

Distribution limited

WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add

Paris, 03 July 2006

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirtieth Session

Vilnius, Lithuania

8-16 July 2006

**Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of the State of Conservation of
World Heritage properties**

7B. State of conservation reports of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

This document contains additional/revised information on the state of conservation of following properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

1st CATEGORY: State of conservation reports for consideration for in-danger listing.

- 11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)
- 18. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)
- 37. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)
- 72. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

2nd CATEGORY: State of conservation reports for adoption requiring discussion by the Committee.

- 1. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)
- 19. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)
- 46. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)
- 60. Prambanan Temple Compunds (Indonesia) (C642)

3rd CATEGORY: State of conservation reports for adoption requiring no discussion by the Committee;

- 44. Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)
- 53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

Decision required: The Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report. The full reports of Reactive Monitoring missions requested by the Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	3
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	3
<i>AFRICA</i>.....	3
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION.....	3
1. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)	3
<i>ASIA-PACIFIC</i>.....	5
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	5
11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083).....	5
<i>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</i>.....	9
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	9
18. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	9
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION.....	12
19. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)	12
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	14
<i>AFRICA</i>.....	14
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	14
37. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956).....	14
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	17
44. Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916).....	17
<i>ARAB STATES</i>	22
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION.....	22
46. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)	22
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	23
53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	23
<i>ASIA AND PACIFIC</i>.....	27
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION.....	27
60. Prambanan Temple Compunds (Indonesia) (C642)	27
<i>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</i>.....	30
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	30
72. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	30

REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

1. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1981

Criteria:

N (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

25COM VIII.96

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 39 580 for technical cooperation and the preparation of a transboundary extension to the property.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission 2001

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Capture and relocation of wildlife ;
- b) Road construction.

Current conservation issues:

In May 2006, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were informed that a wildlife inventory was being undertaken jointly by the management authority (Direction des Parcs Nationaux - DPN) and African Parks Foundation (APF), a Dutch based NGO. On 2 June 2006, the preliminary results of this census were presented and discussed with DPN and the Ministry. UNESCO and IUCN representatives participated in the meeting. The

preliminary results indicate a serious deterioration in the state of conservation of Niokolo-Koba National Park, in particular with regard to its large mammal fauna. Elephants seem to be on the brink of extinction (with only 4 traces found along 1600 km of transect, whilst populations of buffalo, eland, hartebeest, waterbuck and Kobs have been heavily impacted and vulnerable for extinction. During the survey, widespread cattle grazing, commercial timber exploitation and poaching activities were also observed.

In addition, there are reports about a road upgrading project, which might potentially threaten the values and integrity of the property. However, the State Party did not inform the World Heritage Centre about this development, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Besides, neither the World Heritage Centre nor IUCN have yet received a full copy of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of this project.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with great concern these reports of ongoing and potential threats to the values and integrity of the property and believe that a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission is required urgently to assess the state of conservation of the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Notes with great concern the reports of ongoing and potential threats to the values and integrity of the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a full copy of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the proposed road upgrading project as well as the final report on the wildlife inventory that took place in May/June 2006;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the status of key wildlife populations and potential impacts of the proposed road construction project;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property, in particular the status of key wildlife populations and potential impacts of the proposed road construction project, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2003

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 8C.4

28 COM 15B.9

29 COM 7B.7

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Proposed hydro-power and dam development;
- b) Boundary definition;
- c) Tourism development.

Current conservation issues:

In response to the decision of the 29th session of the Committee (Decision **29 COM 7B.7**), the State Party submitted a report on the status of dam planning and construction along the Three Parallel Rivers watersheds, adjacent to the World Heritage property, on 25 January 2006.

The State Party report notes there are no plans for dam projects in the eight areas of the World Heritage serial property. However, plans have been developed for constructing hydropower stations in adjacent areas outside the property.

According to the State Party report, 17 hydropower stations are currently planned, with a total installed capacity of 34.66 million KW. The details of the proposed dams are as follows:

- a) in the middle and lower reaches of the Jinsha River, nine cascade hydropower stations are planned. Before the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2003, eleven hydropower stations had been planned, but since then two of the hydropower stations in the original proposal have been dropped due to their potential adverse impact on the property;
- b) in the upper reach of the Lancang River, two optional schemes were originally planned: one for five power stations and another for six power stations. In 2003, when the property was inscribed, the five dam option was selected (i.e. the proposed dam site at Guonian, inside the World Heritage property was eliminated);
- c) in the middle reach of the Nuijiang River, three hydropower stations are planned.

According to the State Party report of January 2006, relevant national ministries and commissions were reviewing the *Reports on the Hydropower Development Planning* on the Nuijiang, Jinsha and Lancang Rivers and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) of the Development Plans included in these reports were under preparation. The Central Government has not yet ratified the Development Plans; accordingly, none of the dam construction projects has started.

In conclusion, the State Party report stated its intention to enhance its efforts for the protection of natural resources and environment; but at the same time noted that only science-based utilization and rational use of the hydropower in the three rivers can contribute to the common goals of natural resource protection and regional sustainable development.

A joint IUCN/UNESCO reactive monitoring mission to the World Heritage property took place from 5 to 15 April 2006 as requested by the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (**29 COM 7B.7**). The objective was to evaluate progress made on the conservation of the property as per the recommendations of the Committee at the time of its inscription and to assess the impacts of planned hydro-power dams on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, its integrity and downstream communities.

The mission noted various measures taken to strengthen the management and protection of the property. Among these are the review of China's national protected areas legislation and policy framework; completion of management plans for each of the eight protected areas making up the World Heritage serial property (though not all are as yet approved); the development of new management structures and regulations; enhanced funding commitments; reforestation initiatives; and the halting of a marble quarrying enterprise in the Bingzhongluo Area of the property.

The mission was informed that large scale projects, such as hydro-power developments of a river basin, require national level approvals and the preparation of a basin level plan. Plans for development on the three rivers are under review within Government ministries and have not as yet been released publicly. The mission received assurances from officials that any future dams would not affect the World Heritage property. However, the mission was not provided with the EIAs or hydro-development plans so this information could not be corroborated. In addition, evidence from maps, the inspection of hydro-power development exploratory works, unclear boundaries and advice on proposed dams in the vicinity of the World Heritage property suggest that direct and indirect

impacts of dam construction on the property may be considerable. Until plans are confirmed and EIAs become available for review, therefore, it is impossible to state categorically that dams on the Nujiang, Lancang and Jinsha Rivers will not impact the World Heritage property.

At the time of inscription on the World Heritage List, IUCN noted that refinement of the boundaries was necessary, especially to include other areas of high natural value and to expand core zones. The mission was however particularly concerned at unclear boundary definition and proposed changes which could significantly alter the originally inscribed property. The mission learned that while two serial sites are being proposed for addition to the property, significant boundary modifications are proposed which in total may reduce the size of the existing property by 20%. Related concerns include the proposed splitting of the Gaoligong Mountains protection regime along the Myanmar Border from continuous protection into two separate protected areas. The mission noted that at present the boundaries of the World Heritage property are confusing and there is a lack of on-ground boundary demarcation through signage or other means.

