Distribution Limited

WHC-97/CONF.205/INF.4
Paris, 5 September 1997
Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

ELEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 27 - 28 October 1997
Room II

Summary record of the tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995)

Distribution limited **WHC-95/CONF.204/8**
Paris, 22 November 1995
Original : English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XII**

SUMMARY RECORD

1. The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural heritage was held in Paris at UNESCO Headquarters, on 2 and 3 November 1995, during the 28th session of the General Conference.

2. One hundred and nineteen States Parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting.

3. Representatives of two non-governmental organizations and the European Communities Commission attended the meeting as observers. Several other observers were also present.

4. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre provided the Secretariat for the Assembly.

Opening of the session

5. In his opening address, the Deputy Director-General, representing the Director-General, evoked the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention to which 143 States Parties now adhered; since the eighteenth session of the Committee, 440 properties situated in 100 States Parties were now inscribed on the World Heritage List.

He emphasized that the desire to preserve the diversity of cultural and natural heritage has made it possible to accomplish noteworthy actions and to strengthen the feeling of belonging to a world community working towards greater tolerance, solidarity and peace.

He informed the General Assembly that the Director-General of UNESCO had signed

several Green Notes concerning the role of the World Heritage Centre and its relations with other units within the Secretariat, in order to rationalise its procedures and to increase its field of action.

He also requested the States Parties to make an effort to settle outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund, now amounting to a total of more than two million US dollars.

Election of the President, Vice-Presidents and Rapporteur

6. The General Assembly elected by acclamation Mr S. Kronfol (Lebanon) as President. The General Assembly also elected unanimously representatives of Brazil, Niger and Japan as Vice-Presidents, and Mr J. Jelen (Hungary) as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda

7. After having moved to item 9 of the draft agenda the examination of new monitoring activities and to item 10 elections to the World Heritage Committee, the General Assembly adopted its draft agenda.

8. Following a point of order on the part of Slovenia, which recalled a resolution of the UN Security Council and a decision of the UNESCO General Conference, and after having heard the advice of the Legal Advisor, the General Assembly decided that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not participate in this tenth session.

Report by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee

9. In accordance with the recommendation made by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session, the Chairman of the Committee, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen (Thailand) presented to the General Assembly the report which the Committee was submitting to the UNESCO General Conference. The text of Dr. Wichiencharoen's presentation is presented in Annex I to this document. The General Assembly took note of this report.

Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund

10. The General Assembly examined the Document WHC-95/CONF.204/3 concerning the budgetary situation of the World Heritage Fund, in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the Fund. The situation concerning contributions up to 28 October 1995, replacing Document WHC-95/CONF.204/3 Add., was also distributed during the session. The Assembly was further informed that the following contributions had been received since 28 October 1995:

State Party	Amount (US $)	Year of contribution
Algeria	10,768	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Argentina	129	balance 1995
Guyana	301	part of 1994
India	9,979	1995
Jordan	180	balance 1995
Mozambique	658	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Nigeria	19,089	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Pakistan	1,878	balance 1994/part of 1995

11. The General Assembly then took note of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period ending on 31 December 1993, the interim statement of accounts for the period 1994-1995, as at 31 August 1995, and the summary contributions received from States Parties as at 31 August 1995. The Assembly also took note of information provided by the Secretariat regarding contributions received since 28 October 1995.

During examination of the accounts, the General Assembly requested the Secretariat to work towards improving the presentation of the budget and the accounts in order to provide greater transparency and clarity, especially with regard to the special voluntary contributions to the Fund and their use. The General Assembly also requested that in the future the accounts up to 31 December carry the visa of the Director of the Centre and the Financial Comptroller.

Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the Convention

12. The General Assembly unanimously decided that the amount of mandatory contributions to the World Heritage Fund for the period 1996-1997, calculated in US dollars, would be maintained at 1 percent of contributions made by States Parties to the Regular Programme of UNESCO, in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention, as had been decided by the nine previous General Assemblies.

Proposed procedural changes for the election to the World Heritage Committee - Proposed amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly

13. The President then explained for which reasons it was proposed to simplify the procedure in force for the election of members to the World Heritage Committee, in order to avoid an excessive number of ballots. This simplification, contained in the proposed amendments to Rules 13.8, 13.9 and 13.10 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (cf. Document WHC-95/CONF.204/5), would comprise four ballots with absolute majority and at the fifth ballot a simple majority, and in the event of two or more candidates obtaining the same number of votes, to proceed by drawing lots.

14. The General Assembly rejected several additional amendments proposed during the session by delegations, comprising:

- in the case of candidates obtaining the same number of votes, deferral of drawing of lots until the sixth ballot;

- replacement of drawing of lots in the case of egality of votes by preference accorded to the State which had not yet been elected to the Committee;

- interdiction of an outgoing Committee member to present its candidature for immediate re-election;

- consideration as invalid the ballot papers where the number of States marked is less than the seats to be filled.

Following these discussions, Rules 13.8, 13.9 and 13.10 as amended in the proposal contained in the Document WHC-95/CONF.204/5 were adopted by consensus, and Rule 13.4 was modified as follows:

"Each delegation shall cast its vote **by encircling** the names of those States for which it.... desires.... to vote."

New monitoring activities related to World Heritage sites

15. This agenda item was introduced by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen (Thailand), who summarized the contents of his report on this subject as reflected in Working Document WHC-95/CONF.204/7 (see note [1]) and the

[1] The Rapporteur decided, for the sake of clarity, to re-number the proposed draft resolutions and revisions to these resolutions submitted to the General Assembly in their chronological order. All these documents as well as the Report of the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee for this agenda item are included among the official documents of the General Assembly and are included in Annex II. Reference numbers used in this report are the ones attributed to them by the Rapporteur.

proposed resolution that had been prepared by him for this General Assembly (WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1). He recalled that the World Heritage Committee, after a long process of consultations, discussions and practical experiences in several States Parties and regions, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, decided, at its eighteenth session in December 1994, to introduce a voluntary system of on-site monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, with a periodic reporting by the States Parties to the World Heritage Committee. With reference to specific provisions in the Articles 4, 6, 7, 8, 11 and the eighth preambular clause of the Convention, the Chairman emphasized that the Committee considered monitoring and reporting to constitute the appropriate modern and scientific means to meet the requirements and responsibilities of the States Parties and the World Heritage Committee as set out in the World Heritage Convention for ensuring the collective protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List. Therefore, he concluded, the reporting, i.e. the presentation of periodic state of conservation reports as proposed by the Committee, is a technical instrument for the implementation of the Convention and is of a different order than the reports to the General Conference of UNESCO mentioned in Article 29 of the Convention.

16. The Delegate of India introduced a draft resolution submitted by her country together with Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2 which was replaced by WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2.Corr.1). Another draft resolution was also submitted by India as an amendment to the Chairman's proposed resolution (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3). She proposed to use the terminology 'systematic observation' instead of 'systematic monitoring' in order to avoid any misunderstanding and misinterpretation. She also pointed out that, in her country's view and based upon Article 29 of the Convention, reports from States Parties can only be required by the General Conference of UNESCO and not by a 'select outside body' such as the World Heritage Committee.

17. The UNESCO Legal Adviser replied to some specific questions that were raised in the draft resolution DR.2.corr.1. He clarified that the World Heritage Convention only foresees a reporting by the States Parties to the General Conference of UNESCO and that no legal basis exists for the Committee to demand reports on a mandatory basis. The Committee could, however, request reports as long as this would be done on a voluntary basis.

18. In reply to a question posed by the Delegate of India, the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee emphasized that it is the responsibility of the Committee to make detailed provisions for the implementation of the different aspects of the Convention which are subsequently reflected in the 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention'. In this sense, he repeated that monitoring and reporting were conceived by the Committee as a technical means of implementing the Convention and as an effective tool for management and planning remedial actions by the States Parties themselves and for the Committee to undertake the tasks entrusted to it in the Convention. He reiterated that the World Heritage Committee can only undertake its tasks to establish and keep up-to-date the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger as well as to provide international assistance for the safeguarding of World Heritage properties, if it has updated and reliable information on their state of conservation available.

19. In the ensuing debate, the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee and the

Chairman's proposed resolution WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1. were fully supported by the Delegates of Cambodia, Argentina, Colombia, Netherlands, Croatia, Mexico, Italy, Sweden, Poland, Cuba, United States of America, Canada, among others, whereas the resolution WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3 tabled by India was favoured or considered suitable for revision by the Delegates of Germany, Greece, France, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Laos, China, Mali, Sudan, among others. The Delegate of Germany, however, expressed reservations about the final part of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution DR.3 and proposed that the text 'on a totally voluntary basis and without any obligation under the Convention to do so' be deleted.

20. The Delegate of Canada then pointed out that it seemed that the main divergence was not on the need for monitoring or reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in itself, but on the question if reports should be submitted to the World Heritage Committee or to the UNESCO General Conference. Upon her suggestion that reports could be presented to the General Assembly of States Parties, the President of the General Assembly decided to adjourn the session to give the delegates the opportunity to discuss and prepare a consensus resolution. After the recess, a 'revised amendment' was submitted by India (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.1). This document was then distributed to all delegates.

21. The Delegate of Germany expressed his support for this DR.3.Rev.1, whereas the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee expressed his strong opposition towards it. In view of the fact that many delegates wished to consult with their respective governments on this new text, the President of the General Assembly decided to defer the debate until after the elections of the new members of the Committee (item 10 of the agenda).

