the comprehensive information and various recommendations presented in the report, ICOMOS experts noted that the area surrounding the rock of the outer moat at the Ancient City of Sigiriya site, which clearly was intended to be included in the original 1984 nomination dossier, is not indicated on the map of the nomination file. ICOMOS recommended that this be officially included in the protected area and that the World Heritage Committee be officially notified of the boundaries of the Ancient City of Sigiriya site. ICOMOS also reported that the complex water-management system, one of the most significant elements of the ancient landscape of Polonnaruwa, is not specifically listed in the original 1984 nomination form. Particulary alarming at the Ancient City of Polonnaruwa site, for which no buffer zones are fixed, was the construction of new buildings without specific design guidelines taking place in half of the city. Furthermore, ICOMOS noted that the boundaries delineated on the official map of the Sacred City of Anuradhapura exclude important areas of the World Heritage site.
Therefore, ICOMOS recommended that the Government of Sri Lanka submit to the World Heritage Committee, maps for all three properties clearly indicating the core and buffer zones of each site. These maps should be accompanied by explanatory material concerning each monument within each zone, also indicating the protection afforded to the monuments and areas protected. ICOMOS also recommended that copies of relevant management plans for individual projects and the corresponding development plans be transmitted to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre.

The Bureau took note of the comprehensive ICOMOS report of the three sites in Sri Lanka and requested the Government of Sri Lanka to submit maps of the three sites, clearly indicating the core and buffer zones of each, accompanied by an inventory of all the religious and secular monuments, historically significant buildings and landscape elements within the core and buffer zones of the sites with explanatory information. Furthermore, the Bureau requested that copies of legislation and relevant management plans which ensure the protection of these zones be submitted to the World Heritage Committee by 15 September 1999. Finally, the Bureau requested the Government to submit a report to the World Heritage Committee concerning the actions taken to address the concerns and recommendations of ICOMOS following the monitoring mission, before 15 September 1999, especially concerning the building control within and surrounding the sites.

Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)

In December 1997, the mission sent by the Secretariat to study the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon had recommended that an overall management plan should be prepared for the site of Palmyra. The Syrian authorities have requested the Secretariat to prepare detailed terms of reference for the management plan. A specialist visited the site in August 1998 and, in close co-operation with the Directorate General for Antiquities and Museums of Syria and with the assistance of the Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient (IFAPO), prepared detailed terms of reference for the management plan which encompasses the archaeological site and the oasis and town of Palmyra, which are intertwined. Meanwhile, the authorities have already taken important protection measures, such as the diversion of the international road crossing the site.

The Bureau congratulates the Syrian authorities for their commitment in the conservation of the important site of Palmyra. It supported the continuation of the work for the development of a full-fledged integral management plan covering the oasis, the town and the archaeological zone. It also thanks the IFAPO for its involvement and the UNDP for its interest. It finally requests the Secretariat to continue its work to develop, starting early in 1999, the management plan of Palmyra. It therefore recommends the Syrian authorities to submit as soon as possible a request for international assistance to this effect.
Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)

The Monument of Hagia Sophia of the Archaeological Park

In 1993, an expert mission visited Hagia Sophia, one of the main monuments of the World Heritage Historic Areas of Istanbul. A series of recommendations for its rehabilitation elaborated by the UNESCO mission in 1993 was approved by the Government of Turkey, who subsequently increased its budgetary allocation for their implementation. In March 1998 another mission visited the monument and stressed the need for an advisory body of international and national experts which can meet regularly to advise the national team composed of the Hagia Sophia Museum and the Central Conservation and Restoration Laboratory, in charge of the restoration of this monument. It also noted that the restoration of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia for which the World Heritage Fund has contributed US$ 80,000 between 1983 and 1994, was progressing satisfactorily. To increase the rhythm of the work, the Central Laboratory has requested additional human and financial resources (request to be considered under International Assistance).

The Zeyrek Conservation Site

With regard to the Zeyrek Conservation Site in Fatih District of Istanbul which is protected as part of the World Heritage area for the value of the Ottoman epoch timber buildings, the State Party submitted in May 1998, a Technical Co-operation request. This request concerned a detailed technical evaluation and the preparation of the repair schedules of these historic timber buildings, following the alarming report presented by ICOMOS to the twenty-second session of the Bureau. This request also included activities to support the Municipality of Fatih to establish a Fatih Heritage House, a service to advise the inhabitants of Fatih (including Zeyrek) of the housing improvement and conservation methods of the historic buildings, the majority of which are under private ownership. The Secretariat reported to the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session held in June 1998 that the urgency of these activities was due to the need to convince the European Union not to exclude Zeyrek from its rehabilitation project aimed at housing improvement, despite the fact that the majority of the Ottoman epoch buildings in Zeyrek had been abandoned by the inhabitants due to their dangerous condition. The Bureau decided to postpone its decision concerning the grant of this request to its extraordinary session in November 1998 and to await additional information. The UNESCO/EC project office and the ICOMOS expert who undertook another reactive monitoring mission in October 1998, reconfirmed the need for urgent measures to (a) prevent the further loss of these Ottoman epoch buildings by at least providing emergency shoring to avoid their collapse; (b) carry out training in conservation skills to stop the use of cement and inappropriate material in the restoration/reconstruction work being carried out on some of these buildings by the private sector; and (c) mobilize the Fatih Heritage House to undertake actions to organize the inhabitants to invest the required self-financing component in the co-funding scheme for housing improvement under the EU/Turkish Government programme, expected to become operational by September 1999.
The Bureau, having noted the State Party’s request for UNESCO to establish a team of national and international experts to strengthen the on-going effort for the restoration of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia, recommended the Government to organize, in close collaboration with the Secretariat, an international expert meeting to take stock of the actions accomplished and to draw up a medium-term plan of action for the continuation of the work and to prepare the terms of reference for the international experts required by the Central Laboratory.

