

Distribution limited

**WHC-01/CONF.208/24
Paris, 8 February 2002
Original: English/French**

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fifth session

**Helsinki, Finland
11 - 16 December 2001**

REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Opening Session	1	XV.	Report on the Proposed World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE)	57
II.a	Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable	2	XVI.	Examination of the World Heritage Fund and Approval of the Budget for 2002-2003	57
II.b	Proposal for a Revision of the Rules of Procedure	2	XVII.	Information on International Assistance	62
III.	Report on the Activities Undertaken by the Secretariat since the Twenty-Fourth Session of the Committee	2	XVIII.	Requests for International Assistance	64
IV.a	Reports of the Rapporteurs on the Bureau Sessions of the World Heritage Committee, 2001	4	XIX.	Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (April 2002)	66
IV.b	Follow-Up to the Resolution of the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties (30-31 October 2001): Acts Constituting "Crimes Against the Common Heritage of Humanity"	4	XX.	Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2002)	66
V.	Progress Report on the Implementation of Reform Measures	8	XXI.	Other Business	66
VI.	Revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i>	11	XXII.	Adoption of the Report	66
VII.	Periodic Reporting	12	XXIII.	Closure of the Session	66
VIII.	State of Conservation of Properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List	15	Annexes		
IX.	Progress Report on Regional Actions for the Implementation of the Global Strategy for a Representative and Balanced World Heritage List	38	I	List of Participants	69
X.	Information on Tentative Lists and Examination of Nominations of Cultural and Natural Properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	40	II.	Opening Speech of the Chairperson, Mr Henrik Lilius	91
XI.	Progress Report on the Global Training Strategy	53	III.	Speech of the Director General of UNESCO, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura	93
XII.	Progress Report on the Information Management Strategy	54	IV.	Speech of the President of Finland, Ms Tarja Halonen	95
XIII.	30th Anniversary Events	55	V.	Speech of the Minister of Culture of Finland, Ms Suvi Lindén	97
XIV.	Awareness Building and Education Activities	56	VI.	Speech of the Minister of Environment, Minister for International Development Affairs, Finland, Ms Satu Hassi	99
			VII.	Statement by the Observer of Israel	101
			VIIIa.	Budget for Afghanistan Mission	103
			VIIIb	Budget for Afghanistan Scientific Documentation	103

IX.	State of Conservation of Properties Inscribed on the World Heritage List <i>(Extract From the Report of the Rapporteur of the Twenty-Fifth Extra-Ordinary Session of the Bureau)</i>	105
X.	World Heritage Global Training Strategy	145
XI.	Speeches of the Young People's Presentation "World Heritage In Young Hands"	149
XII.	Provisional Agenda and Timetable of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the Bureau (Paris)	151
XIII.	Provisional Agenda of the Twenty-Sixth Session of the World Heritage Committee (Budapest)	155

I. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Helsinki, Finland, from 11 to 16 December 2001. It was attended by the twenty-one members of the World Heritage Committee: Argentina, Belgium, China, Colombia, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Oman, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zimbabwe.

I.2 The following States Parties to the Convention who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Gambia, Germany, Holy See, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Tunisia, United States of America, Uzbekistan. Barbados and the Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO, non States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, also participated at this session as observers.

I.3 Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the Committee, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the following international governmental organizations (IGOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs): The Arab League Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), Common Wadden Sea Secretariat (Germany), Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC), Nordic World Heritage Office (NWHO), The Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Getty Conservation Institute, Global Heritage Fund (USA), International Centre for Mediterranean Cultural Landscapes (Italy), International Council of Museums (ICOM), International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), International Union of Architects (IUA), Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), The Gibraltar Museum (Gibraltar) and University of Edinburgh (U.K). (The full List of Participants is included as Annex I to this report).

I.4 The twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee was opened in the presence of the President of Finland, Ms Tarja Halonen, by Mr Henrik Lilius, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. During his address, Mr Lilius welcomed the newly-elected members of the Committee: Argentina, India, Lebanon, Oman, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia and the United

Kingdom. He recalled that several among these new members had announced that they would limit their mandate to four years instead of six. He also recalled that great progress had been made in the Revision of the Guidelines and remarked that the Convention helped in the recognition of the cultural and social differences and in overcoming conflicts and finding pacific solutions for the protection of World Heritage throughout the world. (The speech of Mr Lilius included as Annex II to this report.)

I.5 The Chairperson welcomed the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, and invited him to deliver his speech. In his allocution, the Director-General thanked the Finnish authorities for their warm welcome. He acknowledged the presence of Ms Tarja Halonen, President of the Republic of Finland, which was an additional testimony of the strong commitment of her country to UNESCO and notably for the protection and conservation of World Heritage. He recalled that diversity lies at the core of UNESCO's agenda and one of the principal contributions for diversity had been the Universal Declaration for Cultural Diversity, recently adopted by unanimity. He also mentioned that, in the framework of heritage, a new Convention had just been adopted by the Organization's General Conference, the *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage*. He emphasized that this represented two major steps forward in the domain of heritage protection. He stressed the importance of addressing conservation issues within the overall framework of sustainable development. He stated that the World Heritage Convention can become a powerful tool for sustainable development as it has proved to be for environmental conservation. He finally indicated that UNESCO would spare no effort in safeguarding the diversity of the world's cultural and natural heritage. (The Director-General's speech is included as Annex III to this report.)

I.6 The Chairperson welcomed Ms Tarja Halonen, President of Finland, and invited her to deliver her address. Ms Halonen stressed the importance of including heritage preservation in the framework of sustainable development, and mentioned that it was essential to build sustainable development on sustainable ethics. She also recalled that education, especially for young children was of crucial importance with regard to heritage. She thus emphasized the need for UNESCO to assist Member States in the development of education values. Ms Halonen also commended the adoption by the UNESCO General Conference of the Declaration on Cultural Diversity which will encourage greater respect for the diversity of cultures, tolerance, dialogue and co-operation. (The speech of Ms Halonen is included as Annex IV to this report.)

I.7 In her address, Ms Suvi Lindén, Minister of Culture of Finland, stressed that one of the principal objectives of the World Heritage Committee was to achieve balance in the World Heritage List. She stated that Finland had been active in the implementation of the Convention, since its adhesion in 1987. She continued by underlining the great importance of encouraging the younger generations to cherish World Heritage values.

(The speech of Ms Lindén is included as Annex V to this report.)

I.8 Ms Satu Hassi, Minister of the Environment of Finland, indicated that in view of the increasing threats weighing upon our natural heritage, the World Heritage Convention is an important instrument in the combat for species preservation. In this regard, she commented on the strict application of the World Heritage criteria by IUCN in its evaluations. She also indicated that Finland would continue to protect natural heritage in the framework of the Convention and that assistance could be granted to other States in the administration and management of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. (The speech of Ms Hassi is included as Annex VI to this report.)

I.9 Following these interventions, the Chairperson announced the opening of the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

II.a ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE

II.1 The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda and the Timetable (WHC-01/CONF.208/1Rev.1) after the Delegate of Belgium requested that an additional item be added to the Agenda concerning the organization of the 30th anniversary of the Convention foreseen in Venice in 2002.

II.b PROPOSAL FOR A REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

II.2 The Chairperson reminded the Committee that a written request for a revision of the Rules of Procedure had been submitted by the Ambassador of Egypt. He requested the Delegate of Egypt to present this proposal.

II.3 The Delegate of Egypt presented the following proposal for an amendment to Article 8.2 of the *Rules of Procedure* (the proposed amendment is in **bold**): "The United Nations and organizations of the United Nations system, as well as, upon written request, other international governmental and non-governmental organizations, **permanent observer missions to UNESCO** and non profit-making institutions having activities in the fields covered by the Convention, may be authorized by the Committee to participate in the sessions of the Committee."

II.4 The Delegates of Lebanon, Oman, South Africa and Finland supported this proposal. The Observer of Israel disassociated himself from this decision. (The intervention by the Observer of Israel is included as Annex VII of this report.) The Committee adopted this decision.

III. REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

III.1 Mr Francesco Bandarin, Director of the World Heritage Centre and Secretary to the World Heritage Committee, presented the report on activities undertaken since the last session of the World Heritage Committee in 2000. He referred to Information Document WHC-01/CONF/208/INF.3. In an audio-visual presentation, he highlighted the important points of the past year's activities.

III.2 The Director of the Centre indicated that in 2001, six countries had ratified the World Heritage Convention: Bhutan, Eritrea, Niue, Rwanda, Samoa and the United Arab Emirates, bringing the number of States Parties to the Convention to 167.

III.3 The Director pointed out that the Centre had organized five statutory meetings in 2001, including the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties. As requested at the last Committee session, the Centre organized the meeting of the Drafting Group to revise the *Operational Guidelines*, held at UNESCO Headquarters in October 2001. Furthermore, the Centre has promoted and organized several workshops on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in all the regions in particular concerning Periodic Reporting and Global Strategy. Additionally, the Centre participated in the workshop on the proposed World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE) held in Winnipeg, Canada in November 2001.

III.4 The Director referred to the reform issues that had been the focus of the Centre's attention throughout this year, namely those expressed in the Resolutions of the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties: Representivity of the World Heritage List (the decision to examine only 30 new nominations in 2003) and Equitable Representation of the Committee (new electoral rules were adopted, with a seat in the Committee reserved for a State Party with no sites inscribed on the World Heritage List); changes in the cycle of the statutory meetings have been adopted for implementation as of 2002: an April/June cycle will replace the June/November Bureau and Committee meetings and extraordinary sessions of the Bureau will be abolished. The Director further indicated that, following the submission of the Draft Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* to this Committee, the next meeting of the Drafting Group is proposed for March 2002, with the final approval of the document being scheduled for the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in June 2002.

III.5 The Director informed the Committee about steps taken to clarify issues concerning inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the possibility for deletion of a property from the World Heritage List, as requested at the last Committee session. He noted that during the course of the year new issues had been raised. These

included the implications for a State Party and consequences for the international community when a site's values are considered endangered, the means available to the Committee and actions available to a State Party that does not agree with the determination of the Committee. He referred to progress in the analysis of the issues noting that a preliminary internal analysis had been prepared in April 2001. The Director-General had requested further internal analysis to involve both the Culture and Science Sectors. The Director reported that the analysis was proceeding and should be ready by March 2002 to guide the work of the March 2002 *Operational Guidelines* Drafting Group. The analysis will also be presented to the next session of the Committee in Budapest in June 2002 in the context of approving revised *Operational Guidelines*.

III.6 Within the framework of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, in particular concerning Periodic Reporting, the Director indicated that the final synthesis report for periodic reporting for Africa will be presented to this Committee, as well as an overview of the activities in progress in Asia and the Pacific (2003), Latin America and the Caribbean (2004) and Europe and North America (2005/2006).

III.7 The Director highlighted the rapid growth of the World Heritage List during the past ten years, and showed a table analysing the sites inscribed by region and by type. The analysis of the types of sites to be examined at this session indicates that the results of the Global Strategy are starting to show, but that efforts still need to be made, among others, in the domain of Tentative Lists, where States Parties are invited to submit their lists or renew the existing ones.

III.8 In the framework of the Global Strategy, the Director brought to the attention of the Committee the various meetings the Centre had organized in 2001. He stressed in particular the progress made in the establishment of the proposed World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE).

III.9 The Director then outlined the objectives of the Global Training Strategy, drafted by ICCROM in consultation with the Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN.

III.10 Referring to the main activities and results in the field of awareness-raising and education, the Director informed the Committee about steps taken in creating a clearer international identity for World Heritage and assisting States Parties in developing their own communication strategy. He stressed that progress had been made in management of World Heritage data through the World Heritage Information Management Programme, thanks to partnerships with, among others, the Council of Europe, the Nordic World Heritage Office and national space agencies. He referred to the success of the World Heritage Education project, in particular of the kit "World Heritage in Young Hands" as one of the flagship projects of UNESCO.

III.11 The Director gave an overview of the budget utilised for international assistance in 2001 and stressed that its implementation rate of 89% was satisfactory, given that the emergency assistance had not been fully used. Bilateral and multilateral co-operation and partnerships, both with the public and the private sector were mentioned in relation to support of World Heritage activities and preservation of sites.

III.12 In referring to the position of the World Heritage Centre within UNESCO, the Director stressed that within UNESCO's Medium Term Strategy 2002-2007, World Heritage has been established as a UNESCO flagship programme, and as a sub-programme within UNESCO's Programme and Budget for 2002-2003. He emphasized that the Centre had undergone restructuring and showed the new distribution of sections and units. He stressed however that office space was lacking, in particular for archiving of statutory documentation and solutions were being sought for obtaining more working and storage space.

III.13 Pointing out that, for the first time, the World Heritage Fund budget was to be presented to the Committee for a biennial period, the Director showed a table of the evolution of the World Heritage Fund and the Extrabudgetary funds since 1997, which clearly indicated that, after the highest point had been reached in 2000, both sources were diminishing and this trend would continue for the next two years. He also stressed the need to establish a separate bank account for the World Heritage Fund within the UNESCO system.

III.14 The Director highlighted some of the achievements in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the recent years, such as: greater efforts on Representivity of the List, more reactive monitoring, the launch of the Periodic Reporting Exercise, better information management and increasing public interest. He also stressed a number of issues remaining to be solved: stronger focus on management and capacity building, the growing gap in meeting international assistance needs, the lack of an international co-operation strategy and limited public outreach. He brought forward a proposal for the improvement of the long-term conservation strategies for World Heritage consisting of: 1. Principles (Guidelines for the conservation of World Heritage properties), 2. Programmes (Reorganization of international assistance) and 3. Partnerships (Partners initiative).

III.15 Finally, the Director referred to the 30th anniversary of the Convention in 2002, highlighting that this was the opportunity to discuss new strategies, strengthen existing networks and increase visibility and effective site management. The twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Budapest in June 2002 and the International Congress planned in Venice, November 2002, as well as the virtual, web-based Congress in October 2002, were presented as occasions to evaluate the impact of the World Heritage Convention,

improve international co-operation and raise awareness on the need to preserve World Heritage.

III.16 The Chairperson and members of the World Heritage Committee thanked the Director for his very complete presentation. Several questions were raised concerning the involvement of World Heritage in forthcoming events, such as the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Rio + 10 Conference) to be held in Johannesburg, South Africa in September 2002, as well as participation of the Centre in activities marking the 2002 United Nations Year of Cultural Heritage. Delegates pointed out that greater focus should be placed on the issues such as sustainable development and dialogue for conservation. Clarification was sought on the relative roles of UNESCO's governing bodies and the World Heritage Committee and the funding sources for the 30th-Anniversary events and the role of the States Parties in these events. Some members of the Committee expressed concern with the situation of the World Heritage Centre within UNESCO, in particular with regard to working conditions and space for staff and documentation.

III.17 Several Committee members stressed that the World Heritage Centre should place greater focus on its Secretariat and statutory functions, as the delayed distribution of some of the working documents for the session had made it difficult for them to properly prepare for the work of the session.

III.18 In responding to the questions raised, the Director stressed that sustainable development was indeed one of the main issues of relevance to the preservation of World Heritage, and fully supported the linking of World Heritage with the Rio + 10 Conference. He pointed out that the 2002 International Congress initiative had been approved by the General Conference within the UNESCO 31C/5 Programme and Budget and specified that its costs would be completely covered through extrabudgetary sources, but that additional partners were still being sought. He further stated that the 2002 International Congress was mainly an event for experts and all States Parties, Advisory Bodies and other partners would be invited to participate. He stressed that in this, as in all other aspects, the Centre was working in full co-operation with other UNESCO sectors and the Advisory Bodies. The Director also clarified the functioning of the assistance provided by States Parties through the system of secondment of staff and associate experts to the Centre.

III.19 Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Assistant Director-General for the Culture Sector, reassured the Committee that the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO had taken close interest in finding solutions for the Centre's space problems, which he expected to be solved in the course of the next few months.

IV.a REPORTS OF THE RAPORTEURS ON THE BUREAU SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, 2001

IV.1 Mr Dawson Munjeri, Zimbabwe, Rapporteur of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, presented the report of this session held at UNESCO Headquarters from 25 to 30 June 2001 and outlined the main issues which were discussed. The Committee took note of the report of the Rapporteur.