22. After the conclusion of the elections, the President of the General Assembly stated that he had received a written statement from the Delegates of Sweden, Denmark and Finland which supported the resolution DR.1 proposed by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee and which proposed specific amendments to the DR.3.Rev.1 in case the DR.1 were not accepted by the General Assembly (for the full text of this statement see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.2). A revision to DR.3.Rev.1 was also submitted to the President of the General Assembly in a written statement submitted by the Delegate of Brazil and reproduced in Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.3. The President then proposed to amend DR.3.Rev.1 in the sense that reporting would take place to the 'General Assembly of States Parties as well as to the General Conference of UNESCO'. He also proposed amendments to paragraph 4 of the same document regarding the 'prime responsibility' of the States Parties in the observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties, and paragraph 5 regarding the role of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies in providing expert advice to States Parties (for the full text of this proposal see Document DR.3.Rev.4).

23. The Chairman of the World Heritage Committee intervened to express his disappointment that not all members of the World Heritage Committee openly defended the Committee's decisions. Hereafter, the Delegate of Italy requested that his country's full support to the Committee's decisions be recorded in the report of the session. The Chairman, supported by the Delegates of Italy, Australia and Canada, also raised objections that his proposed resolution was not taken as the basis for the discussions. The President referred to Rules 12.6 and 12.7 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly to justify his decision

to first invite discussions on the draft resolutions submitted by India (DR.3.Rev.1) and himself (DR.3.Rev.4).

24. The discussions then focused on the DR.3.Rev.4 proposed by the President of the General Assembly.

25. The Delegates of Brazil and Italy supported the President's proposal to bring paragraph 4 of DR.3.Rev.1 in line with Article 4 of the World Heritage Convention which stipulates that 'the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage (...) belongs primarily to that State'. As to paragraph 5 of the President's proposal, the Delegate of Brazil, supported by the Delegates of Italy, Madagascar, Australia and the Netherlands, found this too restrictive and proposed to replace its text by the following: "Emphasizes further that with the expressed agreement of the State Party concerned, UNESCO, through the World Heritage Centre and/or the advisory bodies mentioned in Art. 13.7, may provide expert advice on ...." (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.3). The Delegate of Italy questioned the meaning of paragraph 9 of DR3.Rev.3 and DR.3.Rev.4 inviting the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29.

26. The Delegate of Australia expressed the view that the Assembly did not seem to be close to a consensus on the matter of monitoring and reporting. In response to the fear he felt among some of the delegates for excessive bureaucracy and an intrusion on the sovereignty of the States Parties, the Delegate stated that the World Heritage Committee's decisions on monitoring and reporting indeed strengthen the role of the Convention and the Committee but that these are in no way intrusive. Given the fact that the Convention as such, of course, cannot reflect the experiences gained since 1972, he felt that there is an important role to play for UNESCO in setting standards in this field. He concluded that he would not concur with the President's proposal DR.3.Rev.4.

27. Adding to this, the Delegate of Canada referred to specific articles in the World Heritage Convention, particularly Article 6, to illustrate the delicate balance between the sovereignty of the States Parties and the responsibility of the international community to cooperate in the conservation of the World Heritage properties, and to the importance of paragraph 5 (a) of the proposed resolution DR.1. She concluded that both DR.3.Rev.1 and DR.3.Rev.4 would imply a step back as compared to the Convention.

28. In response to the President's draft resolution (DR.3.Rev.4), the UNESCO Legal Adviser remarked that this proposal would encounter the same legal difficulties as the one proposing reporting to the Committee. He again recalled that, according to Article 29 of the Convention, it is to the General Conference of UNESCO to determine the dates and the manner in which the States Parties to the Convention shall give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, together with details of the experience required in this field. He stressed that Article 29 could be used in a flexible way and that 'the manner' of the reporting could very well be, if the General Conference would so decide, through the General Assembly or the World Heritage Committee.

29. During the debate, the Delegate of Zimbabwe observed that the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee address the concerns of, what he called, the practitioners and that monitoring is crucial for their work and that he therefore supported the Committee's position. He also proposed to mandate the Committee to look again into this matter. The Delegates of Australia and Austria equally stressed the need to develop, on the basis of the past experiences, standards for management and monitoring of World Heritage properties including a format for periodic state of conservation reports and the important role the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO, in collaboration with the advisory bodies ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN, should play in this matter.

30. The Delegates of Algeria and Morocco remarked that the positions defended by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee and the Delegate of India differed fundamentally from each other and that more reflection was needed on this matter. They proposed to defer the discussion and decision-making to the next General Assembly in 1997. This was supported by the Delegates of Australia, Canada, Sweden, Malta and Pakistan. As the discussion continued on various related matters, the Delegate of Sweden requested the President to bring the proposal to defer the debate to a vote. The President did so and the proposal was adopted by forty-one votes in favour. Ten delegates voted for the continuation of the debate and five abstentions were recorded.

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

32. The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Assembly that the report of the session will be finalized by the Rapporteur and will be distributed, in english and french, to all States Parties before the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee (4-9 December 1995). Furthermore, he indicated that the item 'the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural and natural properties' figured already on the provisional agenda of the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee and that the Committee would certainly examine this matter in the light of the debate at the Tenth General Assembly very seriously. He furthermore informed that the Committee will decide whether financial support will be given to States Parties upon their request, for monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and for training of site managers in this field. He also indicated that guidelines were being prepared jointly with ICCROM for on-site recording and documentation.

33. Subsequently, upon the proposal made by the Delegate of the United States of America, the General Assembly thanked the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee for the work undertaken by the Committee and for his personal commitment and professional input in the debate at this General Assembly.

Elections to the World Heritage Committee

34. Under item 10 of its agenda, the General Assembly was called upon to elect seven members to the World Heritage Committee, to replace the following seven members whose mandate would expire at the end of the twenty-eighth session of the General Conference: Colombia, Indonesia, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic and Thailand. Following the withdrawal of its candidature by Nigeria, as well as that of Colombia which withdrew in favour of Ecuador, the list of twenty-eight States Parties having submitted their candidature was read to the General Assembly: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Benin, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lithuania, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mauritania, Mozambique, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

35. On the decision of the President, the elections were held by secret ballot. Mr Li Jiangang (China) and Ms A.K. Endresen (Norway) were appointed tellers.

36. The results of the first ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	28
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	0
Number of votes recorded	114
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	58

Australia, having polled 68 votes, was declared elected by the President.

37. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the second ballot was to be limited to those States which had obtained the greatest number of votes, provided that the number of States did not exceed twice the number of seats remaining to be filled, which was six. The following States obtained the greatest number of votes: Canada, Morocco, Ecuador, India, Benin, Viet Nam, Cuba, Oman, Poland, Lithuania, Zimbabwe, Greece and Malta. These last two candidates having obtained the same number of votes, and in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, an eliminatory ballot between these two States was held.

38. The results of the eliminatory ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	26
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	2
Number of votes recorded	114

Malta, having obtained the greatest number of votes (61) was maintained as candidate for the second ballot.

39. The results of the second ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	33
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	1
Number of votes recorded	108
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	55

States which obtained the required majority of votes were:

Canada	68
Morocco	68
Ecuador	56
Malta	56

The President thus declared the above States elected.

40. Two seats remaining to be filled, the following States, having obtained the greatest number of votes, were maintained as candidates for the third ballot: Benin, Cuba, India and Viet Nam.

41. The results of the third ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	29
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	1
Number of votes recorded	112
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	57

State having obtained the required majority:

Benin	61

The President declared this State elected.

42. At the end of the third ballot, with one seat remaining to be filled, the following States having obtained the greatest number of votes were maintained as candidates for the fourth ballot: Cuba and Viet Nam.

Following Viet Nam's announcement to stand down in favour of Cuba, and applause and expressions of gratitude by the General Assembly, the President declared Cuba elected.

Other business

43. The Representative of Germany informed the General Assembly that the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee would be held in his country, in Berlin, and invited all States Parties to attend.

44. The Representative of Mexico and the Representative of Italy both proposed to host in their countries the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. The General Assembly thanked these two States for their generous invitations and decided that the question would be examined during the nineteenth session of the Committee.

45. No other question having been raised under the item "Other business", the President declared the tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention closed.

REPORT

by

Professor Dr Adul Wichiencharoen
Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

presented to the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties
to the Convention

Paris, 2 and 3 November 1995

Mr President,
Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates,

I have the honour to submit a report on the activities undertaken by the Committee in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention for the two-year period since the ninth General Assembly held in 1993. During this period the number of States Parties has grown from 136 to 143. The Committee has held two meetings, the first at the invitation of the Colombian authorities, from 6 to 11 December 1993, in Cartagena, Colombia, and the second at the invitation of the Royal Thai Government in Phuket, Thailand, from 12 to 17 December 1994. The Bureau of the Committee met twice in 1994. In 1995, the first meeting was held in July and second will be in December.

On the basis of nominations put forward by States Parties, the Committee has, since the last General Assembly, decided to add 62 new inscriptions. The total number of inscriptions on the World Heritage List is now 440, distributed as follows: 326 cultural properties or sites; 97 natural sites and 17 mixed sites. In drawing up the World Heritage List, the Committee has been guided by the need to ensure, as far as possible, the representative nature of the List for all cultural and natural properties which meet the requirements of outstanding universal value stipulated by the Convention, and also satisfy the criteria adopted by the Committee for the evaluation of cultural and natural properties.