The mission was also made aware of mining activity affecting the World Heritage property. According to the document entitled “Protective Standards for the ‘Three-River-in-Parallel’ World Heritage Site of Yunnan Province” adopted by the Yunnan People’s Congress on 24 October, 2005, the Red Mountain cluster of the property contains a number of small operating mines. The document also suggests a significant change of boundaries of the World Heritage property primarily to avoid conflict with its World Heritage status and conservation values. In addition, there is a proposal currently under review by authorities for a large copper, lead and zinc mine that may impact on the property depending on the final boundaries.

A number of additional management issues are affecting the property including stalled implementation of management plans due to delays in approval, and a lack of coordinated and strategic tourism planning.

In summary, the IUCN/UNESCO monitoring mission found that the positive conservation measures advanced by the State Party are regrettably overshadowed by the grave concerns about the, as yet unreleased, plans for hydro-development; the status of mining activities within the World Heritage property and the integrity of the property’s boundaries.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.7, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
3. *Commends the State Party for its continued efforts to improve the management and conservation of the World Heritage serial property and encourages further efforts to develop strengthened legislative and policy frameworks; strategic tourism planning; participatory approaches and work with NGO partners ;*
4. *Urges the State Party to provide sufficient funding for the management of the property at national, provincial and local levels, in particular the provision of*

adequate funding to support conservation efforts to be made at the local community levels;

5. *Reiterates its continuing serious concern over the potential significant impact from proposed hydro-power and dam development on the property and downstream communities and considers that any dam construction within the World Heritage property or significantly impacting the property would provide a case for inclusion of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
6. *Notes with grave concern the findings of the mission in relation to proposed changes to the boundaries of the property which could significantly alter the values for which the property was inscribed, and mining operations within the property which threaten its integrity and values;*
7. *Notes that additional information from the State Party on the potential impacts of dam construction, boundary changes and mining are essential, in order to fully assess the state of conservation of the property;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2007 for review by the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee in response to the findings of the 2006 IUCN/UNESCO monitoring mission, and in particular including:*
 - a) *detailed plans for hydro-power and dam construction in the Nujiang, Lancang and Jinsha River Valleys, including the Environmental Impact Assessments, as well as information on the dams which are finally approved for construction (also shown on a topographical map at an appropriate scale) and any anticipated direct and indirect impacts on the World Heritage property;*
 - b) *topographical maps showing the boundaries of the serial property and detailed information on proposed changes to those boundaries, and how these changes will affect each of the criteria for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List;*
 - c) *detailed information on how ongoing and proposed mining operations within and near the World Heritage property, and their incompatibility with World Heritage property management objectives, will be addressed; and*
 - d) *copies of the following:*
 - (i) *copies in English or French of a summary of the approved management plans for each component of the serial property;*
 - (ii) *the 2005 Yunnan Provincial regulations affecting the property; and*
 - (iii) *“Protective Standards for the “Three-River-in-Parallel” World Heritage Site of Yunnan Province” adopted by the Yunnan People’s Congress on 24 October, 2005.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

18. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1996

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A.

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.19

28 COM 15B.22

29 COM 7B.19

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 63,528 for Preparatory Assistance and Training

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A.

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO mission 1998; UNESCO/IUCN mission 2001; UNESCO/IUCN mission 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Pollution;
- b) Illegal timber harvesting; gas and oil pipeline;
- c) Lack of adequate management regime.

Current conservation issues:

Following previous World Heritage Committee discussions on the state of conservation of this property and, prompted by reports that works on a new oil pipeline started in May 2004 within the boundaries of the property, the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, South Africa) requested a new monitoring mission to the property. Accordingly the mission took place from 21 to 31 October 2005 following an official invitation from the State Party (the full report from the mission is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>).

The mission noted with satisfaction that important progress has been made by the State Party to address a number of concerns. In particular these include the setting up of basic monitoring mechanisms; efforts to agree with the Government of Mongolia on acceptable pollution standards for the Selenga River, efforts to modernize sewage treatment systems

in the watershed, the preparation of a management plan; and preparatory work to define the boundaries of the Central Ecological Zone and to re-instate the Baikal Commission. The mission noted that on a number of critical issues (such as the determination of the Central Ecological Zone) the necessary technical preparatory work is finalized but that the necessary approval by the Government has not yet happened.

The mission noted the lack of progress on a number of other key conservation and management issues (as previously identified by the 2001 reactive monitoring mission) upon which a number of key conservation and management regulations depend, as well as a delay in the implementation of the re-conversion plan for the Baikalski Pulp and Paper Mill which should lead to achieving a closed water circuit system by 2007. The mission further noted, with strong concern, that the route proposed by the Russian oil company Transneft for the Trans-Siberian pipeline within the boundaries of the World Heritage property crossing areas of high accident risk. Furthermore a part of this route was proposed in the immediate vicinity (800 meters) of Lake Baikal's shoreline. Thus, this planned development represented a significant potential threat to the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. Soon after the mission the oil pipeline route proposed by Transneft to cross the World Heritage property was subject to the State Ecological Expertise (EIA) as required under the existing Federal Law. This assessment was prepared by a Committee of 52 state experts appointed by the Federal Service for Ecological, Technological and Atomic Supervision (ROSTECHNADZOR). On 24 January 2006 an overwhelming majority of 43 out of the 52 experts forming this Committee voted against this proposal.

However, on 7 February 2006 both UNESCO and IUCN were informed that the Federal Service for Ecological, Technological and Atomic Supervision decided not to approve the recommendation of the Committee but rather to extend the period for the State Ecological Expertise (EIA) and to add additional members to the Committee. This extended Committee decided on 1 March 2006 to approve the proposal and a positive EIA statement was signed on 3 March 2006 by the Head of Federal Service for Ecological, Technological and Atomic Supervision. Following the approval of this project the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee wrote on 10 March 2006 to the President of the Russian Federation expressing her great concern at this development and requesting the re-examination of the proposed routing of the pipeline taking into account the World Heritage status of Lake Baikal.

The Director General of UNESCO sent a letter dated 29 March 2006 to the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation expressing his deep concern about the impacts of the pipeline which constitutes a potential and substantive threat to the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property.

The routing decision has also generated a lot of protest from civil society in Russia as well as national and international environmental NGOs. It is reported that on 18 March 2006 over 5,000 people attended a rally in the Siberian City of Irkutsk to protest the approval of the route that would run the oil pipeline near the World Heritage property. According to the Moscow Times (20 March 2006), the Irkutsk Governor warned that it was impossible to rule out an oil spill in Lake Baikal and that the consequences of such an occurrence would be irreversible. At the same time information received from a number of media and NGO sources indicated that the Russian Government would go ahead with the construction of the first section of the pipeline, which would be transporting oil to Asian markets, and would be completed by the end of 2008.