IV.2 Mr Francisco Lopez Morales, Mexico, Rapporteur of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Helsinki, 7-8 December 2001), thereafter presented the report of this session (Document WHC-01/CONF.208/4). He recalled that this was a working document for the twenty-fifth session of the Committee and drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that any comments on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List could be made during discussions under Agenda item 8.2. The Committee took note of the report.

IV.3 The Chairperson thanked Messrs Munjeri and Morales for their reports, as well as Mr Gaballa Ali Gaballa, Egypt, for having acted as Rapporteur until the arrival of Mr Morales in Helsinki on the first day of the Bureau session.

IV.b FOLLOW-UP TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE THIRTEENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (30-31 OCTOBER 2001): ACTS CONSTITUTING "CRIMES AGAINST THE COMMON HERITAGE OF HUMANITY"

IV.4 The Secretariat presented Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/23 concerning the chronology of events related to the nomination for inclusion on the World Heritage List of the statues of Bamiyan and other Afghan cultural heritage properties submitted by the Afghan authorities. The Committee was informed that in 1982, nine nominations of cultural heritage properties submitted by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had been received by UNESCO for inscription on the World Heritage List. However, as five were incomplete nominations, only four were evaluated by ICOMOS and were subsequently deferred by the Committee at its seventh session in 1983.

IV.5 The Assistant Director-General for Culture, in his capacity as the Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO informed the Committee that the Opening Session of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee held in June was dedicated to Afghan heritage. He informed the Committee of UNESCO's recent actions relating to the protection of Afghan heritage and the wider scope of activities within the competence of the Organization. A special Task Force had been established by the Director-General, headed by the Assistant Director-General for Education, Sir John Daniels, to prepare UNESCO's programme which will

form part of the United Nations Inter-agency Programme for the rehabilitation of Afghanistan. Education will be the main priority of UNESCO, although activities for the protection of cultural and natural heritage will also be presented.

IV.6 A representative of the Culture Sector is a member of this UNESCO Task Force and the Centre will be working closely with him. The urgent need for an assessment of the present state of conservation of the cultural heritage properties of Afghanistan was recognized as a priority within the range of cultural activities in post-conflict Afghanistan. Among the priority actions identified are: assessment of the current state of (1) the Kabul National Museum, where many artifacts from archaeological properties, monuments and sites within Afghanistan were kept; (2) Bamiyan, (3) the Minaret of Jam, (4) the Mosque of Haji Piyada in Balkh Province, (5) the site of Surkh Kotal, and (6) the Old Town of Herat (including the Friday Mosque, ceramic tile workshop, Musallah complex, fifth minaret, Gawhar Shad mausoleum, mausoleum of Ali Sher Navai and the Shah Zadehah mausoleum complex). To this end, the Assistant Director-General for Culture informed the Committee that a mission as early as January 2002 was being planned.

IV.7 He stated that the Governments of Belgium and Switzerland had offered to organize expert meetings in 2002 to reflect upon ways and means to enhance the implementation of the UNESCO legal instruments for the protection of the common heritage of humanity. Moreover, the Director-General of UNESCO will organize a meeting concerning the interpretation of Islamic law and cultural heritage, in co-operation with the Faculty of Law of Qatar, ISESCO, and ALECSO. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of France organized, on 6 December 2001, a meeting to discuss the reconstruction of Afghanistan. During this meeting, UNESCO participated in a roundtable discussion concerning the cultural heritage of Afghanistan with former Ambassador Pierre Lafrance of France, who undertook a mission to Afghanistan in March 2001 as Special Envoy of the Director-General in an attempt to convince the Taliban not to destroy the Bamiyan Buddhas.

IV.8 The Committee was informed that UNESCO continued to work in close collaboration with the Committee's Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS and ICCROM), institutions and NGOs such as the Society for the Protection of Afghanistan's Cultural Heritage (SPACH), the Pakistan-based international NGO, Hirayama Foundation (Japan), Fondation Bibliotheca Afghanistanica (Switzerland), and the Musée Guimet (France).

IV.9 The Committee and observers, noting the deliberations during the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session and the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention at its thirteenth session, reiterated the importance of education, awareness building activities, and capacity building to prevent deliberate and wilful destructions of the cultural and natural heritage of humankind. The Delegate of Egypt informed the

Committee that his Government had immediately sent the highest ranking Islamic religious leader of Egypt to attempt to dissuade the Taliban forces from destroying the Bamiyan Buddhas. The Committee noted with appreciation all the efforts made by the States Parties aimed to dissuade the Taliban forces from destroying the monuments and sites of Bamiyan. Taking into consideration the gravity of the situation in Afghanistan, the Committee underscored the necessity for taking concrete actions to support the protection of the country's cultural and natural heritage.

IV.10 A number of delegates stated that a situation such as the Bamiyan case merited the convening of an extraordinary session of the Committee to activate paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines* which could have been applicable for Bamiyan and other nominated sites whose outstanding universal value had been recognized by ICOMOS and the Bureau. In response to the point raised by the Delegate of Greece on why UNESCO did not convene an extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee soon after the threat proclaimed by the Taliban forces, the Committee was informed that all possibilities were examined, as if the Bamiyan Buddhas were actually inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Director-General considered that the urgent inscription of Bamiyan and other Afghan cultural heritage properties on an exceptional basis may not serve the intended purpose of protection and conservation because of the unpredictability of the Taliban's reaction. Unfortunately, the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas occurred within days of the proclamation.

IV.11 Several delegates suggested that the events related to the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention be devoted to drawing international attention to the natural and cultural heritage of Afghanistan, with appropriate budgetary provisions.

IV.12 Regarding the debate over the reconstruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas, the Committee underlined the importance of respecting the wishes of the Afghan authorities and international conservation norms such as the Venice Charter and Nara Statement on Authenticity. The Assistant Director-General informed the Committee that the Bamiyan Buddhas had been carved out of a soft stone cliff, and any reconstruction project would require careful consideration with international technical expertise. The Observer of Austria extended the technical expertise of Graz Technical University for the elaboration of the technical details for the reconstruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas.

IV.13 IUCN, recalling that plundering and illicit trafficking of the irreplaceable resources was not only restricted to cultural heritage but also affecting natural heritage resources, drew the attention of the Committee to the importance of the country's natural heritage. ICOMOS underscored the serious degree of looting and illegal transfer of cultural heritage properties from sites of potential World Heritage value and stressed the importance and need for effective co-operation of non-

governmental organizations such as the International Committee of the Blue Cross (ICBC), the International Council on Archives (ICA), the International Council of Museums (ICOM) amongst others, which complement inter-governmental activities for the protection of movable and immovable properties in times of armed conflict, including in Afghanistan. The Observer of ALECSO appealed to the Committee to take concrete action to promote the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of Afghanistan. The Committee and observers emphasized the importance for the World Heritage Convention to be implemented in a pro-active manner, instead of in a reactive manner.

IV.14 Following the deliberations, the Chairperson requested a Working Group to:

- (i) elaborate a plan of action to provide assistance to Afghanistan to implement the World Heritage Convention in the wake of the destruction of the monuments of Bamiyan Valley;
- (ii) consider:
 - a) *ways and means by which the implementation of the World Heritage Convention can be reinforced*, especially in relation to the other relevant UNESCO Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage;
 - b) *measures* for enhancing the promotion of education, awareness raising activities and communication concerning the irreplaceable values of the cultural heritage of humanity;
 - c) *improved mechanisms for promoting the scientific documentation* of potential and existing world cultural heritage properties.

IV.15 The Group was composed of the Delegates of Argentina, Egypt, Greece, India, South Africa, Observers of Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Pakistan, the three Advisory Bodies, the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director and Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre. The Delegate of India, Ms Neemal Sabhrawal, chaired the Working Group, which met twice and also held consultations.

IV.16 Upon examination of the work of the Working Group the following decision, composed of three parts, was adopted:

Part 1

1.1 The Committee examined the chronology of events related to the nomination for inclusion on the World Heritage List of the statues of Bamiyan and other cultural heritage properties of Afghanistan by the Afghan authorities presented in WHC-01/CONF.208/23 at the request of the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention.