The increase in the number of nominations from States Parties has made it more than ever desirable to draw up tentative lists of properties which may be nominated for inclusion on the World Heritage List, as provided for in Article 11 of the Convention.

At its eighteenth session in December 1994, the World Heritage Committee adopted the 'Global Strategy' proposed by a group of experts convened by the Centre and ICOMOS in June 1994, to define a certain number of measures to be undertaken to improve the representative nature of the World Heritage List. In this context, several thematic and regional meetings were organized in 1994 and 1995 by the Centre, in cooperation with the advisory bodies and the States Parties.

Thus, a regional thematic study meeting on 'Asia Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes' was held in the Philippines from 28 March to 4 April 1995, and an expert group met in Australia from 26 to 28 April 1995 to identify and assess World Heritage cultural landscapes (associated landscapes). Furthermore, two thematic studies were carried out in 1994: one being the 'Heritage Part of our Cultural Heritage', convened in Spain. In addition, an international expert meeting on 'Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention' was held in Nara, Japan, in November 1994, anteceded by a preparatory workshop held in Bergen, Norway, in early 1994. A first meeting on African cultural heritage was held in autumn 1995. Furthermore, studies on twentieth century architecture and industrial heritage by ICOMOS continue.

The World Heritage Committee, in reviewing the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary in 1992, recognized monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List as essential functions. The Committee adopted in December 1994 a text on monitoring and reporting for the 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention'. In so doing, the Committee believed that the conditions and circumstances that constitute serious dangers threatening World Heritage properties as to require inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger, under paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Convention, can be rescued from such an eventuality if the earlier trends have been monitored and remedial measures have been taken in time to prevent the deterioration. Furthermore, the Committee feels that in order to perform its function effectively in accordance with the provisions in paragraphs 1 and 4 of Article 13, specifically to study requests for international assistance formulated by States Parties and, bearing in mind the urgency of the work to be done, to determine an order of priorities of its operations, the Committee needs to know the varying conditions of the state of conservation of all the properties under consideration. Thus, systematic monitoring and reporting is indispensable for international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve World Heritage properties situated in their territories.

A distinction is being made between reactive monitoring, i.e. reporting to the Bureau and the Committee on the state of conservation of world heritage sites that are under threat, and systematic monitoring and reporting, i.e. a continuous process of observing the conditions of world heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation to the Committee . The Committee noted the positive results of several pilot monitoring initiatives undertaken by States Parties themselves (e.g. Norway, Mexico, United Kingdom), as well as the successful conclusion of the regional pilot programme for monitoring the cultural world heritage sites in Latin America and the Caribbean undertaken within the framework of the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project for Cultural Heritage.

The importance the Committee accords to the monitoring of the state of conservation of world heritage sites has made it aware of the dangers threatening the state of world heritage sites and enabled it to alert the international community to the necessity of undertaking emergency measures. In 1994-1995, reports of the state of conservation of all the sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger were submitted to the Committee and its Bureau. No site inscribed on the Danger List was removed. On the contrary, the Committee inscribed two additional properties: Everglades national Park (United States of America); and

Virunga National Park (Zaire). Seventeen properties are at present inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and special attention, as well as financial considerations, are accorded to them by the Committee.

At its seventeenth session in December 1993, the Committee approved a budget of US $ 2,910,000, for 1994, and at its eighteenth session in 1994, a budget of US $ 2,935,000 for 1995.

For the period 1 January 1994 to 1 May 1995, several types of international assistance were made available to States Parties under the World Heritage Fund. For preparatory assistance, which include assistance for the preparation of tentative lists of cultural and/or natural properties suitable for inclusion on the World Heritage List, nominations for the World Heritage List, and for requests for technical co-operation, funds totalling US $ 257,874 were approved for the following States Parties : Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Egypt, Gambia, Laos, Lithuania, Mauritania, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Peru, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Uruguay and Zaire.

The emergency assistance fund of US $ 1 million created from the Fund reserves made possible several rapid interventions and contributed to meeting emergency situations in 14 properties totalling US$ 612,910 for the period January 1, 1994 - May 1995. US$ 440,000 were allocated in 1994 for training activities, and US$ 452,000 in 1995. The Committee continued to give priority to group training rather than individual fellowships. The total cost for the period amounted to US$ 689,050.

Technical cooperation's budgets were of US$ 790,000 for 1994 and US$ 750,000 for 1995. Between December 1993, at the Cartagena Bureau and Committee's meetings, and the Paris Bureau's meeting in July 1994, twenty two projects were approved. The Chairperson also approved a series of projects not exceeding US$ 20,000. The total approved for 1994 is US$ 743,510. In December 1994 the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau approved eleven projects, totalling US$ 521,900, whereas the Chairperson approved from January to May 1995 a series of projects, not exceeding US$ 20,000, totalling US$ 99,211. The total as at 1 May 1995 is US$ 621,000.

For promotion and education, the Committee approved a sum of US$ 270,000 for 1994 and US$ 268,000 for 1995. These funds were used to finance activities in the areas as approved by the Committee. The activities under general heritage information included the development of a data bank with INTERNET linkage, and production of CD-ROMS, Newsletters, diaries, photo-exhibits, etc. for a total expenditure as of May 1995 is US$ 279,000. The on-site promotional activities in favour of States Parties amounted to US$ 100,000.

Under awareness building through schools, an interregional pilot project was launched in 1944 with the Education Sector involving the Associated Schools in 25 countries in all regions of the world. The purpose is to assess the results of the experimental phase of the project and to help elaborate a strategy for World Heritage awareness-building through schools. The Fund contributed US$ 50,000 to this project over the two year period, whereas US$ 104,000 were obtained from private funding.

Detailed items of expenditures are contained in the Report by the Intergovernmental

Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on its Activities (1994 - 1995), document 28C/98, submitted to the General Conference of UNESCO in accordance with Article 29.3 of the Convention.

Mr. President, Excellencies, distinguished delegates, thank you for your attention.

Documents regarding item 9 of the agenda: New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites

Contents*

WHC-95/CONF.204/7	Report of the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee to the 10th General Assembly on the new monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1	Proposed resolution on monitoring and reporting submitted by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, dated 18 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2	Draft resolution, presented by India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea, dated 26 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2/Corr.1	Explanatory note and draft resolution presented by India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea, dated 28 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3	Draft resolution submitted as amendment to DR.1 by India, and distributed at the beginning of the session on 2 November 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.1	Revised draft resolution submitted by India and distributed during the evening session on 2 November 1995

---

*

Note : The rapporteur decided, for the sake of clarity, to re-number the proposed resolution, draft resolutions and amendments to these resolutions submitted to the General Assembly in their chronological order. Reference numbers used in the report of the tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties are the ones attributed to them by the Rapporteur.

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.2	Proposed revision of DR.3/Rev.1 by Sweden, Denmark and Finland submitted to the President of the General Assembly on 2 November 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.3	Proposed revision of DR.3/Rev.1 by Brazil submitted to the President of the General Assembly on 3 November 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.4	Proposed revision of DR.3 by the President of the General Assembly as read out on 3 November 1995

Distribution limited **WHC-95/CONF.204/7**
Paris, 16 August 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda : New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites

Contents **page**

Executive Summary 2

I. Introduction 4

II. Decisions of the World Heritage Committee with respect to systematic monitoring and reporting 4

III. Consideration of the issue of systematic monitoring and reporting by the governing organs of UNESCO 8

IV. Systematic monitoring and reporting in the context of the World Heritage Convention 11

V. Procedures for systematic monitoring and reporting and format for World Heritage state of conservation reports 14

VI. Concluding remarks 15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To ensure the efficient implementation of the World Heritage Convention it is essential that all the actors involved have access to up-to-date knowledge on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. This is not only true for the national authorities and site managers, in order to plan for preventive conservation, but also for the World Heritage Committee and its Secretariat, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, to fulfil their functions in collaborating in the preservation of properties and enhancing international solidarity as set out in the World Heritage Convention. In order to set priorities for international collaboration and emergency assistance the international community has to be kept informed of requirements at World Heritage properties.

The World Heritage Committee decided in December 1994 to introduce a system of monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves. This was the result of a long process of consultations, discussions and practical experiences in several States Parties and regions, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, the final report of which was presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in Phuket in 1994. This process was initiated in 1982, involving numerous States Parties and experts, as well as the advisory bodies, and the work subsequently undertaken by the Working Group of States Parties on Monitoring and Reporting in 1987 and by the Strategic Planning Meetings held in 1992, constituted the main stages of this process, which is described in Part II of this document.

Part III of the document describes in which manner the Committee's discussions and decisions were regularly brought to the attention of the governing bodies of UNESCO.

The term 'monitoring' does not appear in the World Heritage Convention. However, the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau considered that there are several provisions in the Convention which not only make it possible for the Committee to introduce an adequate monitoring and reporting system, but which create an obligation for the Committee to do so. References to these provisions are made in Part IV of this document. In particular, the Committee considered monitoring and reporting as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7 of the Convention.