The State Party submitted a report dated 31/01/06 on the state of conservation on Lake Baikal; however the report omits to inform on the final decision approving the pipeline route crossing the World Heritage property. It also failed to provide updated information on the programme to construct a closed wastewater cycle to decrease the pollution associated with the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill. Other sections of the State Party report included much of the same information provided in 2005 with no further details on new developments.

Furthermore, the Centre sent a letter to the Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO dated 30 March 2006 requesting the official decision and statement by the authorities concerning the routing of the pipeline. In addition a meeting was organized between the Chairperson of the Committee, the Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO, the Director of the Centre and his staff and the Chair of the Russian World Heritage Committee on 12 April 2006 at UNESCO Headquarters to review the situation. The Ambassador informed the meeting that responses to the letters were under preparation in Moscow.

On 26 April 2006 the President of the Russian Federation, publicly announced in Tomsk his firm decision of re-routing the Trans-Siberian pipeline as to ensure the protection of Lake Baikal. Following this important statement the Director General of UNESCO received a letter on 29 May 2006 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation dated 10 May 2006 in reply to his letter of 29 March and replying to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The letter stressed the importance of the preservation of the World Heritage properties and that an in-depth study of the pipeline in the vicinity of the property of Lake Baikal was implemented. As a result, a new pipeline routing is being developed, "which would pass at a considerable distance to the north of Lake Baikal (from 250km to 450 km) to eliminate all risks of ecological damage". Furthermore, it stated that a wide range of measures on the conservation of Lake Baikal have been carried out and that therefore there would be no ground to include the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling its Decisions **28 COM 15B.22** and **29 COM 7B.19**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou 2004) and 29th (Durban 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Commends the State Party for the progress achieved in setting up a basic monitoring programme, its efforts to agree with the Government of Mongolia on acceptable pollution standards for the Selenga River, its efforts to modernize sewage treatment systems in the watershed, the preparation of a management plan for the property and preparatory work implemented to define the boundaries of the Central Ecological Zone of Lake Baikal;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction the confirmed re-routing of the Trans-Siberian oil pipeline at a distance of 250 to 450km from the lake and outside of the boundaries of the World Heritage property, as recommended by the joint UNESCO/IUCN monitoring*

mission of October 2005 and commends the State Party for this courageous decision;

5. Urges the State Party to increase its efforts on implementing the other recommendations of the 2005 joint UNESCO/IUCN mission, in particular the urgent approval by the Government of the proposed Central Ecological Zone of Lake Baikal, the re-establishment of the Baikal Commission, and the implementation of the re-conversion plan for the Baikalski Pulp and Paper Mill which should lead to achieving a closed water circuit system by 2007;
6. Requests the States Party to provide the World Heritage Centre a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property and further progress made in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

19. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1998

Criteria:

N (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

22 COM/A.1

25 COM/III.120-121

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO-UNDP mission in 2001

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Impacts of a road project across the site

Current conservation issues:

According to newspaper articles including the Eurasia Daily Monitor dated 31 March 2006, the Russian Federation “pledged to build two huge natural gas pipelines to China by 2011, one of these routes has already triggered an environmental controversy..... a direct pipeline link between Russia and China through Altai is only possible across the Ukok highland. For years Russian environmental organizations have been calling for

international support in their campaign to protect the Ukok highland, which is the natural habitat of the snow leopard and other endangered species.” The project for gas pipelines would adversely impact the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property.

According to newspapers, protests against development plans of the Ukok highland erupted in the late 1990s. In December 1999, Russian scientists and environmental activists wrote a collective letter to Siberian Accord, an association of Siberian government leaders, arguing that a road or a pipeline could irreparably damage the Ukok highland. They also warned that the project would incur enormous costs in both construction and maintenance, since it would transit highland marshes, tundra, permafrost areas, and mountain passes at elevations reaching 2,600 meters. The scientists and environmentalists recommended an alternative route through Mongolia along existing roads. Nonetheless, in March 2000 the Siberian Accord group voted to approve road construction through Altai and across the Ukok highland into China. However, there has been no talk of any major road or pipeline project through the Ukok highland since then.

According to newspaper information, on 21 March 2006 the President of the Russian Federation during his visit to China made a statement about a new project in Altai. It was announced that China and the Russian Federation (Gazprom) had signed an Agreement for the construction of a gas pipeline from Russia to China through Altai. The information that a pipeline is under consideration was confirmed at a meeting between the Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre on 12 April 2006. At the time of the preparation of this document no further information was available.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.19

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **22 COM** and **25 COM** adopted at its 22nd (Kyoto, 1998) and 25th (Helsinki, 2001) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with great concern that a pipeline project across the World Heritage property of the Golden Mountains of Altai is being considered;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide any information in compliance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Recalls its request at its 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998) to the State Party to start a co-operative process with neighbouring States Parties to consider a possible transboundary expansion of the World Heritage property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of any development plans that will impact on the World Heritage property and to provide the World Heritage Centre with a report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property, including any pipeline or road constructions, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

37. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2000

Criteria

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.38

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extrabudgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 139,000 for a general inventory; and the preparation of a nomination dossier and the safeguarding and enhancement plan.

Previous monitoring missions:

2004, Mission France UNESCO Convention -World Heritage Centre

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) No regulations for the safeguarding and enhancement of the property
- b) No local management structure for the property
- c) Hazardous condition of the buildings
- d) Integrity of the property
- e) Environmental disorder due to the modification of the mouth of the Senegal River.

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM to undertake a joint mission, in collaboration with the State Party, to evaluate the state of conservation of the property, and to present a report for examination by the Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). The Committee had also requested the State Party to organise at UNESCO Headquarters a meeting of representatives of funding institutions and major partners within the international community which are active in Senegal.

The mission was undertaken from 24 to 28 April 2006 at the invitation of the State Party. It drew attention the following worrying observations:

- The physical boundaries of the property, notably the delimitation of the elements of which it is composed (bridges and banks) and the delimitation of its buffer zone, are not clear, which makes it difficult to set regulations.
- Major changes which affect the integrity of the property were noted with regard to the built structures. These changes are mostly due to inappropriate restorations that impact on the structures and the facades of the buildings (additions of cement balconies, modifications to entrances, etc.) and also to new constructions visible in the city, which make use of inappropriate materials and typology.
- 17 architectural units, out of 1344 on the Island, are still in a very hazardous condition necessitating urgent measures for their safeguard.
- The site still does not have a regulatory and urban planning tool. In fact, the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan (SEP) developed with technical and financial support of the France-UNESCO Convention, has still not been completed. The work carried out in collaboration with the Senegalese authorities and in liaison with the technical services of the City of Saint-Louis, is still on going and should be finished at the end of June 2006.