The Bureau expressed concern over the state of conservation of the Ottoman epoch timber buildings in Zeyrek as reported by ICOMOS and the Secretariat and requested the State Party to inform the Secretariat by 15 April 1999, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third ordinary session, on measures it intends to take for the preservation of this important site which forms an integral part of the World Heritage Historic Areas of Istanbul. The Bureau furthermore, requested the Secretariat to maintain close collaboration with the European Commission and the Fatih Municipality to maximize the benefits of the EU-funded project in Fatih for the rehabilitation of historic buildings in the World Heritage protected areas.

Kiev: Saint Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)

At its twenty-second ordinary session, the Bureau requested the Government of Ukraine to reconsider its hotel-building policy and specific hotel projects in respect of their historical context. It requested the authorities to submit a report on this matter by 15 September 1998 at the latest.

The State Party informed the Secretariat on 14 September 1998 that the above-mentioned projects were repeatedly considered by the experts of Ukraine and were discussed by the local and central authorities as well as by ICOMOS Ukraine. As a result, the project of the hotel "Kiev-International" was decreased in height to the level of the existing surrounding buildings. Furthermore, the construction of the nearby “Laboratory House” project, which did not correspond to the surrounding architectural environment of the Cathedral, was suspended pending the preparation of a new proposal.

On 31 August 1998, the State Party also informed the Secretariat on the proposed reconstruction of the Dormition Cathedral in Pechersk-Lavra that, according to other sources, could cause problems to the surrounding buildings due to the unstable and geologically difficult terrain. It was stated that the reconstruction project would be carried out on the basis of a complex geological and engineering research, which offers the opportunity to select the optimal engineering and constructive solution. The State Party asked the Secretariat for advice in this matter.

ICOMOS stated that the final designs of the hotel buildings should still be reviewed and confirmed that open excavation pits at the site of the Cathedral, undertaken to research the geology of the soil, now pose dangers to the stability of the area. Expert assistance on
the rehabilitation of the subsoil should be obtained without delay. Any further excavation in this area should be carried out according to accepted archaeological principles.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the State Party on the projects for the construction of hotels in the city of Kiev and the proposed reconstruction of the Dormition Cathedral in Pechersk-Lavra. It also noted the advice of ICOMOS that the final designs of the hotels should be verified and in-depth hydro-geological studies should be undertaken at the site of the Dormition Cathedral. The Bureau requested ICOMOS to field an expert mission to this effect.

Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam)

The World Heritage Committee, at its the twenty-first session noted the concerns raised by the Bureau over the increasing cases of inappropriate reconstruction and new construction activities taking place in some parts of Zone 1 and more noticeably in Zone 2 of the World Heritage protected area of the Complex of Hué Monuments. The deformation to the historic urban pattern, renowned for its “garden houses” built respecting the traditional spatial organization of “feng shui”, is caused primarily by the densification of land-use to accommodate the increase in family size after the end of the Vietnam War. The deformation of the historic townscape of Hué is also caused by inappropriate designs of houses being renovated or newly constructed which do not use traditional construction material nor are built in a style harmonious to the historic environment of the site.

With the international technical co-operation grant provided from the World Heritage Fund in 1998, a legal audit was conducted as part of the Hué-Lille-UNESCO joint project which has confirmed the weakness or the non-existence of some essential regulations. A proposal of provisional land-use regulations and general building guidelines are currently being drafted for consideration by the competent local and national authorities. The Heritage House (Maison du patrimoine), an advisory service for local inhabitants aimed to involve them in heritage conservation in the process of housing improvement, is expected to begin operations in March 1999 upon completion of the rehabilitation of a historic house to be used as the office. This rehabilitation and the architectural survey being conducted in five pilot project sites, have involved the mobilization of some 50 students of the Department of Architecture of Hué University over a period of six months under the technical supervision of Vietnamese professors and French architect-urbanists from the School of Architecture of Lille. These activities are financed by Lille Metropole and the French Foreign Ministry with catalytic financial input from the World Heritage Fund and being carried out within the framework of the decentralized co-operation agreement signed in November 1997 between between Lille Metropole (France) and Hué Provincial and Municipal Authorities under the aegis of UNESCO. Complementary activities in urban landscape protection and training of two Vietnamese professors of architecture in Lille are being financed and conducted by the Region Nord Pas de Calais in consultations with the Hué-Lille-UNESCO team. Close collaboration is also being maintained with the French DATAR team working on the regional development scheme
to ensure that the upgrading of National Route No. 1 which cuts across the World Heritage site between the Citadel and the Imperial Tomb area, will not undermine the integrity of the site. The Bureau was informed that with funds made available in 1998 by the Committee, the Provincial Authority of Huế with support from the Vietnamese National Commission for UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre, will be organizing a donors’ information meeting in Hanoi in March 1999 to co-ordinate international co-operation and development activities in Huế.

The Bureau encouraged the continued efforts of the Provincial and Municipal Authorities of Huế and the Huế Conservation Centre with technical support of Lille and UNESCO in mitigating the threat to Huế caused by inappropriate building design and densification of land-use. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a written report to the Committee through the World Heritage Centre by 15 September 1999 on progress made in the elaboration and application of provisional regulations concerning the urban design and land-use in Zones 1 and 2 of the Huế World Heritage site.