In reaching its conclusions, the World Heritage Committee recognized explicitly that the responsibility for the preservation of the World Heritage properties is incumbent upon the States Parties themselves. The principles of monitoring and reporting elaborated by the Committee rely on voluntary action of the States Parties which are invited to

make the necessary arrangements for the monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties on their territory and to report regularly to the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

The procedures for systematic monitoring and reporting and the format for World Heritage state of conservation reports are discussed in Part V.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its 146th session in May-June 1995 the Executive Board, after having examined the draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997 (28 C/5), recommended the General Conference that

> " the proposals concerning the new monitoring activities related to World Heritage sites should be the object of a consultation process among States Parties to the World Heritage Convention and submitted for approval to the General Assembly of States Parties which will be held in 1995; meanwhile, the activities should be held in abeyance " (146 EX/Decision 4.2. paragraph 56).

2. Following this recommendation the issue of monitoring and reporting in the context of the World Heritage Convention was discussed by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session (Paris, July 1995). The Bureau decided that

> " the Chairperson and the Secretariat, in consultation with Bureau members, should jointly prepare a document (...) as a means to clarify the principles on monitoring and reporting adopted by the Committee and as a basis for future discussions at the Convention's and/or UNESCO's statutory bodies ".

3. Therefore, the present document is submitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee as a working document to the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention to be held in Paris on 2 and 3 November 1995.

II. DECISION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO SYSTEMATIC MONITORING AND REPORTING

4. The issue of monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties has been under discussion in the World Heritage Committee since the early eighties. On the request of the Committee, IUCN and ICOMOS started already in 1983 to submit ad-hoc reports on the state of conservation of individual sites.

5. At its tenth session held in 1986, the Committee " agreed that a more encompassing monitoring-reporting system was required as an integral part of the process of maintaining a World Heritage List " and decided that a Working Group of the Bureau would be set up to " examine procedures, including reporting, periodicity of such reporting, resources, criteria for priority setting, and other related issues " (Report of the tenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, 1986, paragraph 30).

6. The Working Group, composed of representatives of Algeria, Australia, Bulgaria, India, Mexico and Zaire, held several meetings in early 1987 under the chairmanship of the Indian Ambassador Ms. A. Ghose. In its report the Working Group proposed the principles of a system to monitor the state of conservation of cultural properties included in the World Heritage List and the procedure to be followed. The Working Group recognized that " ratification of the Convention by States Parties carrie(d) with it the obligation of providing information on the status of conservation of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage list ". It also recognized the following principles:

a) States Parties should be the primary source and collector of information on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites and should have the sole responsibility for reporting to the Committee thereon;

b) The system should be based on the completion by States Parties of questionnaires, the purpose of which would be to update the information provided in the nomination dossier/previous report and to help States Parties to identify dangers threatening World Heritage cultural properties;

c) States Parties should be required to prepare reports on each of their properties every five years.

7. The report of the Working Group was presented to the Bureau and to the World Heritage Committee at their eleventh sessions in 1987. The Committee decided to implement the system as proposed by the Working Group, at least for an experimental period, following which the necessary adjustments could be made, by means of questionnaires that were to be sent to the States Parties (Report of the eleventh session of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, 1987, paragraph 13).

8. The system of questionnaires proved to be less successful than expected. In 1990 the Committee, while it " congratulated the Secretariat on the quality of its report on the monitoring of the state of conservation of world heritage properties ", accepted the Secretariat's proposals concerning the dis-continuation of the monitoring system. The mailing of a third series of questionnaires was thus postponed. (Report of the fourteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Banff, 1990, paragraphs 19 and 21). Since then, further discussions and consultations took place as outlined below.

9. The Committee, at its fifteenth session in 1991, took for the first time note of two regional initiatives to monitor on a systematic basis the state of conservation of cultural World Heritage properties: one undertaken by the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project for Latin America and the Caribbean, the final report of which was presented to the Committee at its eighteenth session in 1994, and one undertaken by the United

Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) for sites in the Mediterranean.

10. In 1991-1992, on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention, an evaluation was undertaken of the successes and failures in the implementation of the Convention. To this effect, a Task Force of States Parties was established to review the evaluation report and to design a strategy for the future implementation of the Convention. Strategic Planning Meetings of this Task Force, composed of representatives of Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Mexico, Tunisia, USA and Zaire, were held in 1992. It was on the basis of this in-depth evaluation and the recommendations emanating from it that the World Heritage Committee adopted in 1992 the following Strategic Goals for the Implementation of the Convention:

- Promote completion of the identification of the World Heritage;
- Ensure the continued representativity and credibility of the World Heritage List;
- Promote the adequate protection and management of the World Heritage sites;
- Pursue more systematic monitoring of World Heritage sites;
- Increase public awareness, involvement and support.

11. The strategic goal to " pursue more systematic monitoring of World Heritage sites ", called more specifically to " define elements and procedures for monitoring and [to] cooperate with States Parties and competent authorities on regular monitoring work " (Report of the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Santa Fe, 1992, paragraphs VII.1-3 and Annex II). The Committee's report on its activities in 1992-1993, submitted to the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference of UNESCO in 1993, recorded that one of the five main goals defined by the Committee was to " pursue more systematic monitoring of world heritage sites " (document 27 C/101, paragraph 20). The General Conference took note of this report, which was also brought to the attention of the ninth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in 1993.

12. To implement this goal, the Committee requested the Secretariat to organize an expert meeting on methodological aspects of monitoring. This meeting was held in November 1993 in Cambridge, U.K. At its seventeenth session in December 1993 the World Heritage Committee examined the conclusions of this expert meeting. The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the experts and requested the Secretariat to convene a small working group of experts from States Parties and the advisory bodies in order, i.a., to prepare a draft text on monitoring

and its procedures for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines (Report of the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Cartagena, 1993, paragraphs IX.1-8 and Annex VI).

13. Further discussions took place at the eighteenth session of the Bureau in July 1994. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to further consult States Parties, site managers and experts on the matter (Report of the eighteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, 1994, paragraphs VI.2-17 and Annex III).

14. These consultations took place between July and December 1994, among other things in the form of a Circular Letter to individual experts and all States Parties (Circular Letter No. 4 dated 14 September 1994) requesting their comments on the introduction of a systematic approach to monitoring. Some fifteen States Parties replied. Their comments, as well as the views expressed by several States Parties during the sessions of the World Heritage Committee or at other occasions, particularly those emphasizing the responsibility of the States Parties to take the necessary actions for the preservation of the World Heritage sites, were brought to the attention of the Committee at its eighteenth session.

15. The Committee also drew upon the experiences gained in the implementation of regional and national monitoring programmes and the different models that had been applied. In some cases for example, the preparation of the reports was undertaken through United Nations activities such as the Regional Project for Cultural Heritage of UNDP and UNESCO for Latin America and the Caribbean, and a UNEP project for the Mediterranean. In other cases, the States Parties undertook the reporting by themselves (Mexico, Australia, Bulgaria), or in collaboration with non-governmental organizations such as ICOMOS and IUCN or ICCROM (United Kingdom, Sri Lanka, Norway). The Committee examined at various occasions the results of these programmes and monitoring activities and concluded that they all resulted in credible state of conservation reports.

16. As a result of the above consultations and practical experiences, proposals concerning systematic monitoring and reporting were submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994. The proposals submitted by the Secretariat on the basis of the various studies and consultations mentioned above were adopted “ as the general framework for monitoring and reporting ”. The Committee also approved a text on monitoring and reporting for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines. The new provisions reconfirm the responsibility of the States Parties to observe and record on a regular basis the condition of the properties (the monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties) and invite all States Parties to present periodic state of conservation reports to the World Heritage Committee (the reporting i.e. the presentation of state of conservation reports on the basis of a five year cycle). The advice of external experts in this process of monitoring and reporting

would only be made available with the agreement of the States Parties. (Report of the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, Phuket, 1995, paragraphs IX.2-11 and XIV.6-7). The full text of the relevant part of the report of the eighteenth session of the Committee is reproduced in Annex I.

17. The decisions of the Committee were brought to the attention of all States Parties by a Circular Letter (Circular Letter No. 2 dated 13 March 1995). Only positive replies were received from some States Parties. Furthermore, the Secretariat asked the representatives of twenty-two States Parties from Latin America and the Caribbean, meeting in Cartagena, Colombia in early May 1995, their views on the new monitoring and reporting procedures. They unanimously expressed their agreement with the decisions of the Committee.

18. Following the recommendation of the Executive Board mentioned in paragraph 1 above, the Bureau examined at its nineteenth session (July 1995, Paris), in private session, the principles of monitoring and reporting adopted by the Committee at its eighteenth session. (Report of the nineteenth session of the Bureau, Paris, 1995, paragraphs VI.2-7). The full text of the relevant part of the report of the nineteenth session of the Bureau is reproduced in Annex II.

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUE OF SYSTEMATIC MONITORING AND REPORTING BY THE GOVERNING ORGANS OF UNESCO

19. Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention stipulates that " the Committee shall submit a report on its activities at each of the ordinary sessions of the General Conference (...)". The report presented to the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference in 1993 makes specific reference to the strategic goals adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 1992, i.a. the <more systematic monitoring of World Heritage sites> (see paragraphs 10 and 11 above).

20. Article 14.2 of the World Heritage Convention stipulates that the Director-General of UNESCO shall have the responsibility for the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee in cooperation with the advisory bodies. The decisions of the Committee are, therefore, necessarily reflected in the UNESCO work plans and programmes.