As concerns the positive aspects, the mission noted a net improvement in the context, due to the increased awareness of all the heritage stakeholders involved in the conservation of the “Saint-Louisian” heritage. This situation has led to a progressive implication of the civil society in the safeguarding actions via associations, and since 2005, work to restoration works of public buildings has been undertaken. This mostly concerned the following buildings: the Festival Hall, the Great Mosque, the André Guillabert house, three “Saint-Louisian” style houses, two secondary schools, and the north Rognat building. Other projects, such as the restoration of the Territorial Assembly building with the support of the Wallonia Region of Belgium, and the south Rognat building with State financing, are also being prepared.

The mission was also able to observe that the current collaboration between the city and the State since 2004 will soon be formalized by an official Convention to be signed for sustainable management of the World Heritage property. With this perspective, the two bodies have undertaken negotiations on the future Heritage Office.

Furthermore, the mission noted that two spans of the Faidherbe Bridge were being consolidated under the direction of the Autonomous Agency for Roadworks of the Ministry of Equipment of Senegal. This work falls within the framework of a decision made by the President of France in 2005, to assist the Senegalese authorities in restoring this bridge dating from the 19th century and which is in an advanced state of degradation. The restoration project will be financed through the French Development Agency (Agence Française de Développement, AFD) and the Senegalese authorities. At a meeting organised in Paris, on 17 November 2005, the World Heritage Centre reminded the AFD that it required the technical documents for this restoration project in order to submit them for technical advice to ICOMOS, so that the outstanding universal value of the Island of Saint-Louis could be preserved. These documents had still not been provided at the time of the mission, neither by the Senegalese authorities, nor by the AFD.

Finally, the mission recommended that the following actions be taken:

- a) the creation of a temporary heritage bureau and the recruitment of a consultant architect specialised in conservation, who would participate in the building permits commission, in order to examine the permit requests and building plans, and to monitor construction sites;
- b) a precise description of the boundaries of the property and a redefinition of the buffer zone, which should include the Barbarie Tongue and the Island of Sor;
- c) the revision of the management responsibilities of the communal boundaries between the Island and the rural commune of Saint-Louis. This measure which concerns essentially the Barbarie Tongue is in addition to the work for redefining and extending the buffer zone of the property;
- d) the urgent finalisation of the SEP in relation to the new Urban Master Plan (UMP) of the city, in order to meet the current legal protection needs and provide the regulatory elements that the municipality and the Regional Urbanism Service should apply;
- e) the appointment, by the Ministry of Culture, of a manager of the World Heritage property, who would work in close collaboration with the municipality of Saint-Louis to draw up a management plan for the Island, involving the representatives of the different districts of the town, the religious leaders, the military authorities and tourist operators, in order to define a common vision for the sustainable conservation of the World Heritage property;
- f) market research for the restoration of Saint-Louis and the skills available in the region;
- g) the initiation of a pilot project for the restoration of a block of houses or a street so as to set an example of good restoration practice and to reactivate the production sources of traditional materials (mud bricks, lime, etc) and to build up restoration skills in Saint-Louis;
- h) the elaboration by the Ministry of Culture, in cooperation with the city of Saint-Louis, of an action plan for 2006-2008 designed to implement the above recommendations made by the ICOMOS-ICCROM-World Heritage Centre mission.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee;

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.38 adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Thanks the State Party for having organised the joint ICOMOS-ICCROM-World Heritage Centre mission, given the results of said mission;*
4. *Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to organise, in 2007, a meeting of representatives of funding institutions and the major partners within the international community active in Senegal, in order to harmonise the current and future interventions on the property;*
5. *Invites the State Party to implement, before 1 February 2008, the following measures to mitigate threats to the property:*

- a) *Approve the SEP and set up a heritage bureau in order to provide the property with a regulatory tool and a specialised service, to monitor any inappropriate architectural modifications and ensure the management of the property;*
 - b) *Define the boundaries of the property and redefine the buffer zone to include the Barbarie Tongue, in accordance with the guidelines of the SEP;*
 - c) *Appoint a site manager responsible for drawing up a management plan, in collaboration with the Municipality and the communities of Saint-Louis;*
 - d) *Initiate a restoration pilot project to provide an example of good restoration practice, to reactivate the production sources of materials and to build restoration skills in Saint-Louis;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to submit an international assistance request in order to carry out an in-depth study on reactivating the production sources of traditional materials (mud bricks, lime, etc.) and the building of skills in Saint-Louis;*
 7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **30 September 2006**, all the technical information on the restoration project for the Faidherbe Bridge, so that the Committee can ensure that the work foreseen guarantees the preservation of the universal value of the property.*
 8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the Committee, by **1 February 2007**, a report including a 2006-2008 action plan designed to implement the recommendations formulated above;*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

44. Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1999

Criteria:

C (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in danger:

N/A

International Assistance:

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.34

28 COM 15A.40

29 COM 7B.39

Previous Monitoring Missions:

Joint ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission 6 to 12 February 2004.

Joint ICOMOS-IUCN mission 1 to 5 December 2005

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Visitor pressure;
- b) Lack of comprehensive Conservation Management Plan;
- c) Lack of specific annual plans of operation;
- d) Lack of human resources;
- e) Difficulties with operational aspects of maintenance and conservation implementation including lack of preventive maintenance funding and programming;
- f) Lack of appropriate conservation of the built heritage;
- g) Lack of proactive management of tourism pressure;
- h) Lack of integration of natural values in management of site.

Current conservation issues:

A first joint IUCN/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission was undertaken to Robben Island World Heritage site in South Africa from 6 to 12 February 2004. The results of the mission was reported to the Committee at its Twenty-eighth session held in Suzhou, China from 28 June – 7 July 2004 (Ref. report *WHC-04/28.COM/16* dated 15 April 2004 and Committee Decision **28 COM 15A.40**). In its decision, the Committee, among others, requested the State Party to implement the nineteen recommendations contained in the report of the mission and to submit a detailed progress report on the implementation of these recommendations by 1 February 2005.

A second ICOMOS-IUCN mission to the property took place from 1 to 5 December 2005. The purpose of the second mission was to follow up on progress made in meeting the recommendations of the 2004 joint mission, and also to review progress in developing the Integrated Conservation Management Plan (ICMP). At the time, the mission team found little visible progress in advancing the ICMP. They also found existing staff questioning the value of more studies and more concerned with creating documents, which could guide day to day decision making. The mission was also concerned with high rates of staff turnover and ensuing loss of corporate memory. As a result, the purpose of the mission was altered and the team in collaboration with RIM staff agreed to develop a work plan to facilitate early completion of the ICMP.

A five step action plan for this purpose was created to: 1. Define the site to be covered by the ICMP; 2. Establish a table of contents for the ICMP structure; 3. Nominate Task force members; 4. Assign strategic priorities; and 5. Monitor Progress towards the ICMP against an agreed timetable. In January 2006, RIM notified the mission members that internal discussion using the methods proposed by the mission had yielded a selection of nine key priority strategic objectives, intended to be used to guide completion of the ICMP.