1.2 It expressed appreciation for the additional information presented by the Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO concerning the continued efforts being made by UNESCO to protect the heritage of Afghanistan.

1.3 The Committee reiterated the condemnation of the wilful destruction of the cultural heritage of Afghanistan by the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, and took note of the Resolution adopted by the thirty-first UNESCO General Conference concerning the Acts constituting “crimes against the common heritage of humanity”.

1.4 The Committee underscored its conviction that all steps taken to implement the UNESCO World Heritage Convention in Afghanistan should be planned and executed within the overall framework of the UN Inter-agency programme being elaborated for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Afghanistan.

1.5 It recognized the need to examine possible actions that the World Heritage Committee can take in similar future cases where there are threats of deliberate and wilful destruction of the World Heritage and potential World Heritage.

1.6 The Committee underlined the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954) and its Protocols, the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970), the World Heritage Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), the UNIDROIT Convention and other relevant international legal instruments.

1.7 It further noted with regret that of the 167 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, only 100 countries are States Parties to the 1954 Convention, 83 States Parties to the First Protocol, and 91 States Parties to the 1970 Convention.

1.8 The Committee expressed its appreciation to UNESCO for commissioning a legal analysis on the ways and means by which the implementation of the relevant UNESCO Conventions concerning the protection of cultural heritage can be reinforced.

1.9 The Committee reaffirmed the duty of the international community as a whole to protect the heritage of humanity, in accordance with Article 6 of the World Heritage Convention.

Part 2

2.1 The Committee encouraged States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre to mobilize and support to the extent

possible and as appropriate, activities by non-governmental organizations active in the field of heritage protection for safeguarding the heritage of Afghanistan.

2.2 It requested the World Heritage Centre to organize a technical fact-finding and consultative mission to Afghanistan, within the framework of the UN Inter-Agency programme for the reconstruction of Afghanistan, as soon as possible and when the security situation permits,

- (i) to assist the Afghan authorities in elaborating a national action plan for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
- (ii) to provide assistance to the Afghan authorities for collating scientific documentation to elaborate a national inventory on natural and cultural heritage properties of Afghanistan in close co-operation with the relevant Advisory Bodies;
- (iii) to assess the state of conservation of the natural and cultural heritage of Afghanistan;
- (iv) to encourage the authorities, supported by the World Heritage Centre, in reactivating the nomination process initiated by the former Afghan authorities in 1981;
- (v) to provide assistance to the authorities as appropriate to reformulate and/or complete the nomination dossiers of those properties deferred in 1983 by the World Heritage Committee, in spite of the recognition of the universal significance of such properties;

2.3 Based upon the results of this fact-finding mission, the Committee encouraged the Afghan authorities in elaborating a Tentative List of properties that they may wish to nominate for inscription on the World Heritage List.

2.4 The Committee decided to allocate US\$49,000 from the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance Budget on an exceptional basis for (a) the organization of the fact-finding and consultative mission (see Annex VIII.A) and for (b) the compilation of the scientific documentation to assist the Afghan authorities in preparing national inventories of natural and cultural heritage properties and to reformulate the nominations submitted by the former Afghan authorities in 1981 (see Annex VIII.B).

2.5 The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to keep it informed of the results of the fact-finding and consultative mission to Afghanistan soon after its completion. The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to inform the Committee at its twenty-sixth session in June 2002 on the progress made in assisting the Afghan authorities in implementing the World Heritage Convention.

Part 3

3.1 The Committee reiterated the appeal made by the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to all States Parties to become signatories to the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, its two Protocols, the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the UNIDROIT Convention and other international legal instruments protecting cultural heritage, if they have not yet done so, in order to maximize the protection of the cultural heritage of humanity, and in particular, against destructive acts, especially taking into consideration the designation of year 2002 as the *United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage*.

3.2 The Committee noted the fundamental principles and guidelines included in these instruments to prevent the destruction of the heritage including looting and illicit excavations and transfer.

3.3 The Committee requested UNESCO through the World Heritage Centre to prepare, in the meantime, explanatory notes outlining the obligations of States Parties of the World Heritage Convention in relation to the other relevant UNESCO Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage.

3.4 It requested the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to make available for the information and consideration by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session in June 2002, the legal analysis on the ways and means to reinforce the implementation of the relevant UNESCO Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage being completed by the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Dr F. Francioni, for the UNESCO Director-General.

3.5 The Committee decided to reconsider at its twenty-sixth session when further information is made available, ways and means by which the implementation of the World Heritage Convention can be reinforced, especially in relation to other relevant UNESCO Conventions for the protection of cultural and natural heritage, including possible modalities for activating paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, in future cases like the destruction of the statues of Bamiyan in Afghanistan.

3.6 The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to elaborate all possible initiatives the World Heritage Committee and the Director-General of UNESCO can take in future cases of wilful and deliberate destruction of heritage.

V. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REFORM MEASURES

Introduction

V.1 The Secretariat summarized the current situation of the reform process ("Putting Reform into Action") and the emerging issues for the future ("The Way Forward") (see Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/5).

V.2 The discussion by the Committee brought to the forefront a number of orientations and recommendations that could constitute a significant contribution to the future preparation of new strategic orientations for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. The substance of the proposal and ensuing discussion could be developed for further review at the twenty-sixth session of the Committee to be held in Budapest in June 2002. This could be one of the key tasks for the Committee in Budapest.

Putting Reform into Action

V.3 The Secretariat presented a report on the implementation of reform decisions of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000). The key components of the report included reference to changes and improvements to the World Heritage statutory meetings, documentation and communication and follow-up actions concerning Representativity of the World Heritage List and Equitable Representation of the Committee.

V.4 The Committee noted the report and commented that it was vital to implement the reform decisions of the Committee. The Committee requested that further efforts be made by the Centre to implement the Item A and B decision-making system. Discussion on the implementation of the new priority system for the selection of the 30 new nominations to be examined in June 2003 by the twenty-seventh session of the Committee is reported in section X of this report.

The Way Forward

(i) Background

V.5 The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that an important cycle of implementation of strategic orientations adopted at the sixteenth session of the Committee in Santa Fe in 1992 is coming to an end. In summary the goals of the strategic orientations were to:

1. Promote completion of the identification of the World Heritage;
2. Ensure the continued representativity and credibility of the World Heritage List;
3. Promote the adequate protection and management of the World Heritage sites;
4. Pursue more systematic monitoring of World Heritage sites;

5. Increase public awareness, involvement and support;

V.6 The 1992 Strategic Orientations have been implemented through the adoption and implementation of the Global Strategy, Periodic Reporting, and the more recent recommendations of the Working Groups on Representivity of the World Heritage List and on the Equitable Representation in the World Heritage Committee endorsed by the twenty-fourth session of the World Heritage Committee (2000) and the Thirteenth General Assembly of States Parties (30-31 October 2001).

V.7 Although some reform activities have yet to be completed (revision of the *Operational Guidelines*) there is now a recognized need to give a new strategic orientation to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. For example, there is a limitation in the amount of technical assistance available for the adequate and effective conservation of World Heritage properties. This is becoming more critical as more sites are added to the World Heritage List. While it is recognized that the primary responsibility for World Heritage conservation belongs to each State Party, the Director of the Centre underlined the responsibilities of the international community in providing help to States Parties for the conservation of World Heritage properties, especially in regions of the world with less technical and financial capacities. He asked the Committee to evaluate whether the current international assistance system is adequate for the long-term conservation of World Heritage sites.

V.8 The Director of the Centre recalled that a preliminary "Agenda" for future reform and strategic orientations had been outlined in four points by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Cameron (Canada), during her speech at the opening of the fifth extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee (1 November 2001):

1. the necessity to focus more on the conservation needs of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
2. strengthening efforts in support of the Global Strategy;
3. the need to align the World Heritage Fund with strategic priorities, in part by exploring new avenues for securing significant new funds through partnerships, foundations, extra-budgetary initiatives and other;
4. the need for a statement of principles for World Heritage conservation or a World Heritage Charter for World Heritage conservation, to be prepared.