21. The “ Report by the Director-General on the reinforcement of UNESCO’s action for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage ” (140 EX/13) submitted to the Executive Board at its 140th session in October 1992 recorded that the World Heritage Committee

> “ ha[d] set up a system of monitoring the state of conservation of property, which enables it to alert the

> authorities concerned to any danger threatening the property's integrity and to co-operate with them in tackling any conservation problems encountered. Reports on some 40 monitored sites are written each year and the Committee is developing this activity in a systematic way " (paragraph 32 of 140 EX/13).

22. The report also pointed out that

> " the World Heritage Committee has a monitoring procedure that enables it not so much to " inspect " as to co-operate with the relevant authorities to ensure more effective protection of a particular component of the world heritage and possibly to finance the necessary safeguarding measures " (paragraph 58 of 140 EX/13).

23. The report also recalled the recommendations of a committee of experts which were to serve as a basis for the strategic orientations to be submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its sixteenth session (see paragraph 10 above). In its decision 141/EX Decision 5.5.1 (the consideration of this report had been postponed from the 140th to the 141st session) the Executive Board noted

> " that the Committee [was] undertaking a revision, of the text of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention, which do not form part of the Convention but ensure its proper application, taking into account the strategic orientations adopted in Santa Fe, United States, in December 1992 " (paragraph 14 of 141 EX/Decisions).

24. The decisions of the World Heritage Committee regarding the implementation of the Convention and the draft strategy for the future, adopted by the Committee at its sixteenth session (Santa Fe, December 1992), were reflected in the Programme and Budget for 1994-1995 approved by the General Conference at its twenty-seventh session (27 C/5 Approved). Paragraph 03115 of 27 C/5 Approved states that one of the functions of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre is to encourage the application of the World Heritage Convention " in States Parties by providing ongoing monitoring of the sites included on the World Heritage List, and identifying the actions to be undertaken in order to guarantee their preservation ".

25. With regard to 1996-1997, the " Preliminary proposals for medium-term planning from 1996 (28 C/4) and the Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997 (28 C/5) " (document 145 EX/5), submitted to the Executive Board at its 145th session (October-November 1994), stated the following:

> " UNESCO bears a very special responsibility for the protection and conservation of the cultural and natural heritage. It will therefore ... [provide] encouragement for measures aimed at ensuring the long-term preservation of sites (particularly those on the World Heritage List,

which should henceforth be monitored on a regular basis) ... ” (paragraph 21).

26. Having considered these proposals, the Executive Board adopted the following recommendation regarding the role of the States Parties in monitoring (145 EX/Decision 4.1, paragraph 9.II.(b) (xiii)):

> “ the monitoring of sites on the World Heritage List should be undertaken in accordance with the Rules of the World Heritage Convention and the guidelines that should govern its implementation, keeping in mind that Member States themselves will undertake the monitoring of their world heritage sites, in consultation with UNESCO and other specialized organizations. ”

27. The Draft Medium-Term Strategy 1996-2001 (28 C/4) and the Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997 (28 C/5), which will be submitted to the General Conference at its twenty-eighth session, reflect the decisions concerning the monitoring and reporting system adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994.

28. As for the Draft Medium-Term Strategy 1996-2001, it stipulates as follows (paragraph 124):

> “ States Parties should also be encouraged to set up systematic monitoring and, to the extent possible, prevention mechanisms for sites on the World Heritage List. Monitoring requires very close collaboration with national authorities, who obviously bear the main responsibility for site conservation ... ”

29. The Draft Programme and Budget for 1996-1997 contains the following proposal (paragraph 03109):

> " The [World Heritage] Centre will assist States Parties in strengthening preventive measures and ensuring timely intervention with a view to ensuring the integrity and conservation of the world heritage properties. In close collaboration with the advisory bodies, UNESCO’s field offices and other specialized institutions, it will promote monitoring activities endorsed by the World Heritage Committee and will support national monitoring activities ”.

30. During the consideration of the Draft Programme and Budget and of the Draft Medium-Term Strategy by the Executive Board at its 146th session in May-June 1995 one Member of the Board questioned the legal basis of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee to promote monitoring and reporting activities. As a result of the discussion on this subject the Board adopted the decision mentioned in paragraph 1 above concerning the Draft Programme and Budget. With regard to the Draft Medium-Term Strategy the Board adopted the following recommendation:

" The proposals for the monitoring of the World Heritage Sites should be reformulated in accordance with the relevant decisions of the 1995 General Assembly of the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention " (146 EX/Decision 4.1, paragraph 34).

IV. SYSTEMATIC MONITORING AND REPORTING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

31. It is obvious that neither the physical condition of World Heritage properties nor the socio-economic circumstances within or surrounding them remain static. The World Heritage Committee was convinced that the impact of these changes should be carefully evaluated so that effective decisions can be taken to ensure the conservation of World Heritage properties and to retain the values on account of which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. Without adequate knowledge of the physical conditions and the management system of the World Heritage sites it is not feasible for the Committee to fulfil the responsibilities stated in the Convention and the Operational Guidelines regarding the establishment of the List of World Heritage in Danger, delisting of properties from the World Heritage List, priority setting for international assistance and the mobilization of extra-budgetary funds, promotion etc.

32. The World Heritage Committee voiced many concerns about the condition of World Heritage sites and questioned whether the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List retain their World Heritage values. The question what actions should be taken to ensure their proper conservation is increasingly raised by the World Heritage Committee, the scientific community and the public at large. As a consequence, the Committee has to examine at its sessions a growing number of reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties when it is reported that development, natural disasters or armed conflicts threaten their integrity and/or authenticity. Provisions for this kind of ad-hoc reporting on properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and for properties that were under threat were made already several years ago by the Committee and prescribed in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

33. As a result of various studies and consultations related in Part II of the present document, in particular of the in-depth evaluation of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention undertaken in 1992, the World Heritage Committee

decided in 1992, as one of its goals for the future implementation of the Convention, that a systematic approach should be developed to review the conditions of all World Heritage properties. At its seventeenth session in December 1993, it defined " to monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List " as one of its four essential functions (paragraph 3 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention).

34. On the basis of a series of further consultations and discussions the Committee established at its eighteenth session in December 1994 the framework for the voluntary systematic monitoring and reporting of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves and adopted a set of principles of monitoring and reporting which were included in the Operational Guidelines (paragraphs 69-76). The principles adopted by the Committee were further substantiated by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session in July 1995. The Bureau reviewed all the relevant provisions of the World Heritage Convention. It concluded that " monitoring and reporting should be considered as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7 " of the Convention. It further " emphasized that the principles of monitoring and reporting as defined in paragraphs 69-76 of the Operational Guidelines fully respect the sovereignty of the States Parties and that these should be implemented by the States Parties themselves on a voluntary basis ". (Report of the nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, Paris, July 1995, Annex II).

35. The term " monitoring " does not appear in the World Heritage Convention. However, the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau, which examined the issue of monitoring and reporting on numerous occasions, considered that there is a number of provisions in the Convention which not only make it possible for the Committee to introduce an adequate monitoring system but which create a duty for the Committee to do so.

36. In its preambular part the Convention stipulates that " it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value " (clause 7) and that the intent of the Convention is to establish " an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods " (clause 8).

37. In reaching its conclusions on the issue of monitoring and reporting the World Heritage Committee also took into consideration Article 6 of the Convention which provides that " whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the states on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in

Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property rights provided by national legislation, the States Parties ... recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate ", as well as Article 7 which stipulates that " for the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve ... that heritage ".

38. Furthermore, the Committee took account of the various provisions calling for the undertaking of studies and research needed to further the objectives of the Convention. Article 5 (c) calls upon States Parties " to develop scientific and technical studies and research and to work out such operating methods as will make the State capable of counteracting the dangers that threaten its cultural and natural heritage ". Studies are also mentioned in Articles 11.7, 21.3, 22 (a) and 24. At its nineteenth session (Paris, June 1995) the Bureau concluded that " monitoring and reporting should be considered as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7 ".

39. The World Heritage Committee did not overlook the primary and fundamental responsibility of States Parties enshrined in Article 4 of the Convention, under which " each State Party recognizes that the duty of ensuring the conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State ". The principles of monitoring and reporting adopted by the World Heritage Committee explicitly underline the sovereignty of the States Parties and make a clear distinction between monitoring, defined as the assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, and reporting, which is to bring forward the results of this assessment to the World Heritage Committee on a voluntary basis. The monitoring and reporting principles allow the States Parties to define their own modalities for the implementation of their voluntary monitoring and reporting activities and to request expert advice if so desired.

40. In defining a set of principles of monitoring and reporting the World Heritage Committee acted within the scope of the authority which is conferred upon it by the Convention in Articles 8-26, giving the Committee a wide range of functions such as to establish and keep up-to-date the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, to define the criteria for inscription on these lists and to co-ordinate and encourage the studies and research needed for drawing them up (Art. 11) and to carry out studies and consultations as it deems necessary before providing international assistance (Art. 13 and 21.3).

41. Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention states that

"The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference (...) on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field." This article is in accordance with Article VIII of the UNESCO Constitution which already requires the Member States to submit to the Organization reports on the action taken upon the recommendations and conventions adopted by the General Conference. The state of conservation reports that the States Parties are invited to submit to the World Heritage Committee are of a different order and are to be considered as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7 of the Convention, among others.