The December 2005 mission report then reviewed progress made in responding to the 19 recommendations of the 2004 mission. While the report of the 2005 mission notes that the appointment of a site CEO has improved the situation, it also draws attention to the need to quickly move to fill the other key vacant positions. Further it noted that completion of the ICMP was lagging badly and addressed this with the 5 step action plan noted above. The mission report also noted among others that many components of the ICMP have not

yet been integrated into the process (e.g., the Phase I Tourism Development Plan of 2001) and that other key components (the Visitor Management Plan and the Interpretation Plan) have not yet been developed. The report noted that the MOU with the National Public Works Department has yet to be formalised, and noted with satisfaction the signing of an MOU with SAHRa which has meant the secondment of expert personnel to assist with site management.

The mission concluded with a proposal that the State Party contact the World Heritage Centre to seek to orchestrate the submission of the ICMP at the end of April 2006, and Advisory Body response to this plan to be forwarded to the Committee in time for discussion during its 30th session. It was anticipated that the two members of the December 2005 mission would return on March 6-7 to carry out a further workshop to support finalisation of the ICMP.

A progress report on the state of conservation of Robben Island World Heritage site was received by the World Heritage Centre on 7 February 2006. The report was provided by the State Party in response to the Committee Decision **29 COM 7B.39** which urged the State Party and the Robben Island Museum to “*set priorities for the implementation of all (nineteen) recommendations made by the joint ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission*” undertaken to the site in 2004, and “*to submit a progress report by 1 February 2006*”.

The State Party report recaps the degree to which it has accepted the 2004 mission recommendations, and made efforts to address these over the last year.

The State Party report details progress made in rationalizing, consolidating and integrating the management structure of the Robben Island Museum, in filling staff vacancies in the emerging structure, and in managing the natural environment. In addition, the report positively describes progress in developing an MOU to improve management of capital works and maintenance. A number of the recommendations touch issues meant to be taken up in development of the Integrated Conservation Management Plan (ICMP) including the need to improve risk preparedness, to improve collections management, to integrate within it the Robben Island Tourism and Management Plan and the designation of the Robben Island Museum Council as the ultimate management authority for the World Heritage property.

The Committee at its 29th session also “*encouraged the State Party and the Robben Island Museum to continue the ongoing development of an integrated management plan.*” A report on progress in developing an integrated conservation and management plan for Robben Island was received by the World Heritage Centre on 31st March 2006 and reviewed by both the ICOMOS and ICCROM.

ICOMOS notes that the ICMP is the result of a series of staff workshops, various consultancies and the amalgamation of a range of pre-existing material, and that while the draft ICMP is still described by RIM as ‘a work in motion’, it now contains the essential frameworks within which operations and more detailed planning can proceed.

ICCROM notes that while the objectives set out in the ICMP may be a step in the right direction, they need to be reviewed with the aim of trying to make them more realistic and achievable. ICOMOS notes that while the ICMP synthesizes much valuable existing material, there are several critical sections as yet without content. The ICMP includes an

outline of a framework for the development of a Visitor Management Plan and a framework for the development of an Interpretation Plan.

The workshop carried out on March 6, 7, 2006 provided the Advisory Bodies a chance to update their understanding of progress made by the State Party in responding to other recommendations of the 2004 mission, and to provide a further report in this regard.

Concerning the need for efforts to integrate the management of cultural, landscape and environmental values, IUCN noted that progress had been made concerning the removal of alien plants, in improving fire management efforts, in maintaining representative populations of herbivores present when the Island was used as a prison, in removing alien cats, European rabbits and black rats, in reducing marine poaching, in reducing vehicle use of the island, in developing policies to reduce littering, and in removing solid waste and marine litter, reducing use of gravel roads and access points to limestone quarries, improving compliance with environmental impact regulations, improved management of the desalination plant, and improved contacts with regional conservation bodies,,

Concerning recommendations to develop an MOU with the Department of Public Works to improve preventative maintenance programming work on Robben Island, ICOMOS noted that while an agreement has been successfully negotiated with NDPW, the island's deferred maintenance needs, and the lack of forward planning and security of funds will continue to cause the site fabric to deteriorate. ICOMOS noted that while several capital works projects were funded this year, once again, no ongoing protective maintenance funding had been reported.

Concerning other elements of the recommendations of the 2004 mission, ICOMOS noted the following:

- While a model template for a collections management policy has been prepared by SAHRa, it has not yet been adapted to Robben Island and its particular significance. Although a support committee was established to apply the policy to Robben Island, it is understood that a draft has not yet been prepared. Nor has the appointment of an on-site conservator for the RIM collection been made.
- While visitor pressures are increasing and accommodations in infrastructure are being rapidly made, planning for visitor management has not kept up and visitor surveys show high degrees of visitor satisfaction. An outline for a Visitor Management Strategy has been included in the ICMP, but has not yet been prepared.
- While the outline of an Interpretation Plan has also been prepared and included in the ICMP, this has not been prepared. ICOMOS strongly recommends that the Robben Island Education Department be involved in developing both the Visitor Management Plan and the Site Interpretation Plan.
- While the 2004 mission had recommended establishing an MOU with SAHRa, and that while SAHRa had seconded a member of staff to RIM for a period of time to a senior management position, the withdrawal of this support and the lack of progress made in developing the MOU offers serious consequences for RIM's operations. SAHRa has however recommended that Robben Island be listed as a National Heritage Site.
- The RIM Council would be declared as the Management Authority of the World Heritage Site in April /May 2006.

The production of the ICMP in March 2006 is a major accomplishment for RIM. While only partly finished, the document is of high quality and when complete should provide excellent guidance for the conservation management of the site.

Of the major recommendations of the previous Mission Reports, ICOMOS recommends priority attention be given to:

- Filling the key operational positions of Site Director, heritage architect and conservator.
- Completing the Visitor Management Plan and Interpretation Plan within 12 months.
- Ensuring that NDPW provides the catch up maintenance programme as well as annual preventative maintenance allocations within 12 months.
- Implementing updating or completing report recommendations of the ICMP management framework.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with thanks the partly completed Integrated Conservation Management Plan (ICMP) being developed for the property;*
4. *Regrets that the recommendations of the 2004 ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission have not yet been fully implemented and that the State Party support necessary to ensure their fulfilment is to date still lacking;*
5. *Strongly recommends that the State Party work closely with the Advisory Bodies and RIM to develop an action plan to address priority management issues already established for the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2004 ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission and completion of the Integrated Conservation Management Plan by **1 February 2007**, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

ARAB STATES

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

46. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

C (i) (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

Bureau deliberations, notably 1998 (WHC-98/CONF.203/18) and 2001 (WHC-01/CONF.208/3).

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,000 for technical assistance in 2001 (Thebes and Abu Mena).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2001 and Hydrology expert mission in 2002.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Raise of the underground water level (Luxor, Karnak);
- b) Risks of flooding (Valleys of Kings and Queens);
- c) Absence of a defined protection perimeter for the property and of a buffer zone;
- d) Absence of a comprehensive Management Plan;
- e) Major infrastructure projects taking place or scheduled;
- f) Uncontrolled urban development;
- g) Housing and agricultural encroachment on the West Bank.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received information, from various sources, concerning the World Heritage site of Thebes and its Necropolis, about major infrastructure and development projects, in Karnak and Luxor as well as demolitions in the village of Gurnah on the West Bank of the Nile.