Old City of Sana’a (Yemen)

A monitoring mission visited the site in June 1998 and found that there was obvious need of co-ordination between the various governmental bodies involved in the city as well as between the World Bank project team and the General Organization for the Preservation of the Historic Cities in Yemen (GOPHCY). The responsible national authorities requested the members of the mission to assist in establishing a new scheme in order to define the roles of various international and national bodies. The mission recommended that UNESCO create a new focal point to co-ordinate preservation activities in Sana’a.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Centre to assist the Yemeni authorities in establishing a focal point in Sana’a and provide technical assistance to prepare an overall management plan for the city.

III.1 During the debates, the Delegate of the United States of America requested the Secretariat to investigate whether the Bureau has the right to send missions to assess the conditions of World Heritage sites.

III.2 The Observer of Germany remarked that the World Heritage Committee at its session in December 1997, asked Italy to submit a report in time for the Bureau meeting in June 1998, on the management measures taken at Pompei, with particular reference to experience gained through planned partnerships between the State and private enterprises, as well as information concerning the protection of the environment surrounding the area. The Delegate of Italy informed that information had been sent to the Secretariat in June 1998. The Director of the Centre proposed that this information be circulated to the Bureau members, once the information is submitted in one of the working languages of the Committee.
IV. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

IV.1 At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau reviewed five natural properties, one mixed site and 15 cultural properties.

IV.2 The Centre informed the Bureau that the following sites were withdrawn by the States Parties concerned:

- **Cultural Stratification in the Historic Centre of the City of Pecs** 853 Hungary
- **Gdansk : The Main Town, the Motlava Side Channel, and the Vistula Mouth Fortress** 882 Poland
- **The Archaeological Ensemble of Tárraco** 875 Spain

The Observer of France informed the Bureau that the following property, which was reviewed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau has been withdrawn:

- **The Medieval Town of Provins** 873 France

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Bureau did not recommend any properties for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
A.2 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Identification number</th>
<th>State Party having submitted the nomination</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden Mountains of Altai</td>
<td>768 Rev.</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>N (iv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Altai region is an important and original centre of biodiversity of plant and animal species. It contains rare and endemic species, including the Snow Leopard. The Altai population of the Snow Leopard serves as a core source for the southern Siberian region. The Bureau noted the rich cultural heritage of the region and encouraged the State Party to consider nominating the area for cultural values.

The Bureau decided to inscribe the site for its rich biodiversity and global centre of origin of montane flora of northern Asia under natural criterion (iv). The Bureau urged the State Party to complete the management plans as soon as possible and suggested that other States Parties may wish to assist in the management planning exercise. It furthermore encouraged the State Party to start a co-operative process with neighbouring States Parties to consider a possible transboundary expansion.

| East Rennell | 854 | Solomon Islands | N(ii) |

East Rennell is part of Rennell Island, the southernmost of the Solomon Islands group. Rennell, the largest raised coral atoll in the world, is 86 km long and 15 km wide and covers an area of 87,500ha. A major feature is Lake Tegano, which was the former lagoon on the atoll and is the largest lake in the insular Pacific (15,500ha). Rennell is mostly covered with dense forest with a canopy averaging 20m in height.

East Rennell is of outstanding universal value under natural criterion (ii), demonstrating significant on-going ecological and biological processes and is an important site for the science of island bio-geography. These processes relate to the role of East Rennell as a stepping-stone in the migration and evolution of species in the western Pacific and for speciation processes underway, especially with respect to the avifauna. Combined with the strong climatic effects of frequent cyclones, the site is a true natural laboratory for scientific study.
Following the Bureau’s request concerning the application of cultural criteria, the Solomon Islands Government indicated that this would be further investigated. The Bureau had also sought further information on the development and implementation of a resource management plan bearing in mind that the land concerned is under customary ownership. The State Party advised that while a draft World Heritage Protection Bill is not yet ready to proceed through the legislative process, it has committed itself to the protection of any World Heritage site. The State Party pointed out that the rights of customary owners in customary law are acknowledged in the Constitution of the Solomon Islands and the Customs Recognition Act of 1995. The State Party also indicated that members of the East Rennell community have agreed to the concept of World Heritage Listing of their land and are working with the State Party and a facilitator provided by the New Zealand Government to prepare a resource management plan. IUCN reported that the document entitled “East Rennell Resource Management Objectives and Guidelines” had been provided and reviewed and was considered to be acceptable in meeting the requirements for World Heritage inscription, even though it may be some years before the final resource management plan is completed.

The Bureau had a considerable debate on customary protection and agreed that customary management should be supported. It pointed out that while traditional protection and management mechanisms are provided for in the Operational Guidelines for cultural sites (par. 24 b(ii)), no similar provision exists for natural sites (par. 44 b (vi)).

The Bureau recommended that the Committee amend the Operational Guidelines to remedy this inconsistency as proposed by the Amsterdam Global Strategy Meeting (March 1998).

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site under natural criterion (ii). It also recommended that the State Party should proceed with the production of the Resource Management Plan and the national World Heritage Protection Bill and that a mission be undertaken in three years time to assess progress made.

### A.3 Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

**Bashkirian Ural**  879   Russian Federation

The Bureau noted that the site is of European importance for the study of the natural dynamics of broadleaf forests. However, the site does not possess outstanding universal value.

The Bureau recommended the Committee not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List.
**Vodlozero National Park** 767 **Russian Federation**

The Bureau noted that the site consists of boreal forest ecosystems of the Eurasian taiga and is an important bird breeding area. It is of European importance, but on its own, does not meet any natural World Heritage criteria. The Bureau noted the rich cultural heritage of the region and encouraged the State Party to consider nomination the area for cultural values.

The Bureau recommended the Committee not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List. The Bureau noted the possibility of Vodlozero being considered as part of a serial site proposal being developed by the State Party for the Green Belt of Fennoscandia.