V.9 The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that following discussions at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau of the Committee (June 2001) and as a follow up to the Thirteenth General Assembly (30-31 October 2001), the Centre had formulated elements of new proposed strategic orientations to be discussed by the Committee in 2001 and 2002.

(ii) Overview of the proposal for Principles, Programmes and Partnerships

V.10 The proposal presented in Section III of Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/5 is based on the development of the following tools (to be called, for the sake of synthesis, the "3 P's"):

1. a new document of "Principles" - Guidelines for World Heritage Conservation;
2. the reorientation of international assistance based on a "Programmes" approach; and
3. a new "Partnerships" initiative in support of World Heritage conservation.

(iii) General overview of the discussion

V.11 Following the presentation of the Director, the Committee provided a number of significant comments and inputs to the proposal. The Delegate of Belgium asked for closer links between the proposal and the objectives of the Global Strategy and the results of Periodic Reporting. Furthermore, several delegates asked that the objectives underlying the proposal be more clearly defined. The Delegate of Belgium suggested that the objectives could usefully be summarized as follows (and called the proposal, the "3 C's"):

1. Strengthening the "Credibility" of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.
2. Supporting "Conservation" of the World Heritage properties.
3. Fostering "Capacity-building" for conservation.

V.12 In order to meet these objectives, analyses of the World Heritage List, tentative lists and a complete evaluation of the state of conservation of sites through the periodic reporting exercise needed to be completed as soon as possible. The analytical work could lead to a revision to the way the budget is presented to better reflect regional needs. Several members of the Committee, observers, IUCN and ICOMOS agreed with the Belgian proposal, stressing the need to focus on long-term conservation, and the development of more effective tools for supporting the conservation efforts of States Parties. The need to link conservation and development was also stressed. Furthermore, the Committee recognized the need for an overall strategic reflection on the implementation of the *Convention* to be discussed in Budapest at the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in June 2002.

(iv) Specific comments on "Principles" - tools for better guidance concerning the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*

V.13 The Director of the Centre explained the meaning of the proposed "Principles" tool. As the World Heritage List increases in size, and conservation needs become more and more important, the need to establish clear guidelines for World Heritage conservation becomes urgent.

V.14 The Director indicated that these guidelines would not replace existing "charters" developed by technical organizations such as IUCN and ICOMOS. The Guidelines would clarify to governments, site managers and potential partners directly involved in conservation of World Heritage, the accepted principles, methods and orientations on conservation of cultural and natural heritage recognized by the World Heritage Committee. The conservation guidelines could complement the *Operational Guidelines*.

V.15 The Committee offered comments on the proposal. It was questioned whether there should be separate guidelines for World Heritage as compared to other heritage. Others pointed out the difficulty of establishing procedures that would be applicable for the diversity of all regions.

V.16 Some members of the Committee supported the idea of a World Heritage Charter and recommended that it be annexed to the revised *Operational Guidelines*. Others recommended giving emphasis to the development of practical guidelines for site managers. The Committee noted that the only cultural heritage protection charter addressed to governments in the form of a "political document" is the 1931 Athens Charter developed by the League of Nations International Committee for Intellectual Co-operation.

V.17 ICOMOS supported the second proposal but cautioned that the exercise could be complex, based on their extensive experience. IUCN stated that it is very important to clarify the objectives and target audience, particularly to ensure that it does not duplicate other exercises such as the process for revising the *Operational Guidelines*. IUCN considered that it would help to have a clear hierarchy in mind when considering Principles:

- First: A brief statement of heritage principles
- Second: *The Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*
- Third: Detailed technical guidance.

V.18 IUCN informed the Committee that it has produced a great deal of technical guidance in the form of Best Practice manuals etc., however, there are gaps.

(v) Specific comments on "Programmes" - a tool for more efficient use of resources for World Heritage conservation

V.19 The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that, following the orientation provided by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001, the Centre has proposed a preliminary set of Programmes for consideration by the Committee (see Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/19). The proposal is, in the first instance, limited to four programmes and to a maximum of 10% of the total International Assistance budget (US\$200,000 for 2002).

V.20 The basic principle underlining the proposal is that International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund can be used strategically, as recommended by the Committee, to provide seed money to programmes that can then be supported financially and technically by other partners. The programmes proposed have been identified on the basis of International Assistance priorities adopted by the Committee in accordance with Section V of the *Convention*. These programmes represent an initial stage of a process of the redefinition of the use of International Assistance. Further strategic direction from the Committee on the application of International Assistance is required. A discussion on this item could be foreseen to take place at the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in Budapest in June 2002.

V.21 The Committee expressed its support for the proposal to develop long-term programmes and stressed the need to link this activity more closely to Global Strategy and Periodic Reporting, in order to reflect more accurately the programme needs. This would require analyses of the World Heritage List, the tentative lists and of the Periodic Reports and could, for example, result in a budget presented in regional groupings. The Centre's capacity to implement the proposals was questioned given staff and other constraints.

V.22 IUCN and ICOMOS welcomed the Programme approach proposed and stressed the need for the Centre to develop it in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies. IUCN stated that they considered that it is important to focus efforts and welcomed the approach. However, IUCN commented that it is important to clearly and openly explain the rationale for the selection of programmes, and also provide clear estimates of costs. It is also important to have an appropriate balance between natural and cultural topics. IUCN welcomes a focus on forests but also suggested adding other biomes such as the marine environment. Further discussion on the Programme proposal is reported in Chapter XVI of the report.

(vi) Partnerships - a tool to strengthen long-term World Heritage conservation efforts

V.23 The Director of the Centre presented the proposal to develop an initiative aimed at strengthening and structuring partnerships for World Heritage conservation. UNESCO and the Centre, in line with the orientation provided by the Director-General and the increasing involvement of the United Nations in this area, have already begun to develop several partnerships involving Governments, local authorities, universities, private foundations and the corporate sector. Some of the most significant technical assistance programmes for World Heritage currently being implemented depend on partnership agreements (eg. the UNF-UNESCO partnership for the conservation of the World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo).

V.24 The proposed scheme intends to give coherence and to expand activities based on co-operation with

partners in a significant manner according to the priorities established by the Committee.

V.25 The Committee asked for clarifications on the modalities of the proposal, noting the need to proceed with caution in an innovative area. ICOMOS stressed the need to establish clear selection criteria for partners and to clarify existing partnerships such as those established through Forum UNESCO. A clear distinction should be made between those seeking to become genuinely involved in conservation and those using World Heritage for marketing purposes only. IUCN noted that key partners are often local communities and it is important to consider bottom-up approaches to partnerships. IUCN commented that there is scope (to be explored) for linking partnerships with key events, such as the 2003 World Parks Congress. IUCN said they will work with the World Heritage Centre to encourage more effective partnerships.

V.26 The Committee noted that Articles 17 and 18 of the *Convention* encourage States Parties to consider or encourage the establishment of national public and private foundations or associations whose purpose is to invite donations for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage and to give their assistance to international fund-raising campaigns organized for the World Heritage Fund under the auspices of UNESCO.

V.27 The Representative of UNEP fully supported the proposal and its focus on long-term conservation. She mentioned the existence of mutually beneficial partnership and projects of UNESCO and UNEP.

V.28 A summary of the discussion concerning events in 2002 is presented in Section XIII of the report (see also WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.3).

(vii) Conclusions

V.29 The Committee adopted the following decision:

The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, to further develop a concept paper on Principles, Programmes and Partnerships taking into consideration the opinions expressed by the Committee, with specific reference to the need to define terms within a framework of strategic objectives. In particular, the paper should consider the need to define and strengthen the "credibility", the "conservation" and the capacity building" objectives of the World Heritage Convention.

Taking this into consideration, the Committee requested the Centre to:

1. indicate the nature of the "Principles" document, its target and the time frame needed to develop and finalize it;
2. provide an overall framework on the proposed "Programmes" system, and to present its

connections with the Global Strategy and Periodic Reporting; and

3. illustrate the proposal on the "Partnerships" scheme, its regulations, the types of partnerships being sought, the selection criteria and the plan for its development and implementation.

The paper should be prepared in time for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002 and decision by the Committee in June 2002. The paper should be provided to Committee members as soon as possible to allow time for it to be studied.