As none of this information was official nor verified, the World Heritage Centre requested additional information from the State Party, in February and in April 2006, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*: “The World Heritage Committee invites the States Parties to the Convention to inform the Committee, through the

Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the outstanding universal value of the property is fully preserved”.

The Permanent Delegate of Egypt replied on 23 May 2006, providing information received from the Supreme Council of Antiquities (SCA) as regards the on-going and future projects, stating notably that “the SCA has appointed a high commission” to study the best approach to the temple of Karnak, and listing a series of foreseen demolitions in front of the temple. As regards the village of Gurnah, on the West Bank of the Nile, the letter informs that “in order to put an end to the damages to the tombs (caused by the inhabitants), it has been decided to remove these houses [...], build new houses for the villagers of Gurnah at El-Taref; the ugly houses will be removed, while leaving the other old houses without inhabitants in this area”. In addition, on 13 June 2006, the Secretary-General of the SCA, sent brief descriptions of the projects in Karnak and Gurnah, confirming the demolishing of all “haphazard buildings in front of the Karnak temple and towards the bank of the Nile”, that the “intention is to have a view from the first pylon of the temple towards the Nile so that there is an unobstructed panorama”, and informing that excavation is foreseen on the site. This document also confirms the demolishing of houses in Gurnah and the displacement of villagers, under the supervision of a high committee specialised in architecture, archaeology and engineering.

Consequently, further to the invitation for a mission from the World Heritage Centre, formulated in the letter of the Permanent Delegate, the Centre has suggested that this mission takes place early July, in order to be able to report to the Committee in Vilnius. Therefore, additional information will be provided orally during the 30th session of the Committee and a draft decision will be proposed in light of the conclusions of the mission.

Draft Decision : 30 COM 7B.46

This draft Decision will be distributed in the room.

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1982

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.49

International Assistance:

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre missions in 2003 and 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) No exact boundaries of the property and no appropriate cartography;
- b) Urban encroachment and development;
- c) Obsolete and inadequate restoration methods;
- d) Lack of maintenance, insufficient guardianship and control system inside and outside the archaeological area;
- e) Absence of a management and conservation plan;
- f) Absence of a site presentation and interpretation programme for visitors and local communities.

Current conservation issues:

Following the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 1982, no State of conservation report was presented until 2004, when the World Heritage Committee, at its 28th session, formulated the following requests to the State Party:

- a) to redefine the exact boundaries of the World Heritage property, as well as the necessary buffer zones;
- b) to ensure, through the appropriate legal and planning instruments, including a Management Plan, the adequate protection of the property;
- c) to conduct a comprehensive survey of the conservation of the property and to develop appropriate solutions for the various types of deterioration processes;
- d) to reassess its policy concerning archaeological excavations and major restoration works on the property to direct all available resources towards the strengthening of the capacity of the technical staff of the Department of Antiquities.

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre in March 2006, mainly constituted of photographs accompanied by documents in Arabic and Italian. Therefore, this report was returned to the State Party at its request, recalling the demands formulated in Decision **28 COM 15B.49** and asking for a report in French or English according to the Decision.

Consequently, the Libyan Department of Antiquities requested the World Heritage Centre to send a mission in order to assist in preparing the state of conservation report for the next session of the Committee and in elaborating a plan of action for the management of the property.

Further to this request, a mission was carried out by an expert from INRAP (Institut national de recherches archéologiques préventives) for the World Heritage Centre from 13 to 22 May 2006. The mission report, in summarizing the state of conservation of the

property noted both improvements and pending issues. Among the improvements, the following were noted:

- a) A proposal for the delimitation of the World Heritage property, as well as the necessary buffer zones, was prepared by the Department of Antiquities and these elements were submitted to the local authorities.
- b) The foreign scientific missions working on the property are, or are going to be, engaged in operations of restoration and are not limited to the excavation work. They will also contribute to the training of local technicians. Indeed, the former restorations of the monuments appear inadequate and will need to be taken over gradually.
- c) A first set of measures aiming at improving the conservation of the remains and the awareness of the local populations was proposed by the Department of Antiquities in its report, prepared during the mission, and should be implemented starting from 2006. These include the conservation of mosaics; cartographic documentation of the remains; set-up of a visitor route; conferences for the local public and pedagogic work with schoolchildren.

The following conservation issues were also identified:

- a) The monumental tombs carved in the rock, located around the ancient settlement, are insufficiently protected and are suffering from vandalism, development works in the rural area, and construction works in the urban area (buffer zone);
- b) The past restorations of the monuments (reinforced concrete and cement) appear inadequate and will need to be removed gradually;
- c) The polluted effluents from the sewers of the agglomeration flow in the Wadi Bel Ghadir, through the World Heritage property, significantly affecting the environment of the site.

In the light of the information provided concerning the property since its inscription on the World Heritage List, the mission report concluded that the priority measure to be undertaken for conservation and management, prior to any development project, is the elaboration of a Management plan. The mission made the following recommendations:

- a) The report drafted by the Department of Antiquities constitutes only the first stage of a work which must be actively continued and developed in order to coordinate medium-term measures required for the site. This plan must be based on a suitable cartography of the site of which the urgent production is absolutely crucial to allow any type of conservation strategy and maintenance planning. These graphic documents, available on several scales, will allow:
 - (i) to visualize the state of conservation of the structures in order to prioritise actions for the maintenance and restoration of the remains, define visiting routes, etc..
 - (ii) to ensure control of development pressures threatening the property and urban encroachments and to survey areas adjacent to the main heritage site, by taking into account the archaeological potential.
- b) The future Management Plan will have to clearly identify the legal protection measures and their scheme of enforcement, in particular in the buffer zones of the World Heritage property. For this reason, it appears essential to improve, by establishing an advisory commission, the sharing of information between the

Department of Antiquities, which has the legal authority over the site, and the local authorities in charge of urban planning.