**The Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and Dobsinska Ice Cave**

858 **Slovakia**

The Bureau at its twenty-second session decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party and asked the Slovak authorities to consider incorporating the Dobsinska Ice Cave portion into the nearby site of the Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst, already recognized as a World Heritage site. The Bureau was informed that the State Party indicated that it did not consider the site belong to the same karst as the Aggtelek and Slovak Karst, but rather to the Spis-Gemer karst. The State Party suggested it as a possible addition to the cultural World Heritage site of “Spissky Castle with its surroundings”. ICOMOS commented that the connection with this site was so marginal as to not be justified.

The natural values of the Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and the Dobsinska Ice Cave are considered to be of national and regional significance. The current nomination thus does not meet natural World Heritage criteria.

The Bureau recommended the Committee not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List.

**B. MIXED PROPERTIES**

**B.1 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

The Bureau did not recommend any properties for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
B.2 Property which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Identification number</th>
<th>State Party</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cilento and Vallo di Diano National Park</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>C(iii)(iv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site as a cultural landscape on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv):

**Criterion (iii):** During the prehistoric period, and again in the Middle Ages, the Cilento region served as a key route for cultural, political, and commercial communications in an exceptional manner, utilizing the crests of the mountain chains running east-west and thereby creating a cultural landscape of outstanding significance and quality.

**Criterion (iv):** In two key episodes in the development of human societies in the Mediterranean region, the Cilento area provided the only viable means of communications between the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian seas, in the central Mediterranean region, and this is vividly illustrated by the relict cultural landscape of today.

The Bureau noted that the natural values of the National Park of Cilento are considered to be of national and regional importance, but not of outstanding universal value.

C. CULTURAL HERITAGE

C.1 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Bureau did not recommend any properties for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
### C.2 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Identification number</th>
<th>State Party</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Semmering Railway (Semmeringbahn)</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>C(ii)(iv)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** The Semmering Railway represents an outstanding technological solution to a major physical problem in the construction of early railways.

**Criterion (iv):** With the construction of the Semmering Railway, areas of great natural beauty became more easily accessible and as a result these were developed for residential and recreational use, creating a new form of cultural landscape.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the comparative study undertaken by a panel of international experts, funded by the Government of Austria, has been completed and would be published in early 1999.

| La Grand-Place, Brussels | 857 | Belgium | C(ii)(iv) |

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** The Grand-Place is an outstanding example of the eclectic and highly successful blending of architectural and artistic styles that characterizes the culture and society of this region.

**Criterion (iv):** Through the nature and quality of its architecture and of its outstanding quality as a public open space, the Grand-Place illustrates in an exceptional way the evolution and achievements of a highly successful mercantile city of northern Europe at the height of its prosperity.
El Fuerte de Samaipata 883 Bolivia C(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: The sculptured rock at Samaipata is the dominant ceremonial feature of an urban settlement that represents the apogee of this form of prehispanic religious and political centre.

*Criterion (iii)*: Samaipata bears outstanding witness to the existence in this Andean region of a culture with highly developed religious traditions, illustrated dramatically in the form of immense rock sculptures.

The Summer Palace, an Imperial Garden in Beijing 880 China C(i)(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The Summer Palace in Beijing is an outstanding expression of the creative art of Chinese landscape garden design, incorporating the works of humankind and nature in a harmonious whole.

*Criterion (ii)*: The Summer Palace epitomizes the philosophy and practice of Chinese garden design, which played a key role in the development of this cultural form throughout the east.

*Criterion (iii)*: The imperial Chinese garden, illustrated by the Summer Palace, is a potent symbol of one of the major world civilizations.

The Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing 881 China C(i)(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The Temple of Heaven is a masterpiece of architecture and landscape design which simply and graphically illustrates a cosmogony of great importance for the evolution of one of the world’s great civilizations.

*Criterion (ii)*: The symbolic layout and design of the Temple of Heaven had a profound influence on architecture and planning in the Far East over many centuries.
**Criterion (iii):** For more than two thousand years China was ruled by a series of feudal dynasties, the legitimacy of which is symbolized by the design and layout of the Temple of Heaven.

**Holasovice Historical Village Reservation**

861 Czech Republic  

C(ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** Holasovice is of special significance in that it represents the fusion of two vernacular building traditions to create an exceptional and enduring style, known as South Bohemian Folk Baroque.

**Criterion (iv):** The exceptional completeness and excellent preservation of Holasovice and its buildings make it an outstanding example of traditional rural settlement in central Europe.

**Classical Weimar**

846 Germany  

C(iii)(vi)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi):

**Criterion (iii):** The high artistic quality of the public and private buildings and parks in and around the town testify to the remarkable cultural flowering of the Weimar Classical Period.

**Criterion (vi):** Enlightened ducal patronage attracted many of the leading writers and thinkers in Germany, such as Goethe, Schiller, and Herder to Weimar in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, making it the cultural centre of the Europe of the day.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the World Heritage site of “The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar and Dessau” was culturally distinct from this site.

**The Historic Centre of Urbino**

828 Italy  

C(ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** During its short cultural pre-eminence, Urbino attracted some of the most outstanding humanist scholars and artists of the Renaissance, who created there an
exceptional urban complex of remarkable homogeneity, the influence of which carried far into the rest of Europe.

**Criterion (iv):** Urbino represents a pinnacle of Renaissance art and architecture, harmoniously adapted to its physical site and to its medieval precursor in an exceptional manner.

Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (iii) and (iv):**

**Criterion (iii):** The Qadisha Valley has been the site of monastic communities continuously since the earliest years of Christianity. The trees in the Cedar Forest are survivors of a sacred forest and of one of the most highly prized building materials of the ancient world.

**Criterion (iv):** The monasteries of the Qadisha Valley are the most significant surviving examples of this fundamental demonstration of Christian faith.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that information concerning the definition of the buffer zone, currently being processed by the State Party, would be submitted in the near future. IUCN unreservedly supported the recommendation for inscription of this site.