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

VI.1 The Secretariat presented a brief progress report on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* making reference to working document WHC-01/CONF.208/6 (Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*) and WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.13 (Application of cultural criterion (vi)). The Committee noted that:

- The current revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* are being prepared on the basis of recommendations of an Expert Meeting held in Canterbury (United Kingdom) in April 2000, that were adopted by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns (2000).
- The overall objective of the current process of revision of the *Guidelines* is to create a user-friendly document that is streamlined and simplified and includes a consolidated section on the protection and conservation of World Heritage properties.
- The 1st Draft Annotated Revisions of the *Operational Guidelines* were sent to all States Parties under cover of a Circular Letter (CL/WHC.8/01) in July 2001. Seventeen submissions were received in response. The 1st Draft and comments received are included on the web site www.unesco.org/whc/opgu/ (English) and www.unesco.org/fr/orient/ (French).
- From 8 to 12 October 2001, a Drafting Group met at UNESCO Headquarters to review the 1st Draft and the submissions and to elaborate a 2nd Draft. The Drafting Group included experts from the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Australia, Canada, Ecuador, Finland, Morocco and Zimbabwe). Due to other commitments, the expert from Thailand was unable to attend. An expert from the United Kingdom (Dr Christopher Young, English Heritage who had chaired the Canterbury meeting) and representatives of the three Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the Culture

Sector of UNESCO, attended the meeting. The report of the Drafting Group was made available to the Committee as WHC-01/CONF.208/6 and is also included on the web site.

- The 2nd Draft Annotated Revisions of the *Operational Guidelines* was presented to the Committee as Annex IV of WHC-01/CONF.208/6.
- It is proposed that the revised *Operational Guidelines* include five main sections:
 - I. Introduction
 - II. Establishment of the World Heritage List
 - III. Protection and conservation of World Heritage Properties
 - IV. International Assistance
 - V. Mobilisation of national and international support in favour of the *World Heritage Convention*
- The Drafting Group considered that three issues require policy and legal consideration by the Committee before drafting can be finalised for consideration by the Committee. These are:
 - (i) The role of State Party consent in reactive monitoring;
 - (ii) The role of State Party consent for inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger; and
 - (iii) The capacity of the World Heritage Committee to decide and the role of the State Party to consent to deletion of properties from the World Heritage List.

The Committee:

1. congratulated the Drafting Group for the substantial progress made in revising the *Operational Guidelines*;
2. approved the organization of the next meeting of the Drafting Group at UNESCO Headquarters from 18 to 22 March 2002 to review the Annexes and sections of the *Operational Guidelines* still requiring finalization. The composition of the next Drafting Group will include an expert nominated by each State Party that is a Bureau member in 2002, an expert nominated by each State Party that were Bureau members in 2001 (Australia, Canada, Morocco, Ecuador and Zimbabwe) in order to use their experience to finalise the text, representatives from the Advisory Bodies, other experts as required (to be selected by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee) and the World Heritage Centre.
3. invited States Parties to provide written comments on the 2nd Draft Annotated revisions of the *Operational Guidelines* to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2001 for consideration by the Drafting Group in March 2002;

4. recalled that the Director of the Centre had indicated that the UNESCO analysis of legal/policy issues identified in the report of the Drafting Group would be available in time for the March 2002 *Operational Guidelines* Drafting Group;
5. considered that the Drafting Group should only examine technical questions and should leave discussions on legal and policy issues to the Committee.

VI.2 The Delegate of Belgium noted that there was a need to further discuss the application of the criteria, and in particular cultural heritage criterion (vi). The Committee did not make a decision on this specific point. However, the Chairperson noted that criterion (vi) will be discussed by the *Operational Guidelines* Drafting Group.

VII. PERIODIC REPORTING

1. Report on the state of the World Heritage in the Africa Region

VII.1 The Secretariat presented the report on Periodic Reporting in the Africa Region (WHC-01/CONF. 208/7) to the Committee. As at November 2001, fifty-three sites were inscribed on the World Heritage List. Forty of these sites were inscribed prior to 1993 and located in eighteen countries, comprising twenty-three natural, sixteen cultural and one mixed site, and were the subject of this monitoring report. The strategic approach for the compilation of the report and the co-operation of the African States Parties in the Periodic Reporting Exercise was explained. Of the possible eighteen reports on the state of implementation of the Convention by the States Parties, sixteen had been received, and of a possible forty state of conservation reports, thirty-two had been received, representing a rate of 80%.

VII.2 As regards the state of the regional overview on the implementation of the Convention, the Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the following issues:

- Periodic Reporting on the implementation of the Convention should not only be limited to countries with sites inscribed on the List;
- Lack of policy and legislative measures for heritage conservation: where policy measures exist, the lack of solid policies and programmes to put these measures into effect is insufficient to implement them;
- High central government-driven initiatives concerning sites with little involvement of the local population or non-governmental organizations;
- Inadequate professional personnel, skills and equipment;
- Lack of scientific information to enhance and update the management knowledge and methods;
- Lack of financial resources to manage sites and techniques for mobilizing international support;
- Lack of education and public awareness concerning World Heritage values;

- Poorly defined and poorly understood World Heritage values;
- Lack of mechanisms for addressing natural and anthropic threats to World Heritage;
- Non-existence of frameworks for bi- and multilateral cooperation for designing transborder sites; and
- Lack of nominations from countries that ratified the Convention in earlier years.

VII.3 In the light of these observations, and the achievements of the Global Strategy, the Secretariat emphasized the following challenges facing World Heritage conservation in Africa:

- Mainstreaming World Heritage protection within the public and private sectors of the African countries;
- Convincing the private sector to incorporate heritage protection in their activities;
- Establish long-term conservation financing programmes for African sites (e.g. the setting up of the African Heritage Fund);
- Promoting urban and regional planning for both urban and rural heritage;
- Promoting transparency in heritage resource management;
- Promoting more proactive use of environmental assessment tools for the decision making process; and
- Effective management through regional and sub-regional training, accountability, cooperation, coordination and agreements.

VII.4 The Secretariat presented an Action Plan focused on:

- Co-operation and Networks for better sharing of resources;
- Training for more skilled and efficient manpower;
- Wider participation to ensure long and sustained conservation of World Heritage in Africa;
- Management to address deficiencies at the national level and on the sites;
- Scientific research and reporting to enhance knowledge at sites, and
- update methods for site protection and information sharing.

VII.5 The Secretariat recommended the convening of the second round of regional meetings with site managers. Meetings with the Permanent Delegations to UNESCO and with the National Commissions for UNESCO should also be held. The Secretariat also recommended the adoption by the Committee of the Action Plan, to be funded by the World Heritage Fund, extrabudgetary sources and the African Heritage Fund.

VII.6 Following the presentation, several interventions were made by Committee members and observers. After debate, the Committee deferred the adoption of the African Periodic Report, on the basis of the following comments:

- the complete Report should have been provided to enable the Committee to have the information which led to the conclusion and recommendations of the Report, provided as a Working Document;
- in view of the importance of the Report and the issues involved in the Periodic Reporting Exercise, the Committee requested that a copy of the report be provided to all members to provide an opportunity to thoroughly study the Report (CD-Rom version), and certain recommendations contained in the Report submitted to the Committee which may be difficult to implement.

VII.7 The Committee noted that the proposed Action Plan should be completed with a quantitative plan, highlighting actions to be undertaken in the short and in the long term, and associating the follow up activities to periodic reporting with the activities undertaken under the Africa 2009 Programme.

VII.8 As regards the proposed African Heritage Fund, while expressing the urgent need to support African countries, the Committee requested a detailed description of the Fund and suggested that it should have a structure whereby the Committee could have a say in its utilisation.

VII.9 In considering the level of awareness raising, the Committee noted that each regional action plan differed, and that more awareness raising activities are foreseen in the follow up to the Periodic Reporting Exercise. The Committee noted that the countries concerned will gain six more months following approval of the proposed cycle for periodic reporting.

VII.10 To simplify the work of the Committee, it was decided to provide the Committee with the summary report. However, the Committee was informed that the full report would be made available to its members.