V. PROCEDURES FOR SYSTEMATIC MONITORING AND REPORTING AND FORMAT FOR WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

42. The Committee defined the objectives of systematic monitoring and reporting as follows: improved site management, advanced planning and preventive action, and improved World Heritage cooperation and decision-making. In this sense, monitoring and reporting should be considered as a dynamic, rather than a linear, process that would involve all institutions, organizations and people involved in the preservation and management of the property. It would also mean a continuous reflection on the values of the property, particularly those on the basis of which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

43. The procedures to be followed for systematic monitoring and reporting are laid down in paragraphs 70 to 75 of the new chapter II of the Operational Guidelines, as approved by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session (text reproduced in Annex III). This text defines systematic monitoring and reporting as “ the continuous process of observing the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation ”. It emphasizes that “ it is the primary responsibility of the States Parties to put in place on-site monitoring arrangements as an integral component of day-to-day conservation and management of the sites ”. It invites States Parties “ to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, every five years, a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories ”. These reports will be examined separately by region as determined by the Committee. The choice of the regions to be examined at the following session will be decided by the Committee and the States Parties concerned will be informed at least one year in

advance.

44. As requested by the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat is preparing jointly with the advisory bodies a revised form for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List, as well as a form for the World Heritage state of conservation reports which the States Parties will be invited to present periodically to the World Heritage Committee. These were examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session in July 1995 (Report of the nineteenth session of the Bureau, Paris, 1995, paragraph VI.9 - VI.13 and its annexes II and III). The Committee will decide on the introduction of these forms at its nineteenth session in December 1995.

45. The basic idea is that the information contained in the nomination dossier, together with the evaluation report of the advisory body(ies) and the Committee's statement of the World Heritage values at the moment of inscription, constitute the baseline information on the site. The periodic state of conservation report would then carefully review and update information in the original nomination dossier and would recommend actions to deal with problems or threats identified. Both forms would follow the same structure to facilitate comparison of the data contained in them.

46. Both forms include, in a re-organized way, the items of the nomination form hitherto in use. Some of them, such as description, documentation and, in particular, management and legal protection, have been expanded considerably.

47. A new item called " factors affecting the site " asks to identify potential threats to the site such as development pressure (encroachment, agriculture, urbanization), environmental pressure, natural disasters and preparedness, visitor and tourism pressure etc. It is forward looking and intends to help to identify from the outset the most appropriate actions that should be taken to preserve the values of the property. These " factors affecting the site " and the corresponding responses will be the main subject matters in the periodic state of conservation reports.

48. Another new item invites the State Party to indicate the administrative arrangements for the monitoring of the site and to indicate key indicators for measuring the state of conservation of the property (such as the number of species or population of keystone species on a natural site, or the stability or degree of movement in a particular building). These key indicators would provide the scientific basis for measuring the state of conservation of the property over time.

49. The state of conservation report will thus verify all information provided in the original nomination dossier, will identify threats to the site, recommend actions to be taken and evaluate the impact of past interventions. It will thus record significant changes in the conditions of the site, its

management structure and legal protection. It will help the State Party to identify and plan conservation measures and it will help the World Heritage Committee to assist the States Parties in the efforts to conserve the World Heritage properties.

50. The Secretariat of the Convention has been requested by the Committee to collect the site-specific state of conservation reports and to present them to the World Heritage Committee. This would be done per region on the basis of a five years cycle. The first of such a regional report, the one on the Latin American region was presented to the World Heritage Committee in December 1994.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

51. Confronted with a considerable growth in the number of World Heritage properties the World Heritage Committee defined, in 1992 the observation of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties to be one of its main functions (paragraph 3 of the Operational Guidelines). The decision taken by the Committee in December 1994 to introduce a system of monitoring and reporting by the States Parties to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties was the result of a long process of consultations, discussions and practical experiences which started in 1982 and in which numerous States Parties and experts, as well as the advisory bodies, were involved. The work undertaken by the Working Group of States Parties on Monitoring and Reporting in 1987 and by the Strategic Planning Meetings held in 1992 constituted the main stages of this process.

52. As reported in Part III above, the various stages by which the Committee reached this decision were regularly reported to the governing bodies of UNESCO, in view of the Director-General’s responsibility for the implementation of the Committee’s decisions.

53. In reaching its conclusions the World Heritage Committee recognized explicitly that the responsibility for the preservation of the World Heritage properties is incumbent upon the States Parties. The system of monitoring and reporting elaborated by the Committee relies on voluntary action of the States Parties which are invited to make the necessary arrangements for the monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties on their territory and to report on its results to the World Heritage Committee on a regular basis.

54. The implementation of the Convention is a dynamic process. Concepts of World Heritage develop over time, as do the application and the interpretation of the World Heritage

Convention by its inter-governmental World Heritage Committee. For this reason, the criteria for inscription of cultural and natural properties are from time to time subject to revision. The process that is described in this document and which led to the adoption of the principles on monitoring and reporting by the World Heritage Committee in December 1994 is very likely to continue as experiences accumulate. The Committee will be very attentive to these experiences and will take the necessary decisions to improve and modify them whenever the need arises.

ANNEX I

Report of the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee

(Phuket, December 1994)

(Extract)

SYSTEMATIC MONITORING AND REPORTING

IX.2 In introducing this item the Secretariat recalled that Article 3 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention stipulates that one of the essential functions of the World Heritage Committee is to "monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List." However, provisions had been made only for regular monitoring of the sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and where sites were threatened. At the request of the Committee, therefore, the Secretariat and the advisory bodies, in consultation with the States Parties and individual experts, proceeded to develop a concept and framework of systematic monitoring and reporting.

IX.3 It was recalled that the initial discussions were held at the Committee's seventeenth session in December 1993 and that further proposals were endorsed by the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1994. On that occasion, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft text on monitoring for inclusion in the Operational Guidelines.

IX.4 The Secretariat presented the Committee, in Working Documents WHC-94/CONF.003/6 and 003/9Rev., a detailed description of the proposed systematic monitoring methodology. The draft text on monitoring for the Operational Guidelines was presented under the corresponding agenda item (see Section XIV of this report).

IX.5 The Committee commended the Secretariat for the progress made in defining the framework for the implementation of this important function of the Committee. It emphasized that one of the principal aims of monitoring was to assess if the values, on the basis of which the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List, have remained intact. It also stressed that a monitoring methodology should be flexible and adaptable to regional and national characteristics, as well as to the natural and cultural specificities of the sites. Furthermore, it expressed the need to involve external advice in the periodic reporting through the non-governmental advisory bodies and/or the existing decentralized UNESCO structures.

The Delegate of Italy insisted on clarifying that "writing of Reports with the participation of experts should be finalized in order to ensure better the monitoring in the management of properties". The Delegate of Italy also drew attention to the positive experiences in his country in involving the authorities from different levels and sectors as well as the civic community in the conservation and management of the sites.

IX.6 The Observer of India informed the Committee of his Government's position that according to the World Heritage Convention's explicit stipulation it is the State Party which decides what measures are to be taken to ensure the preservation and protection of the World Heritage sites on its territory, and that monitoring procedures should not affect the decision-making prerogative of the States Parties. He also emphasized that any involvement of outside agencies in the monitoring process could be done only on the specific request and consent of the State Party concerned.

IX.7 The Representative of ICOMOS introduced this organization's experiences in monitoring and offered its assistance in monitoring, World Heritage information management and the identification of needs for preventive action and its implementation. He drew particular attention to the need to develop guidelines for site specific monitoring and the identification of the World Heritage values of each site. He stressed that in his opinion the key to meaningful monitoring is the understanding of what impact time and circumstances have had upon these values.

IX.8 The Representative of IUCN stressed that his organization had been monitoring World Heritage natural sites since 1983 and that, following the Operational Guidelines (para. 57), this is one of the functions attributed to it by the Committee.

IX.9 Following the discussion, the Committee adopted the proposals presented in Document WHC-94/CONF.003/6, Section A, as the general framework for monitoring and reporting. The Committee also adopted a text on monitoring and reporting to be included in the Operational Guidelines. The adopted text is included in Section XIV of this report.

IX.10 In order to implement its decisions regarding systematic monitoring, the Committee invited the Secretariat to undertake the following actions:

(a) Prepare a revised nomination format for presentation to the nineteenth sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, so as to provide adequate baseline information at the time of inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

(b) Organize in early 1995, with the participation of

the advisory bodies and other relevant institutions, a meeting of experts on World Heritage information management, in order to develop guidelines for the establishment of a World Heritage Data Base.

(c) Inform the States Parties of the decisions of the Committee, invite them to put monitoring structures in place and to report on the state of conservation of the property to the Committee on a 5-year basis.

(d) Prepare workplans for and implement regional programmes to provide advice and assistance to the States Parties in setting up adequate monitoring and management systems, to promote the preparation of 5-year state of conservation reports, to handle and analyse these reports and to present 5-year Regional State of the World Heritage Reports to the World Heritage Committee.

(e) Incorporate monitoring as a management tool in World Heritage training courses and other activities.

(f) Report to the nineteenth session of the Bureau on the implementation of the decisions of the Committee and on the application of the new monitoring and reporting procedures.