The Historic Monuments Zone of Tlacotalpan

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of **criteria (ii) and (iv):**

**Criterion (ii):** The urban layout and architecture of Tlacotalpan represent a fusion of Spanish and Caribbean traditions of exceptional importance and quality.

**Criterion (iv):** Tlacotalpan is a Spanish colonial river port on the Gulf coast of Mexico which has preserved its original urban fabric to an exceptional degree. Its outstanding character lies in its townscape of wide streets, modest houses in an exuberant variety of styles and colours, and many mature trees in public and private open spaces.
Archaeological site of Troy 849 Turkey C(ii)(iii)(vi)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), and (vi):

The archaeological site of Troy is of immense significance in the understanding of the development of European civilization at a critical stage in its early development. It is, moreover, of exceptional cultural importance because of the profound influence of Homer’s *Iliad* on the creative arts over more than two millennia.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the State Party had assured that it would submit the requested precise cartographic maps providing information regarding the area proposed for inscription and that proposed as a buffer zone before 21 December 1998. Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the name of the site was modified to be the Archaeological site of Troy.

L’viv – The Ensemble of the Historic Centre 865 Ukraine C(ii)(v)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), and (v):

Criterion (ii): In its urban fabric and its architecture, L’viv is an outstanding example of the fusion of the architectural and artistic traditions of eastern Europe with those of Italy and Germany.

Criterion (v): The political and commercial role of L’viv attracted to it a number of ethnic groups with different cultural and religious traditions, who established separate yet interdependent communities within the city, evidence for which is still discernible in the modern townscape.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the State Party had agreed to remove the mast and antenna, which dominates the skyline, as soon as funds were secured.
C.3 Extension of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Historical Centre of Oviedo 312bis Spain C(i)(ii)(iv)
(Extension of World Heritage site 312 – Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to approve the extension of this site to include the Cámara Santa, the Basilica of San Julián de los Prados, and La Foncalada, on the World Heritage List, under the existing criteria (i), (ii) and (iv).

C.4 Properties which the Bureau deferred

The Imperial Capital of Tiwanaku 567rev. Bolivia

Although acknowledging the undoubted World Heritage value of this archaeological site, the Bureau deferred inscription of this nomination until 1999, in anticipation of the State Party’s submission of:

(a) clear maps precisely defining the five zones composing this site, along with their buffer zones;
(b) precise details relating to the protection and management of the site including information on the specific measures proposed to apply the new law promulgated in 1998 which extends protection to the entire area of the historic settlement;

for evaluation by ICOMOS, recommending the State Party to consider requesting technical assistance from legal experts for submitting such information.

The Early Medieval Architectural Complex and Town of Panauti 869 Nepal

Although acknowledging the World Heritage qualities of this site, the Bureau deferred inscription of this nomination until 1999, in anticipation of the State Party’s submission of:

(a) copies of the official documents designating the core area of Panauti under the Ancient Monuments Protection Act and the buffer zone as a Conservation Area under the Municipalities Act;
(b) details of the site management plan;

information already requested by the Secretariat in July 1997, and which is fundamental to an evaluation of the nominated property by ICOMOS.
V.  REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

V.1  In accordance with paragraphs 90-117 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the outgoing Bureau examined requests for international assistance for formulating recommendations to the Committee. Sixteen requests for amounts above US$ 30,000, for training and technical co-operation for natural and cultural heritage, presented in working Document WHC-98/CONF.202/6 were examined, in the light of supplementary information provided by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.
**NATURAL HERITAGE**

**V.2** The outgoing Bureau examined four requests for training assistance and three requests for technical co-operation, and adopted the following recommendations for transmitting to the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</th>
<th>Requesting State Party</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1.1</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Three training fellowships at the School for the Training of Wildlife Specialists, Garoua, Cameroon for the Academic Biennium 1999-2001</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of US$ 45,000 by the Committee. IUCN fully supports this request and informed the Bureau that it provides training materials to Garoua (Cameroon) and Mweka (Tanzania) Colleges, in Africa. IUCN encouraged States Parties to consider supporting these two Regional Training Centres of Africa as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1.2</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Regional capacity building training workshop for the promotion of awareness in natural heritage conservation</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of US$ 40,000 by the Committee, subject to the State Party submitting to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a revised proposal with well-focused and clearly defined objectives, better definition of target groups, exact dates for the workshop and links to IUCN/WCPA’s activities for the Arab region. The workshop should include a field exercise component where workshop participants would review the status of the on-going management planning and boundary demarcation project for the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary, and prepare a report for submission to the 23rd session of the Committee in 1999. The Committee may wish to recommend linking the outcome of this training activity to the Bureau’s concerns regarding the state of conservation of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary of Oman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1.3</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Lake Baikal training workshop for Russian and Trans-boundary World Natural Heritage Site-</td>
<td>48,528</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of US$ 48,528 by the Committee. The Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to request IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to co-operate with the State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</th>
<th>Requesting State Party</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1.4</td>
<td>WCMC</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Integrating biodiversity information management into curricula of regional wildlife/protected area management training institutions – project development workshop</td>
<td>40,220</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended that US$ 30,000 be approved by the Committee as a contribution to the organization of the project development workshop (Phase 1). The outgoing Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to endorse WCMC’s efforts to seek additional funding from the Darwin Initiative (UK) for the implementation of Phases 2 and 3 of the training materials and curriculum development project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural heritage</td>
<td>173,748</td>
<td>163,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A.2.2.1 | Ecuador | Technical Co-operation | Ecological monitoring in the Galapagos Archipelago – establishing a quarantine system for monitoring the introduction and spread of alien species | 100,000 | The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of US$ 92,500 as per the revised budget submitted by the State Party, of which US$ 61,000 under the technical co-operation and the balance of US$ 31,500 under training. The Committee may wish to commend the efforts of Ecuador for launching this project to mitigate the problem of the introduction and spread of alien species in the Galapagos. The Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to endorse the World Heritage Centre’s efforts to link this project to global efforts, undertaken as part of the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and that of organizations such as SCOPE (Scientific Committee for the Protection of the Environment), to address problems of introduced species worldwide. |