VII.11 IUCN welcomed the report on Africa. Africa is the only region where the number of natural sites exceeds the number of cultural sites. In addition, 22% of all natural World Heritage sites are from Africa. Alarming, 42% of natural sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger are from Africa, in some cases the result of armed conflict related issues as in the Democratic Republic of Congo. IUCN considered that this required increasing emphasis by the Committee on African heritage conservation, particularly through activities which build local support, linking conservation to sustainable development and support capacity building efforts. However, it is important to understand that root causes such as poverty, debt, lack of development and ethnic conflict afflict too many African countries. These underlying causes will be addressed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002.

VII.12 IUCN felt the report has many positive points but that the recommendations would have more impact if the set of priority items were presented in a clearer and shorter fashion. IUCN also informed the Committee that the

World Parks Congress (WPC) will be held in Durban in September 2003. This 10-yearly event is key in shaping the world's protected areas now covering the equivalent of 10% of the earth's terrestrial surface. The WPC will include a major focus on World Heritage and on African conservation. The meeting will provide an important opportunity to address the issues identified in the Periodic Reporting Exercise.

VII.13 The ICCROM Representative reported that several activities proposed in the Action Plan are already being implemented by ICCROM under Africa 2009, and more links will be established with the periodic reporting.

VII.14 The Committee noted that the Action Plan as well as the recommendations were derived from consultations with the States Parties during regional meetings, responses to the questionnaires and through various consultant missions undertaken to assist the participating countries.

VII.15 As regards follow up consultations with the concerned African States Parties, the Committee noted that the Chairperson had approved two international assistance requests amounting to US\$40,000 to enable the organization in Africa of two follow up meetings for Francophone and Anglophone African countries respectively.

VII.16 Taking into consideration the above observations, the Committee deferred the adoption of the African Periodic Report and the proposed Action Plan. It recommended that the Centre re-examine the African Periodic Report in consultation with the States Parties, taking into consideration the comments, and re-submit the Report to the next session of the World Heritage Committee. The Report should include more details on the proposed Action Plan and the proposed African Heritage Fund, and be circulated to the States Parties. A Progress Report on the African Periodic Reporting Exercise should be submitted to the next Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

2. Progress Reports on Regional Periodic Reporting Strategies

Asia and the Pacific Region

VII.17 The Committee examined Section 2 of Document WHC-01/CONF.208/8 concerning the progress report on the preparation of the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Reporting Exercise. The Committee took note that the Asia-Pacific Region with thirty-five States Parties (twenty-seven Asian and eight Pacific States Parties) will be undertaking the Exercise for preparing Part I (State Party information) of the Periodic Report to report to the Committee in June 2003. It was noted that in the Asia-Pacific Region, there are 135 World Heritage properties, including ninety-one cultural, thirty-five natural and nine mixed sites, of which fifty-five cultural and thirty-three natural or mixed properties were inscribed before or in 1994, located in sixteen countries, to be reported within

Part II (site information) of this first round of the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Report.

VII.18 The Centre informed the Committee that following the Action Plan it had approved at its twenty-fourth session, the Asia-Pacific States Parties have started the preparation of their national Periodic Reports in close co-operation with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It was underscored that the entire process involved consultation between States Parties, UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and other relevant authorities; twenty-one out of thirty-five Asia-Pacific States Parties had appointed national coordinators for the Exercise. The main activities undertaken in 2001 for the Periodic Reporting Exercise were highlighted.

VII.19 The Centre expressed appreciation to the States Parties who are making special efforts to support this important Exercise within the work of the Convention, notably, the Republic of Korea and Australia, who have or are planning to host UNESCO Regional or Sub-Regional Workshops for the preparation of the periodic reports for the Asia-Pacific Cultural, Mixed and Natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List before or in 1994. Moreover, the Centre drew the attention of the Committee to the generous contribution by the Government of Japan, which had committed US\$334,800 to support the Periodic Reporting Exercise for this region to be reviewed in June 2003.

VII.20 For Natural and Mixed Heritage, the Committee was informed that close links have been developed between the Periodic Reporting Exercise and the Centre/IUCN Global Project entitled "*Enhancing our Heritage: Monitoring and Managing Success in World Natural Heritage sites*", financed by the UN Foundation. The first meeting to co-ordinate the preparation of the periodic report on natural and mixed World Heritage properties (33 from 11 States Parties) will be hosted by Australia, in March 2002.

VII.21 The Delegates of India and the Republic of Korea, and the Observer of Iran underscored the importance of consultation and usefulness of the close co-operation between UNESCO, the concerned States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and other relevant organizations to ensure a positive outcome of this exercise.

VII.22 The Committee was assured by the Secretariat, that the Periodic Reporting Exercise was being conducted by the States Parties themselves, and that the Report, to be examined by the Committee at its twenty-seventh session in June 2003, would be presented by representative(s) of the Asia-Pacific States Parties, and not by the Secretariat.

VII.23 The Committee approved the Action Plan proposed in Document WHC-01/CONF.208/8 Section 2 as well as the regional strategic action plan to complete the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Reporting Exercise.

Latin America and the Caribbean Region

VII.24 The Committee took note of the presentation of Section 3 of the Document WHC-01/CONF.208/8 concerning the Periodic Report on the Latin American and Caribbean Region. The Delegate of Argentina informed the Committee that his country had designated two focal points, one for natural sites and one for cultural sites. The Periodic Report of Argentina will be discussed during the second seminar on the 1972 Convention, foreseen in Cordoba, in March 2002, after the sub-regional meeting of Montévideo and with the technical assistance of the Centre. Argentina is studying, among others, the means to ensure its own permanent evaluation mechanism. Whilst approving the strategy proposed for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Delegate of Argentina requested that the budget of this part of the programme be discussed at the same time as the budget for international assistance and the World Heritage Fund. Following a question raised by the Delegate of Mexico, the Secretariat informed that each State Party designated one or more focal points. The Committee took note of Section 3 of the Periodic Report for the Latin American and Caribbean Region and approved the proposed timetable.

Europe and North America Region

VII.25 Concerning the proposals for the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe (Section 4 of Document WHC-01/CONF.208/8), the Committee agreed both with the timing and the proposal to collaborate with the Council of Europe and its HEREIN project, a comparative databank on European cultural heritage policies. It furthermore noted the co-operation with the Nordic World Heritage Office/Foundation in the development of technical tools.

VII.26 The Committee also requested that all States Parties be included in this effort and to fully co-operate with the Advisory Bodies. A number of European States Parties took the floor to support the arrangements proposed, namely to cover Section I of the reports for all countries in 2005 and Section II in 2006. A question was raised as to whether the capacity in the Centre would be sufficient for the work to be carried out and the Director responded that assistance be provided by States Parties through the Associate Expert Scheme.

VII.27 The Delegate of Hungary pointed out that the year 2007 should be devoted to a stocktaking exercise and the development of conceptual guidelines for the second cycle. The Delegate of Greece informed the Committee that a Conference on the Safeguarding of Byzantine Heritage had been organized in May 2001 and that a database on the state of conservation of this type of heritage for the Mediterranean countries is being established. ICOMOS fully supported the link to the Council of Europe and the HEREIN project, as this is an open project which could be very beneficial to other regions. The thesaurus already exists in English, French and Spanish and the thematic and methodological

approach could be expanded to cover the other reporting exercises as it includes heritage protection in general.

Arab States Region

VII.28 The Committee noted the summary on the follow-up to the Arab Region Periodic Reporting (Section 1 of Document WHC-01/CONF.208/8). Background information was provided on the activities of the Secretariat since the adoption of the regional summary report in Cairns in 2000, such as on the meeting organized in April 2001, to inform States Parties of the conclusions and recommendations of this report. The Delegate of Lebanon commented that the identification of Modern Heritage is not a priority within the Arab region.

VII.29 The Secretariat outlined its proposed strategy to implement the above-mentioned recommendations, insisting on the need to establish and reinforce national World Heritage "focal points", fine-tune regional strategies and national work plans, develop model international assistance packages and encourage States Parties to apply for those packages under the World Heritage Fund.