- c) The Management plan must take into account a gradual approach in the build-up of the actions aiming at preserving the heritage by clearly identifying the emergencies and the possible medium-term measures, by including the progressive reinforcement of the personnel assigned to the monitoring of the site, to the restoration of the remains, to the preventive archaeological interventions, as well as their necessary training. Each cooperation agreement with foreign institutions will have to include a clearly specified capacity-building component.
- d) The immediate risks threatening the World Heritage property are related to pressure from human activities, such as urban encroachment, vandalism in the necropolises, and the pollution of the Wadi Bel Ghadir. These issues must be dealt with as a priority, and will require a significant increase of the human resources made available to the management of the site.
- e) Natural risks, mainly due to climatic conditions, will have to be addressed. These include floods and uncontrolled vegetation, for which a permanent maintenance programme should be developed.
- f) The mission noted that the co-operation with foreign teams is correctly managed and encourages the Department of Antiquities to continue its collaboration with the University of Al Baida, both in the area of archaeological research and of training.
- g) The mission suggested that a draft Management Plan could be presented by the Libyan authorities to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2008, and recommended that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission be sent before the end of 2006 to assess the proposed boundaries for the World Heritage core and buffer zones, monitor progress and support the Department of Antiquities in its planning process.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling its Decision 28 COM 15B.49, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that a proposal for the delimitation of the World Heritage Property, as well as of its buffer zones, has been prepared by the national authorities and that a first set of measures aiming at improving the conservation of the property and the awareness of the local populations have been proposed by the Department of Antiquities for implementation from 2006 ;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with further information regarding the set of measures proposed, and a detailed map at the appropriate scale showing the proposed boundaries for the World Heritage core and buffer zones;*

5. *Urges the State Party to ensure, through the appropriate legal and planning instruments, the adequate protection of the property in the light of the newly proposed boundaries and to develop appropriate solutions for the most urgent problems (urban expansion, vandalism and pollution of the Wadi Bel Ghadir);*
6. *Further requests the State Party to prepare a Management plan in order to coordinate medium-term measures required for the property;*
7. *Requests moreover the State Party to invite a joint mission by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to assist in reviewing the above-mentioned plans and facilitate the formulation of an adequate conservation strategy and maintenance planning, and in particular the development of a Management plan for the property;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2007, a report on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, including on the elaboration of the Management Plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

ASIA AND PACIFIC

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

60. Prambanan Temple Compunds (Indonesia) (C642)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1991

Criteria:

C (i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission, 17-25 February 2006 and World Heritage Centre mission, 7-10 June 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

At 05:53 hrs on 27th May 2006, an earthquake measuring 5,9 on the Richter Scale (BMG) struck Yogyakarta and some parts of Central Java. The epicentre was located approximately 3,8 kilometres south of Yogyakarta. The earthquake impacted eight districts within Yogyakarta and the neighbouring Central Java Provinces, severely damaging housing and infrastructure. The two worst-affected districts were Bantul, in Yogyakarta, and Klaten in Central Java. About 6,234 people were reported dead, and 30,000 injured. An estimated 650,000 were displaced, as some 135,000 houses were damaged or destroyed.

The Prambanan Temple Compounds, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 and located a few kilometres North East of Yogyakarta, was severely affected by the earthquake. The main enclosure of Prambanan contains three temples decorated with reliefs illustrating the epic of the *Ramayana*, dedicated to the three great Hindu divinities (Shiva, Vishnu and Brahma) as well as three minor buildings dedicated to the animals who serve the deities (“Vahana” or Vehicles). Around the main enclosure are numerous other structures and Temples. The President of the Republic of Indonesia, H. E. Mr. Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, visited the site with the Minister for Culture and Tourism, Mr. Jero Wacik, on Tuesday, 30 May 2006. On this occasion, the President called for UNESCO’s assistance towards the rehabilitation of the World Heritage site. In the mean time, the main enclosure of the Temple Compounds had been closed to the public.

Indeed, immediately after the earthquake, and in consultation with the Indonesian authorities, the World Heritage Centre dispatched to the site an expert in historic structures, Prof. Giorgio Croci, to assess the damage suffered by the Temples as well as the remaining risks for the structures and visitors. The mission took place from 7 to 10 June 2006, and benefited from the full assistance of the Indonesian Ministry of Culture, as well as of the UNESCO Office in Jakarta.

The report of the mission indicates that all of the structures have suffered, to different degrees, from an enlargement of the vertical joints with consequent outward deformations, cracks in some stones, collapse of some *ratna* (small stupa) and of parts of the balustrades, inclination of the top pinnacle, etc. Some Temples were particularly affected. Among these were the Sojiwan Temple, which was under restoration when the earthquake struck; the Plaosan Temple, where large portions of the roof have collapsed; the gates of the Compound, which have fallen down; and the so-called Sewu Temple, located outside of the main enclosure, where the outward deformations are particularly pronounced and wide cracks have opened at the four corners. With the possible exception of the Sewu Temple, the standing structures of the Temples do not appear at imminent risk of collapse. However, some risk for the security of people was noted in numerous places, mostly due to stone fragments in unstable position.

The mission examined as well the dynamic of the deformations that took place during the earthquake, taking into account the very important structural interventions that had been carried out at the Temples over the second half of the past century. These, in fact, had completely altered the structural behaviour and original constructive characteristics of the monuments. Indeed, starting from the 1950s, many of the Temples had been dismantled and rebuilt around a cage of reinforced concrete. Stones were reassembled using mostly a

dry masonry technique reinforced in the joints by the injection of cement or resins. The reinforced concrete frame and the dry masonry (partially strengthened by injections) behave very differently in the event of a horizontal thrust (typical of earthquakes) since the former has a good strength but a large elastic (reversible) deformability, while the latter has a limited strength (limited by the friction between the blocks) and huge stiffness. It would appear, indeed, that the different elastic modules of these two structures are one of the main causes for the damage suffered by the Temples. This is because the deformation of the stone masonry, and in certain cases its collapse, were enhanced by the much wider deformations of the reinforced concrete grid. The latter, owing to its intrinsic structural features, did not start “working” under stress until the stones had already been deformed by the seismic action, but then contributed to the instability of the ancient monument by hitting like a hammer on the masonry, thus causing broader deformation and in some cases the collapse of the stones. In the end, the assessment has shown that under seismic action the presence of the reinforced concrete frames inside the Temples may have been not only useless, but indeed negative.

This hypothesis, if verified by the necessary detailed seismic analysis that must be carried out, will determine the possible long term remedial measures to be implemented. A credible conservation intervention, indeed, will have to be based on a detailed study of the seismic behaviour of the two structures (reinforced concrete and masonry), possibly by the development of mathematical models, combined with a very precise survey of the situation of each structure of the Compound. This will certainly require some time, and substantial resources and expertise.

In the short term, however, the mission identified some simple but essential steps to reduce the remaining risks and ensure the safety of the staff of the Ministry of Culture and visitors alike. These steps include the elimination of local risks related to unstable blocks and fragments, etc. which could fall down with obvious risks to people and workers; and the reduction of the risk of collapse for certain structures, mainly the Sewu Temple, including by means of pre-stressed belts in special fibres that must be fixed around the endangered buildings.

Based on the assessment carried out by Prof. Croci, the Indonesian authorities developed and submitted, on 22 June 2006, a request of emergency assistance, for an amount of USD 75,000, to carry out the two above urgent measures. At the time of writing of the present report (30 June 2006), the request had been approved by the Chairperson of the Committee and the corresponding funds were being decentralised to the UNESCO Office in Jakarta for implementation.