<p>| A.2.2.2 | IUCN-Environment | Technical Co- | Legal interpretation and application of the World Heritage Convention | 212,440 | The outgoing Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to express its support, in principle, to the project concept and request IUCN- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</th>
<th>Requesting State Party</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mental Law Centre</td>
<td>operation</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELC to circulate the proposal widely to receive comments for further refinements, particularly with regard to the expected outcome of the project. The Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to urge IUCN-ELC and the World Heritage Centre to co-operate in identifying donors who would be willing to provide the sum of US$ 90,000 needed to finance the cost of two legal consultants (US$ 60,000) and one research associate (US$ 30,000), respectively. If IUCN-ELC and the World Heritage Centre are successful in raising this initial amount of expert costs needed to initiate the project, IUCN-ELC may submit individual proposals for the organization of the expert panel review and regional workshops for support from the World Heritage Fund at the appropriate time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.2.3 Niger</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Strengthening management at “W” National Park</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of US$ 45,000 for the purchase of two 4-wheel drive vehicles, on the condition that the State Party: (a) pays its contributions to the World Heritage Fund for 1997; (b) acknowledges receipt of, and provides an inventory of equipment already received in 1998, to the World Heritage Centre and; (c) finalizes all administrative matters regarding the equipment purchase project funded by the US$ 50,000 approved by the Committee in 1997.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural heritage</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>385,440</td>
<td>137,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.3 Five requests for training assistance and eight requests for technical co-operation were examined by the outgoing Bureau, which adopted the following recommendations to the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</th>
<th>Requesting State Party</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2.1.1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Specialized course on Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation – Brazil programme ITUC 1999-2000</td>
<td>49,900</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of US$ <strong>49,900</strong> by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.1.2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training programme for site managers of World Heritage Cities in China – Consolidation of the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of US$ <strong>35,000</strong> by the Committee. ICCROM announced its full support and availability to actively participate to further develop the programme of this activity. ICCROM encouraged the Chinese Government to consider nominating a candidate to participate at the Second ITUC Workshop, to be held in May – June 1999 in Rome. The Bureau, appreciating the initiatives taken by the Chinese Government to address the problems faced in the preservation of urban historical fabric in the context of rapid urban development in Asia, strongly supported this request. The Bureau recommended that the Committee may wish to request the State Party to strengthen the proposed programme by increasing links between ICCROM’s ITUC programme and this training exercise, as proposed by ICCROM in their evaluation of the request. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the Committee request the State Party to give sufficient attention to follow-up after the training activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.1.3</td>
<td>Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti,</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training in underwater archaeology</td>
<td>59,838</td>
<td>ICCROM, although supporting the initiative of the States Parties, suggested reformulation of the request to strengthen the component of conservation within the programme. ICOMOS, stating that neither the specialized ICOMOS Underwater Cultural Heritage Committee nor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</td>
<td>Requesting State Party</td>
<td>Type of Assistance</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Requested (US$)</td>
<td>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICOMOS had been consulted on the formulation of this request, stressed that emphasis should be placed on conservation if this activity was to be funded under the World Heritage Fund, as part of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The outgoing Bureau recommended that the Committee request the States Parties to reformulate the request, so that the project proposed was relevant to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, it encouraged the State Party to utilize the network of existing international organizations and institutions specializing in underwater heritage conservation, and to consider the possibility of extending the target audience quantitatively and geographically. A Bureau Member, the United States of America, announced that, if requested, it could make available, the specialized expertise for underwater heritage protection from the relevant USA authorities and the National Park Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.1.4</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training Programme of Conservators-Restorers in the field of Mural Paintings at the World Heritage sites of Lebanon</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of <strong>US$ 60,000</strong> by the Committee, requesting the State Party to conduct the activity at a sub-regional level, including participants from the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.1.5</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>International training workshop for World Heritage cultural site managers from Eastern and Central Europe</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval of <strong>US$ 40,000</strong> by the Committee, subject to the agreement by the State Party to co-operate closely with ICCROM for developing the curriculum and widening the scope of themes to be addressed, to include new modules of conservation management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>244,738 184,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cultural Heritage                  | Sub-total               | Training           | 244,738 184,900 | |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</th>
<th>Requesting State Party</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Restoration of the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus de Congonhas</td>
<td>32,574</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of US$ 32,574 by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.2</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Rescue and preservation activities of La Estrella Fortress and of Smith (Gramma) Key at the San Pedro de la Roca Castle, Santiago de Cuba</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of US$ 50,000 by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.3</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation programme for Islamic Cairo</td>