IX.11 Following the recommendations of Work Group 2, the Committee also invited the Secretariat in collaboration with the advisory bodies, to:

(a) present to the nineteenth session of the Bureau a workplan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes so that States Parties will have sufficient time to prepare the state of conservation reports;

(b) develop a format for monitoring reporting as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base.

ANNEX II

Report of the nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

(Paris, July 1995)

(Extract)

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

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

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

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

2. Bearing in mind also the provisions of Article 6, which provides that "whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the states on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property rights provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate" and Article 7, which

provides that "for the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve....that heritage", also in consideration of Articles 8, 11, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 29, and in pursuance of the intent of the Convention as reflected in the preambular clause 8 in "establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with scientific methods", the World Heritage Committee invited the States Parties to present every five years a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories, and decided that, to this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies and that the Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

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

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

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

VI.7 The Bureau also considered whether it would be desirable to create a consultative body as mentioned in Article 10.3 of the Convention for the examination of technical matters such as state of conservation reports, the establishment of which would allow more States Parties to participate directly in the implementation of the Convention. As no consensus could be reached, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to look into this matter in more detail so that the Bureau can discuss it again at its next session.

ANNEX III

Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

(WHC/2 Revised, February 1995)

(Extract)

II. MONITORING THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

69. One of the essential functions of the Committee is to monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and to take action thereupon. In the following, a distinction will be made between systematic and reactive monitoring.

A. Systematic monitoring and reporting

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

The objectives of systematic monitoring and reporting are:

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

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

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

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

71. It is the prime responsibility of the States Parties to put in place on-site monitoring arrangements as an integral component of day-to-day conservation and management of the sites. States Parties should do so in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority. It is necessary that every year the conditions of the site be

recorded by the site manager or the agency with management authority.

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

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

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

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

B. Reactive monitoring

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

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1
Paris, 18 October 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,

1. Having examined the document (WHC-95/CONF.204/7) submitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on "New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites" ;

2. Recalling that Strategic Goal 4 for the Implementation of the Convention adopted by the World Heritage Committee, at its sixteenth session in Santa Fe in 1992, calls for "a more systematic monitoring of World Heritage Sites" ;

3. Noting that, being aware of the need for meaningful and proper terminology, and after a long process of consultations, testing, and experimenting the method of work in several States Parties and regions, the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in Phuket in 1994, conceived a systematic monitoring and reporting as the continuous process of observing the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on the state of conservation by the States Parties concerned ;

4. Recalling the following relevant provisions of the Convention:

(a) Article 4, which provides that each State Party to the Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State ;

(b) Article 6, paragraph 1, stating that "Whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the States on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated; and without prejudice to property rights provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate" ;

(c) Article 7, stipulating that "international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international co-operation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve ... that heritage" ;

(d) the provision of Article 8 and the following articles under Part III concerning "Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage" together with those under Part IV concerning "the World Heritage Fund" constituting the system of international co-operation and assistance as stipulated by Article 7 ;

(e) Article 11, paragraph 7, laying down that "The Committee shall, with the agreement of the States concerned, co-ordinate and encourage the studies and research needed for the drawing up of the lists referred to in paragraphs 2 and 4 of this Article" (The list referred to in paragraph 2 being the "World Heritage List", and the list in paragraph 4 being the "List of World Heritage in Danger") ; and, lastly,

(f) the eighth preambular clause of the Convention expressing the intent to establish "an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods".

5. Considers that:

(a) monitoring and periodic reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties are the appropriate modern and scientific means to meet the requirements and responsibilities of States Parties and the World Heritage Committee as stipulated by the above-cited provisions of the Convention for ensuring collective protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List ;

(b) the establishment of systematic monitoring as an integral component of the day-to-day observation and management of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constitutes a meaningful, active and effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural World Heritage;

(c) systematic monitoring of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves is essential for the States Parties in order to be able to remedy serious problems of conservation and to plan for preventive conservation ; and

(d) regular reporting on the state of conservation of properties to the World Heritage Committee by the States Parties is indispensable for the Committee to evaluate changes in the main characteristics of the properties since their inscription on the World Heritage List and to the Committee and the international community to fulfil its assigned functions, and essential for the Committee and the international community to set priorities for international collaboration and mobilization of resources for collective assistance.

6. Endorses the provisions on monitoring and reporting adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session and included in paragraphs 69 to 76 of the Operational Guidelines;

7. Reaffirms that systematic monitoring of the conditions of World Heritage properties and periodic reporting on their state of conservation is the prime responsibility of the States on whose territory these properties are situated;

8. Invites States Parties to the Convention to make appropriate arrangements for monitoring the conditions of World Heritage properties on their territory and for taking timely measures to prevent their deterioration;

9. Invites States Parties to the Convention to submit at regular intervals, of every five years, to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre scientific reports on the state of conservation of the properties situated on their territory, in a format to be established by the World Heritage Committee, so as to enable the Committee to carry out its assigned responsibilities;

10. Invites further States Parties to the Convention, independently of periodic reports of the state of conservation, to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur, or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property;

11. Requests the World Heritage Committee to make the necessary arrangements to assist the States Parties, upon their requests, in the establishment of national monitoring mechanisms and in the preparation of periodic reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties;

12. Recommends that the World Heritage Committee keep the procedures for monitoring and reporting under constant review so that, when desirable, further elaboration and improvement could be made on the basis of the workings of these procedures.

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2
Paris, 26 October 1995
Original : English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI

Item 10 of the provisional Agenda: New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY INDIA, INDONESIA, JAMAICA, OMAN AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Explanatory Note

1. The World Heritage Convention does not foresee any reports being submitted to the World Heritage Committee (WHC). The reports under Article 29 (i) are to be submitted to the UNESCO General Conference. There is a distinct difference between submission of reports to a General Conference or to a select body. Furthermore, the reports foreseen in Article 29 (i) do not pertain to the types of specific activities being projected in the guidelines of the World Heritage Centre. The WHC has the powers, within the Convention, to adopt its own rules of procedure. However, these rules of procedure cannot apply to monitoring or reporting since the Convention has not given such a mandate to the Committee in any of the Articles, from Article 8 to Article 14 of the Convention.

2. In addition, the lead role of the World Heritage Centre with regard to assisting the States Parties in ensuring on-going monitoring is not in line with Article 29-22 which deal with the assistance granted by the WHC. Both articles are singularly silent about "monitoring".

3. In fact, the nomenclature of "monitoring" would seem to indicate a surveillance, by a select outside body of the activities of the State Party in conservation of its world heritage sites.

4. The competence of the WHC in providing technical and financial assistance upon request and under other provisions of the Convention is of course well acknowledged and its work in those domains is noted with great satisfaction.

Draft resolution

Recalling Article 8-15 of the World Heritage Convention, which set out the composition and powers of the Intergovernmental Committee for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC),

Recalling also Articles 21 and 22 of the said Convention which deal with the assistance granted by the Committee,

Recalling further Section VII Article 29 of the said convention entitled "Reports",

1. Notes that the term "monitoring" does not appear in the World Heritage Convention,

2. Emphasises that monitoring, that is, the day to day observation of world heritage sites, is the sole responsibility of the State Party concerned, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority,

3. Emphasises further, that only on the express request of the State Party concerned will UNESCO Secretariat or the advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13.7 provide expert advice on how to monitor the state of conservation of a world heritage site or on how to improve its state of conservation,

4. Requests UNESCO legal counsel to inform the Tenth General Assembly to States Parties

   i) whether the "monitoring" procedure presently proposed by the WHC is distinct from the "reporting" procedure laid down in Article 29,

   ii) whether a demand that State Party submit every five years a "monitoring" report for examination by the WHC is included in the World Heritage Convention,

   iii) whether it is within the present powers of the WHC to make such a demand, without amending the Constitution, and,

   iv) whether the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29 can be expanded to include a report by the State Party concerned based on its continuous observation of the state of conservation of its world heritage sites,

5. Invites the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29 which has remained a dormant article since the date of the Convention's adoption in 1972,

6. Invites the WHC, further to consider expanding the said reporting procedure to include a report on a day to day observation, by the State Party concerned, of the state of conservation of its world heritage sites.

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2/Corr.1
Paris, 28 October 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XII**

Item 10 of the provisional Agenda: New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY INDIA, INDONESIA, JAMAICA, OMAN AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Explanatory Note

1. The World Heritage Convention does not foresee any reports being submitted to the World Heritage Committee (WHC). The reports under Article 29 (i) are to be submitted to the UNESCO General Conference. There is a distinct difference between submission of reports to a General Conference or to a select body. Furthermore, the reports foreseen in Article 29 (i) do not pertain to the types of specific activities being projected in the guidelines of the World Heritage Centre. The WHC has the powers, within the Convention, to adopt its own rules of procedure. However, these rules of procedure cannot apply to monitoring or reporting since the Convention has not given such a mandate to the Committee in any of the Articles, from Article 8 to Article 14 of the Convention.

2. In addition, the lead role of the World Heritage Centre with regard to assisting the States Parties in ensuring on-going monitoring is not in line with Article 19-22 which deal with the assistance granted by the WHC. Both articles are singularly silent about "monitoring".

3. In fact, the nomenclature of "monitoring" would seem to indicate a surveillance, by a select outside body of the activities of the State Party in conservation of its world heritage sites.