In the long term, the incompatibility of the reinforced concrete structure with the original masonry of the Prambanan Temples will have to be carefully considered, taking also into account their being nowadays part of the “history” of the monument and of conservation sciences in general. Removing these structures from all the Temples, indeed, would be an extremely radical, complex and costly operation that other priority needs might not justify. At the same time, the negative role of the cement contained in the concrete, source of salts carried by water and crystallizing on the surface of the stones during evaporation, will certainly require a solution. The extensive use of epoxy resins and water repellent based on silicon resins, practiced until today, will also need to be reconsidered. In summary, the earthquake has caused significant damage to this World Heritage property, and opened a number of conservation issues that will have to be dealt with over the next years, once the immediate risks have been mitigated.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.60

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Expressing its deepest condolences to the State Party of Indonesia for the tragic loss of human lives caused by the recent earthquake that struck the Island of Java,*
3. *Congratulates the Indonesian authorities for the rapid response and the commitment shown for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of the affected area, including the World Heritage site of Prambanan;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to implement as soon as possible the urgent measures identified by the expert mission of June 2006 to reduce the risks for the structures and people at the site;*
5. *Also encourages the State Party to conduct, if necessary with international assistance, the required further studies, analysis and research identified by the expert mission of June 2006 as essential to define an appropriate long-term conservation approach for the Temples;*
6. *Further encourages the donor community to support the development of the above-mentioned studies as well as the implementation of the ensuing conservation interventions that will be defined on their basis;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a report on the progress made towards the reduction of the risks currently threatening the property as well as on the elaboration of a long-term conservation strategy, for consideration by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

72. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1990

Criteria:

C (i) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.83

28 COM 15B.95

27 COM 7B.74

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 29,540 for Emergency Assistance (2003).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

ICOMOS (1992, 1993, 1994); UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission and on-site workshop (August 2002); Russian follow-up workshop (December 2003).

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Structural integrity of the Church of the Transfiguration as well as the overall restoration and conservation project to replace the scaffolding within the Church;
- b) Tourism development pressures affecting the property;
- c) The need to strengthen management of the property.

Current conservation issues:

The Russian Federation has submitted two reports to the World Heritage Centre concerning the state of the conservation of the World Heritage property dated 12 July 2005 and December 2005 and received on 8 February 2006.

These reports do not meet the expectations of the World Heritage Committee as expressed in its decision at its 29th session. Both reports were prepared by the local management authority (Kizhi Museum) and do not show any involvement on the part of the national authorities in this process. They do not address any of the main recommendations made by the Committee concerning provision of information on the management of the property, updates on the status and determination of the buffer zone, information on risk preparedness measures in place for the entire property, and clarification on the impact of tourism on the values of the inscribed property. While to some extent both reports provide information on aspects of the construction work plan for the Church of the Transfiguration, the precise budget data requested is not provided, and the “Detailed Report” describes information that at the time of the 30th session will be 19 months out of date. The “Brief Report” of December 2005, together with its attached photos and chart showing “main stages of the restoration of the Transfiguration Church and the schedule of their implementation (1999-2014)” provides some updated information but is of limited value as the report is only one page in length.

The response of the State Party to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session is entirely inadequate, maintaining a pattern repeated over many years for this property of providing limited information to the Committee, prepared by the local management authorities without any understanding of the nature of the Committee’s requests. There is no evidence, in spite of the detailed planning and scheduling being carried out for the restoration work on the Church of the Transfiguration at the local level, that the national authorities have committed themselves to fund this work. No detailed budget for this work is available showing budget commitments over time. Nor is there any evidence of effort to address the larger over-arching issues important for the site and

stated by the Committee in its recommendations: development of a management plan (which would address boundary issues, buffer zone definition and risk preparedness), and development of a tourism strategy.

A meeting of 100 conservation experts to identify conservation strategies for this property was already organized in 1988, two years before it was inscribed on the World Heritage List. A number of expert missions have taken place since to review the state of conservation of the property. All have highlighted the serious and specific dangers facing the property. Little evidence of commitment at the national level has come forth in those many years to provide confidence that the outstanding universal value recognized by the inscription is maintained.

ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre consider that the property should be placed on the World Heritage List in Danger, and that the property should not be removed from this List until the following benchmarks are agreed upon and reached:

- a) Completion of restoration work on the Church of the Transfiguration;
- b) The development and implementation of a comprehensive management plan for the property (addressing tourism development, risk preparedness, boundary definition and buffer zone issues).

The State Party should provide, by 1 February 2007, the outline plans and a timescale for the development of a comprehensive management plan and strategy, to provide a clear description of the restoration concept guiding the works on the Church of the Transfiguration, and a detailed long term (10 year) budget commitment for all activities on the site, prepared and endorsed by the concerned national authorities and the Ministry of Culture. Detailed benchmarks could then be agreed upon between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the authorities.

An additional brief report with an explanatory note on the most important activities of the preparatory period and some updated information by the Kizhi Federal Museum was transmitted by the national authorities on 8 June 2006.

The report mentioned new information concerning, in particular the assembly and adjustment of the fire alarm system inside and outside of the Church, as well as the replacement of the old electric supply cabinet and installation of a new power supply, communication and alarm systems.

Some information concerning new restoration approaches and preparation of timber conservation was also provided. The report mentioned in particular, that the main cross has been reinforced temporarily with metallic plates and that the zones infected by wood beetles have been identified. The entrance of the Church has been repaired and a metallic tie-bar installed in the northern wall of the refectory.

An attached chart showing the “main stages of the restoration of the Transfiguration Church and the schedule of their implementation (1999-2014)” is the same as provided in the previous reports. The report further notes that the annual monitoring of the stability of the property conducted by the Institute “Spetsproectrestavratsiya” shows continued stability of all monuments and indicates that none of them is considered to be in danger.

By letter of 9 June 2006, the authorities of the Russian Federation underline that they consider that the State Party is fulfilling its obligations concerning the protection of the property and object to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

However, the latest report provides no information concerning the detailed budget and funding sources, the overall state of conservation of the property, nor details of management measures for the property or the determination of the buffer zone, as requested by the Committee. As a result, the requests for information made by the Committee at its 29th session in Durban remain unanswered.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.72

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.95** and **29 COM 7B.83**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with great concern that the reports provided by the State Party do not respond to the requests made by the Committee at its 29th session;*
4. *Urges the State Party to collaborate closely with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to elaborate detailed benchmarks (completion of restoration work on the Church of the Transfiguration; and the development and implementation of a comprehensive management plan for the property, which addresses tourism development, risk preparedness, boundary definition and buffer zone issues);*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007, with a detailed report, a timescale and a workplan for:*
 - a) *the development and implementation of a detailed management strategy;*
 - b) *a comprehensive management plan, including a tourism strategy, risk preparedness measures and clear boundary and buffer zone definitions;*
 - c) *an overall restoration concept for the Church of the Transfiguration, as well as a report on the status and likely impact of proposed interventions;*
 - d) *the preparation of a buffer zone for the property; and*
 - e) *a detailed budget;*
6. ***Decides to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
7. *Notes that the corrective measures mentioned in paragraph 5 above constitute the benchmarks for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to define the appropriate timeframe for their implementation.*