<td>200,000 (600,000 over three years)</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of US$ 120,000 by the Committee, subject to the State Party agreeing to report on the progress made in each phase of the implementation of the programme to the Committee, and subject to the State Party agreeing to contribute an equal amount of funds for the first year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.4</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Documentation research for Forts and Castles of Ghana</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of US$ 40,000 by the Committee, considering the importance of documenting historical data and iconographic material for enhanced management and conservation of the Forts and Castles of Ghana. However, the Bureau recommended approval of this grant, subject to the: (i) Terms of Reference for the international consultant explicitly including a preliminary mission to Ghana to develop proper policies for compilation, storage, handling and conservation of the collection, and; (ii) World Heritage Centre ascertaining that there are trained staff members at GMMB who would be assigned to the Documentation Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF. 202/6</td>
<td>Requesting State Party</td>
<td>Type of Assistance</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Requested (US$)</td>
<td>Recommendations by the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.5</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Emergency measures at the Lines and Geoglyphes of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of <strong>US$ 50,000</strong> by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.6</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>GIS for mapping the Rice Terraces of the Philippines, and for strengthening enhanced management.</td>
<td>131,846</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of <strong>US$ 50,000</strong> by the Committee for the purchase of computer equipment through the UNESCO Equipment Unit, and for partially funding the international expert services, subject to the authorities of the Philippines securing funds from other international agencies or donors such as UNDP. The Bureau recommended that the Committee requests the UNESCO Regional Advisor for Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region and the UNESCO Representative in Jakarta to assist the authorities of the Philippines in mobilizing such funds from other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.7</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Conservation Projects for the Ancient City of Damascus</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of <strong>US$ 30,000</strong>, by the Committee on the condition that the State Party submits detailed information concerning the budget breakdown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2.2.8</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td>Conservation work of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia</td>
<td>100,000 (250,000 over two years)</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended approval of <strong>US$ 50,000</strong> by the Committee, representing the last contribution for the conservation works for the mosaics of the Hagia Sophia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Technical Co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>654,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>422,574</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.4 Six requests submitted by ICCROM, amounting to a total amount of US$ 248,470, were examined by the outgoing Bureau, which adopted the following recommendations to the Committee. To give due emphasis to the activities of ICCROM for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, all ICCROM requests were presented together. A total amount of US$ 241,470 was recommended by the outgoing Bureau, for approval by the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No. in WHC-98/CONF.202/6</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested (US$)</th>
<th>Recommendations of the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCROM 1</td>
<td>AFRICA-2009 Conservation of immovable cultural heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of <strong>US$ 100,000</strong>, noting that the AFRICA-2009 Programme was a joint initiative of the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and CRATerre-EAG, and launched in March 1998 in Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire, with the endorsement of 9 Sub-Saharan African States Parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCROM 2</td>
<td>2.1 PAT 99 – Second Pan-American Course on the Conservation and Management of Earthen Architectural and Archaeological Heritage; 2.2 ITUC Programme for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention – Second International ITUC Workshop</td>
<td>78,470</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of <strong>US$ 78,470</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of <strong>US$ 30,000</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCROM 3</td>
<td>3.1 Development of global training strategy in South East Asia</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>3.1 The outgoing Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of <strong>US$ 25,000</strong>, requesting ICCROM to develop training curricula which could be used (a) within university architecture and urban planning departments to teach future architects and urban planners the basics of heritage conservation; and (b) by heritage site-managers to introduce and train the inhabitants, community leaders and local administrators of World Heritage cultural sites, on the scientific basis of heritage conservation and maintenance. The Bureau recommended that ICCROM develop this strategy in South-East Asia, in close co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Regional...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount Requested (US$)</td>
<td>Recommendations of the outgoing Bureau to the Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Scientific Development of the World Heritage Convention – Reference manual of methodologies for assessing the state of conservation of World Heritage sites</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Advisor for Culture in the Asia-Pacific. 3.2 IUCN welcomed the opportunity of using this activity to enhance co-operation between the three Advisory Bodies. IUCN, reiterated the need to tightly define the target audience for the manual and that it should be aimed to support the capacity of the States Parties, as well as to enhance the process of monitoring to strengthen the management of World Heritage sites. The outgoing Bureau recommended that while strongly supporting this activity, consideration for translation of the final manual into several languages should be considered from the outset. For identifying the best procedure in producing such a manual, the outgoing Bureau recommended approval of an initial US$ 8,000 to hold a brainstorming session between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Based upon the results of the first step, proposals could be made to the 23rd session of the Bureau for further funding to implement the second and third phases of this activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ICCROM                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 248,470 241,470        | V.5 A total amount of US$ 1,149,972 (US$ 301,028 for natural heritage, and US$ 848,944 for cultural heritage) was recommended by the outgoing Bureau for approval of the Committee.  
V.6 The Bureau reiterated its request to the Secretariat to summarize reports resulting from training activities funded by the World Heritage Fund, for information to the Committee. |
VI. EXAMINATION OF GUIDELINES CONCERNING THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM AND FUND-RAISING