4. The competence of the WHC in providing technical and financial assistance upon request and under other provisions of the Convention is of course well acknowledged and its work in those domains is noted with great satisfaction.

Draft resolution

Recalling Article 8-15 of the World Heritage Convention, which set out the composition and powers of the Intergovernmental Committee for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC),

Recalling also Articles 21 and 22 of the said Convention which deal with the assistance granted by the Committee,

Recalling further Section VII Article 29 of the said convention entitled "Reports",

1. Notes that the term "monitoring" does not appear in the World Heritage Convention,

2. Emphasises that monitoring, that is, the day to day observation of world heritage sites, is the sole responsibility of the State Party concerned, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority,

3. Emphasises further, that only on the express request of the State Party concerned will UNESCO Secretariat or the advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13.7 provide expert advice on how to monitor the state of conservation of a world heritage site or on how to improve its state of conservation,

4. Requests UNESCO legal counsel to inform the Tenth General Assembly to States Parties

   i) whether the "monitoring" procedure presently proposed by the WHC is distinct from the "reporting" procedure laid down in Article 29,

   ii) whether a demand that State Party submit every five years a "monitoring" report for examination by the WHC is included in the World Heritage Convention,

   iii) whether it is within the present powers of the WHC to make such a demand, without amending the Constitution, and,

   iv) whether the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29 can be expanded to include a report by the State Party concerned based on its continuous observation of the state of conservation of its world heritage sites,

5. Invites the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29 which has remained a dormant article since the date of the Convention's adoption in 1972.

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3
Paris, 2 November 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XII**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: New Monitoring Activities related to the World Heritage Sites.

AMENDMENT

Submitted by INDIA

The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

1. Having examined the Document (WHC-95/CONF.204/7) submitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on "New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage Sites":

2. Recalling the following relevant provisions of the Convention:

(a) Article 4, which provides that each State Party to the Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State;

(b) Article 7, stipulating that "international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve....that heritage";

(c) the eighth preambular clause of the Convention expressing the intent to establish "an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and 'in accordance with modern scientific methods";

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.1
Paris, 2 November 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: New Monitoring Activities related to the World Heritage Sites.

REVISED AMENDMENT

Submitted by INDIA

The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

1. Having examined the Document (WHC-95/CONF.204/7) submitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on "New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage Sites":

2. Recalling the following relevant provisions of the Convention:

(a) Article 4, which provides that each State Party to the Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State;

(b) Article 7, stipulating that "international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve....that heritage";

(c) the eighth preambular clause of the Convention expressing the intent to establish "an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods";

3. Considers that:

(a) periodic observation by the States Party concerned of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is one of the appropriate scientific means to meet the responsibilities of States Parties under the Convention for ensuring protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List;

(b) systematic observation as an integral component of the management of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constitutes an effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural world heritage;

(c) systematic observation of World Heritage Sites by the State Party concerned is essential for the States Parties themselves in order to be able to remedy serious problems of conservation and to plan for preventive conservation; and

(d) regular reporting to the General Conference of UNESCO, which would then bring their reports to the World Heritage Committee, under Article 29, is important for the WHC to evaluate changes in the main characteristics of the properties since their inscription on the World Heritage List.

4. Reaffirms that systematic observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties is the sole responsibility of the States on whose territory these properties are situated;

5. Invites States Parties to the Convention to make appropriate arrangements for observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties on their territory and for taking timely measures to prevent their deterioration;

6. Invites States Parties to the Convention to submit periodic reports to the General Conference of UNESCO under Article 29 of the Convention;

7. Invites further States Parties to the Convention, independently of the above-mentioned periodic reports, to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur, or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property, on a totally voluntary basis and without any obligation under the Convention to do so;

8. Requests the World Heritage Committee to make the necessary arrangements to assist the States Parties upon their request, in their observation of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

3. Considers that:

(a) periodic observation by the States Party concerned of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is one of the appropriate scientific means to meet the responsibilities of States Parties under the Convention for ensuring protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List;

(b) systematic observation as an integral component of the management of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constitutes an effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural world heritage;

(c) systematic observation of World Heritage Sites by the State Party concerned is essential for the States Parties themselves in order to be able to remedy serious problems of conservation and to plan for preventive conservation; and

(d) regular reporting to the General Conference of UNESCO, which would then bring their reports to the World Heritage Committee, under Article 29, is important for the WHC to evaluate changes in the main characteristics of the properties since their inscription on the World Heritage List.

4. Reaffirms that systematic observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties is the sole responsibility of the States on whose territory these properties are situated;

5. Emphasises further, that only on the express request of the State Party concerned will the World Heritage Centre or the advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13.7 provide expert advice on how to monitor the state of conservation of a world heritage site or on how to improve its state of conservation,

6. Invites States Parties to the Convention to make appropriate arrangements for observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties on their territory and for taking timely measures to prevent their deterioration;

7. Invites States Parties to the Convention to submit periodic reports to the General Conference of UNESCO under Article 29 of the Convention;

8. Invites further States Parties to the Convention, independently of the above-mentioned periodic reports, to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur, or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property.

9. Invites the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29 which has remained a dormant article since the date of the Convention's adoption in 1972.

10. Requests the World Heritage Committee to make the necessary arrangements to assist the States Parties upon their request, in their observation of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.2
Paris, 2 November 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: New Monitoring Activities related to the World Heritage Sites.

PROPOSED REVISION OF DR.3/Rev.1 BY SWEDEN, DENMARK AND FINLAND SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON 2 NOVEMBER 1995

The States Parties of Sweden, Denmark and Finland cannot accept the so-called compromise proposal on Monitoring.

We support the Committee's document on Monitoring at first hand.

Sweden proposes the following changes and amendments to the compromise text, if the Committee's text is not accepted:

1. Para 5 shall be deleted.

   The wording of the paragraph does not reflect the spirit of the Convention, which underlines the need of international cooperation between States Parties, the Committee, the Centre and NGOs, especially ICOMOS and IUCN.

   We propose that the Committee's text, para 4b, be inserted instead as a new paragraph between paras 2a and 2b.

2. Concerning para 3d.

   As the General Conference is not a body under the World Heritage Convention, we propose that the words "General Conference" be altered to "the World Heritage Committee" or if that cannot be accepted, to the "General Assembly of States Parties".

   As a consequence, we also propose that para 9 is deleted and the Committee's text paras 11 and 12 replace para 9.

3. The word "sole" be changed to "prime" in para 4.

4. The chosen terminology "observation" is in our opinion too weak.

Our compromise proposal is to change that word to the following:

"observation and report on the implementation of the Convention".

The word 'observation' appears at first in 3a, but is thereafter repeated. Our proposal is that alterations should be made wherever the word "observation" appears.

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.3
Paris, 3 November 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: New Monitoring Activities related to the World Heritage Sites.

PROPOSED REVISION OF DR.3/Rev.1 BY BRAZIL SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON 3 NOVEMBER 1995

Paragraph 5 of DR.3/Rev.1 to read as follows:

"5. Emphazises further, that with the expressed agreement of the State Party concerned, UNESCO, through the World Heritage Centre and/or the advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13.7, may provide expert advice".

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.4
Paris, 3 November 1995
Original : English

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XI**

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: New Monitoring Activities related to the World Heritage Sites

PROPOSED REVISION OF DR.3 BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AS READ OUT ON 3 NOVEMBER 1995

The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

1. Having examined the Document (WHC-95/CONF.204/7) submitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on "New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage Sites":

2. Recalling the following relevant provisions of the Convention:

(a) Article 4, which provides that each State Party to the Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the protection and conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State;

(b) Article 7, stipulating that "international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve....that heritage";

(c) the eighth preambular clause of the Convention expressing the intent to establish "an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods";

3. Considers that:

(a) periodic observation by the States Party concerned of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is one of the appropriate scientific means to meet the responsibilities of States Parties under the Convention for ensuring protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List;

(b) systematic observation as an integral component of the management of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constitutes an effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural world heritage;

(c) systematic observation of World Heritage Sites by the State Party concerned is essential for the States Parties themselves in order to be able to remedy serious problems of conservation and to plan for preventive conservation; and

(d) regular reporting to the General Assembly as well as to the General Conference of UNESCO, which will then bring their reports to the World Heritage Committee, under Article 29, is important for the WHC to evaluate changes in the main characteristics of the properties since their inscription on the World Heritage List.

4. Reaffirms that systematic observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties and the reporting on the implementation of the Convention is the prime responsibility of the States on whose territory these properties are situated;

5. Emphasises further, that only in agreement with the State Party concerned will the World Heritage Centre or the advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13.7 provide expert advice on how to monitor the state of conservation of a world heritage site or on how to improve its state of conservation,

6. Invites States Parties to the Convention to make appropriate arrangements for observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties on their territory and for taking timely measures to prevent their deterioration;

7. Invites States Parties to the Convention to submit periodic reports to the General Conference of UNESCO under Article 29 of the Convention as well as the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention;

8. Invites further States Parties to the Convention, independently of the above-mentioned periodic reports, to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur, or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property.

9. Invites the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned

in Article 29 which has remained a dormant article since the date of the Convention's adoption in 1972.

10. Requests the World Heritage Committee to make the necessary arrangements to assist the States Parties upon their request, in their observation of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.