VI.1 The Chairperson presented item 6 of the Agenda on the Examination of the Guidelines concerning the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising and provided the background of the concerns raised by the Committee at its twenty-first session which led to the inclusion of this item as part of the tasks entrusted to the Consultative Body established by the Committee. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Delegates of Japan and the United States of America who formed the working group of the Consultative Body on the use of the World Heritage Emblem.

VI.2 The Delegates of the United States of America and Japan in presenting WHC-98/CONF.202/7, recalled that this document contains two parts: Part I. Proposed Guidelines for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Part II. Proposed Guidelines for External Funding and Fund-raising. The document was a revised version of the paper initially prepared by the two Delegations which was endorsed in principle by the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session held in June 1998.

VI.3 Part I of this document reflects the discussions which took place at the Bureau meeting in June and contains two additional sections: Section I.3, “Examples of project proposals received by the Centre for endorsement”, and Section I.4, “Comments from the UNESCO Sectors concerned with the use of the World Heritage Emblem ». The Delegate of the United States of America stated that consultations with members of the Secretariat were deemed essential in view of their work in negotiating the use of the Emblem with external entities for information dissemination and fund-raising purposes.

VI.4 The document also addresses the question of authority to grant the use of the World Heritage Emblem under which two options in the authorization procedure were proposed, (A) by the Bureau, and (B) by the Chair. Draft revisions to the Operational Guidelines reflecting the above were also proposed.

VI.5 During the discussions, the Observer of Canada suggested the inclusion of a statement of objectives in the guidelines for the use of the World Heritage Emblem. These objectives could guide the Director of the World Heritage Centre to decide on matters within the scope of responsibilities that could be designated to him by the Committee and set the framework for those requesting the use of the Emblem.

VI.6 Regarding the issue of authority, the Delegate of Japan stated preference for Option B of the proposal outlined in Section I.6 of the document, as, in his view, Option A would be too time-consuming and complicated to implement and may risk the loss of opportunities.

VI.7 Given the complexity of the issues and the implications, the Bureau agreed to the suggestion made by the Delegate of Italy to refer the matter to the Committee for wider consultations.
VI.8 The Delegates of Japan and the United States of America then presented Part II of the document on fund-raising, stating that this text also reflected the discussions of the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session of the Bureau. The Delegates recalled that the Financial Regulations for the World Heritage Fund (WHC/7) do not address the issue of fund-raising. The Bureau suggested that the Committee adopt the “Internal Guidelines for Private-Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO” as an interim measure to give more time for the Committee to elaborate more specific guidelines.

VI.9 The Bureau thanked the Delegations of Japan and the United States of America for their commendable work in the preparation of this document and decided to transmit WHC-98/CONF.202/7 to the Committee for further examination at its twenty-second session.

VI.10 The Bureau examined the proposals made by Italy, following its statement made at the twenty-second session of the Bureau, to amend selected parts of paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines concerning, in particular, the delay for the examination, by the advisory bodies, of nominations to the World Heritage List (before 1 April) and for transmission (before 1 May) of evaluations undertaken by these bodies to the States Parties by the Secretariat of the Committee.

VI.11 Advisory bodies, members of the Bureau and some observers expressed their views concerning the proposal made by Italy. On the basis of the discussion which followed, the Bureau decided that the Secretariat should transmit, by 1 May 1998, evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies to all Members of the Committee and the States Parties which had nominated sites for inscription on the World Heritage List. This will provide time and opportunity for the concerned States Parties to make additional documentation and information, including those which may have been identified by the advisory bodies in their evaluations of nominations, available to the Secretariat. The Bureau recommended that the other change proposed by Italy, i.e. setting a deadline for the examination of nominations by the advisory bodies, be considered in more detail, in view of the practical constraints which the imposition of such a deadline will place on the work of the advisory bodies, at the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

VII.1 The final draft of the Bureau’s recommendations on the Kakadu National Park (Australia) was discussed. The record of the debate and the full text of the recommendations are included in Chapter III, pages 26-32 of this Report.
VIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

VIII.1 The Chairperson thanked the members of the Bureau, representatives of the advisory bodies and the observers for co-operating in the efficient conduct of the deliberations of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Delegate of the United States of America thanked the Chairperson for the time and leadership he had provided to the work of the Committee and the Bureau since his election in November 1997. The Chairperson then declared the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau closed.
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IUCN has reviewed the report of the Kakadu Review Mission, together with the submissions provided to the Mission. IUCN applauds the Australian Government for agreeing to receive the Mission and thanks the wide range of stakeholders for their professional submissions.

IUCN is aware that the preparation of the Report was constrained by the limited time available for all Mission members to work together and notes that this was a consequence of the change in dates of the Mission.

In commenting on the Kakadu situation in June 1998, IUCN noted that on issues of major significance, IUCN's approach is derived inter alia from the periodic World Conservation Congresses. Resolution 1.104 dealing with “Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia” was adopted by the World Conservation Congress (WCC) at its 1st Session in Montreal, Canada, 14-23 October 1996. A copy of this Resolution was provided to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June and is available separately.

The action section of the Resolution includes inter alia the provision:

“To urge the Government of Australia to prevent the development of Jabiluka and Koongarra uranium mines should it be shown that such mining would threaten the Park's World Heritage values.”

On the basis of these considerations IUCN’s position on the issue of Kakadu and mining can be summed up as follows:

1. The report of the Review Mission adds to the concerns discussed in June by analysing and listing a set of ascertained and potential threats to both the cultural and natural values for which Kakadu was listed as a World Heritage site.

2. On the basis of this analysis and WCC Resolution 1.104, IUCN considers that the recommendations of the Review Mission should be addressed as a matter of urgency.

3. After careful consideration of the issues raised by the Review, IUCN believes that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN believes that failure to recognise the dangers would seriously undermine the standards for which the World Heritage Convention enjoys such high international respect.

27 November 1998
Mr Chairman,

In our capacity as the technical advisors to the World Heritage Convention on natural and cultural heritage matters, IUCN and ICOMOS are of the opinion that we would be failing in our duty if we were not to comment upon the Resolution as put before you this evening. We do so because of the urgency of the issues being considered and in particular in light of the ongoing construction of the Jabiluka mine as we speak.

As recorded in our statements to the Bureau on 27 November 1998 we endorse the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee Review Mission to Kakadu. We note in particular the recommendations of the Review report for ‘application of the Precautionary Principle’ and that inter alia ‘the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed’.

In the view of IUCN and ICOMOS Kakadu is a threshold issue for the World Heritage Convention, one that can confirm the standards for which the World Heritage Convention enjoys such high international prestige, or one that can diminish these standards. We believe that failure to implement the Recommendations of the Review Mission will diminish these standards and risks prejudicing the credibility of the Convention within the international community.

This is of particular concern at a time in the Convention’s history when, as we have heard at this meeting, the pressures on World Heritage sites are growing, and mining in particular is bringing such serious impacts.

Thank you.

28 November 1998