VII.30 The Committee noted the various actions aimed at implementing the above-mentioned strategy, that the Secretariat is carrying out. These include: national seminars to assist States Parties in reviewing periodic reports and generating requests for international assistance activities; regional and sub-regional meetings to strengthen the capacity of States Parties in implementing the Convention and improve the representivity of the Arab Region on the List; and Regional Technical Assistance Programmes, mainly funded through extrabudgetary sources, to provide best-practice examples in addressing common management and conservation problems of the region.

VII.31 The Committee noted that a special effort is made by the Secretariat to ensure that all international assistance activities, under the World Heritage Fund, are conceived in such a way to contribute to the general objectives of the regional strategy.

VII.32 The Committee, recalling that heritage conservation is an absolute priority for all States Parties from the region, supported the idea of establishing World Heritage "focal points" in each State Party, suggesting that there might be an overall World Heritage Co-ordinator for each country, and two "executives", one for cultural and one for natural heritage. In this respect, the Delegate of Egypt underlined that National MAB, where they exist, Committees are best placed to become the counterparts of the Centre for natural heritage. The need to involve renowned universities from the region as well as encouraging interregional Mediterranean co-operation was also stressed. The Delegate of Egypt drew the Committee's attention to the Training Center at Sharm El-Sheikh, located near the Ras Mohamed Marine Park, St Catherine Monastery and other noteworthy natural and cultural sites. This Center is equipped with the most

modern material for cultural and natural training courses and is able to accommodate up to 52 trainees.

VII.33 The Committee furthermore agreed on the necessary link between international assistance activities and the "programme" approach, and requested that the experience of the Periodic Reporting in the Arab region be used to develop indicators and benchmarks, which would enable an assessment of the progress accomplished in a given region once the cycle completed.

VII.34 The ALECSO Observer took the floor proposing that a strategic partnership be established between the Centre and his Organization, to co-operate in the Arab region on the basis of the recommendations and Action Plan deriving from the Periodic Reporting. He recalled that ALECSO is in the process of setting up its own global strategy, which will take into account the directives of the Committee, and he underlined the need to integrate efforts with a view to optimising the resources.

VIII. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

VIII.1 The Committee examined document WHC-01/CONF.208/9 describing reports on the state of conservation of nineteen natural and seven cultural heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

NATURAL HERITAGE

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil)

VIII.2 The Committee learned that the Colon road was effectively closed in June 2001 through the intervention of the Brazilian Federal Police. The Committee was informed that the State Party provided information by a letter dated 5 December 2001 to the Centre on several steps taken: on the one hand to ensure permanent closure of the road and rehabilitate areas damaged by the illegal use of the road; and on the other, to assist local communities affected by the closure of the road.

VIII.3 To ensure permanent closure of the road, the Brazilian authorities sunk a ferry boat, scarified the whole of the 18 km of the road to render it unuseable, destroyed three bridges along the road and established a guard-post at the entrance to the road manned by 12 Federal Police personnel to prevent any attempt by dissidents to begin illegal use of the road again. Soon after the closure of the road on 13 June 2001, 5000 seedlings of native tree species were planted to rehabilitate areas damaged by the road; an additional 20,000 saplings are being planted during December 2001.

VIII.4 An interministerial Working Group has been created with the participation of the State Government of Paraná, and under the leadership of the Ministry for National Integration, to promote sustainable development initiatives among local populations inhabiting the vicinity of the Iguazu National Park. FUNPAR (Fundação da Universidade do Paraná) has been hired to carry out appraisal studies on how municipalities around the Park could benefit from projects and activities that will soon be launched. The Government of the State of Paraná has developed a joint project with the surrounding populations focusing on organic agriculture and sustainable use activities, including development of craftsmanship and ecotourism. Private enterprises and public agencies have set up infrastructure projects with the aim of fostering ecotourism and organic agriculture. These projects will employ approximately 450 persons.

VIII.5 The twenty-fifth session of the Bureau that met in Paris from 25 to 30 June 2001 had recommended that if the positive developments are sustained, the Committee could remove this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee concluded that the State Party had met the conditions it had set at its twenty-third session (1999), i.e. ensuring the permanent closure of the Colon road, to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee invited the State Party to continue forest rehabilitation efforts and monitor their outcome and build co-operative programmes to enhance income generation and employment opportunities for local communities in municipalities bordering the Park. The Committee decided to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested that IUCN and the Centre undertake a site visit during 2002/2003 to prepare a status report for submission to the twenty-seventh session of the Committee in June 2003. Based on the suggestions made by the Delegate of Argentina and the Observer of Brazil, the Committee welcomed the idea to study a permanent mechanism for transborder co-operation between the World Heritage sites of Iguazu (Brazil) and Iguazu (Argentina) National Parks, in particular for sustainable tourism.

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

VIII.6 The Committee noted with satisfaction that in accordance with the recommendation made at its last session the State Party had invited a Centre/IUCN/Ramsar mission to the site which took place from 1 to 4 October 2001. The Committee reviewed the findings of the mission, included in document WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.5.

VIII.7 The Committee was pleased to note that improvements observed by a 1998 mission to the integrity of the site have all been sustained and that the chances of continuing improvements to the state of conservation of the site are quite high. Population of the dalmatian pelicans, control of water flow in and out of the Lake, water quality indicators and institutional aspects such as continuity in data collection and maintenance for systematic monitoring of the state of conservation of the

site, were all showing positive or stable trends. The mission team had commended the staff for its dedication to preserve the site's World Heritage values despite cash-flow and financial constraints. The Committee invited the State Party to consider, if necessary, to submit a request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for purchasing equipment and materials essential to ensure effective regulation of water flow in and out of the Lake. The Committee took note of the fact that the management plan, being prepared with a small grant from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, will be finalized and adopted by the Government in due course and that discussions with other countries sharing the Danube Delta to develop transborder co-operation for World Heritage are underway.

VIII.8 The Committee congratulated the State Party for sustaining all the positive and stable trends in the rehabilitation of the site reported by the 1998 mission and welcomed the management's co-operation with the scientific community to ensure continuous data collection for systematic monitoring of changes in key parameters reflective of trends in the state of conservation of the site. The Committee invited the State Party to finalize the management plan and confirm its adoption by the Government and to submit a calendar of activities for preparing a proposal for a transborder World Heritage area in the Danube Delta in co-operation with other concerned States Parties to the Convention. The Committee decided to remove Srebarna from the List of World Heritage in Danger, effective from the date at which the State Party submits to the Centre, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, a copy of the approved management plan for the site and a letter committing core resources for the timely and effective implementation of the plan.

Manovo-Gounda-St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic (CAR))

VIII.9 The Committee noted with satisfaction that in accordance with the recommendations made at its last session, a mission to the site was fielded from 5-13 May 2001. The Committee took note of the conclusions and recommendations deriving from the examination of that report by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau held in June 2001.

VIII.10 The Committee noted that the Centre and IUCN were in the process of co-operating with the State Party to prepare a fundraising plan for the implementation of urgent rehabilitation measures and a realistic workplan including institutional responsibilities for the implementation of those measures. These plans will include benchmarks that could signal improvements in the state of conservation of the site and assist the Committee's decision concerning the eventual removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. As part of this co-operative process, a two-phase, 24-month programme of actions for addressing the critical and most urgent needs for the conservation of the site have been developed. The list of actions includes those needed to provide urgent protection for the site and others to encourage dialogue among stakeholders to link site protection to socio-

economic development of the broader region. The Committee took note of those actions included in pages 38 and 39 of the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/20 as part of the description of an emergency assistance request from the World Heritage Fund submitted by the State Party.

VIII.11 The Committee was informed that, in accordance with the recommendation of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, the Director-General had written to the Permanent Delegations of all countries neighbouring the Republic of Central Africa inviting their co-operation in mitigating across-the-border poaching. The Committee invited the State Party to actively seek the co-operation of all its neighbours to combat poachers entering from neighbouring countries. The Committee requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to identify potential financial sources, over and above that which the Committee may consider providing from the World Heritage Fund, to implement the urgent rehabilitation measures and long-term conservation actions for the benefit of this site. The Committee decided that the site be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

World Heritage sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Virunga National Park
Garamba National Park
Kahuzi-Biega National Park
Okapi Wildlife Reserve
Salonga National Park

VIII.12 The Committee was updated on the state of conservation of each of the five sites and the outcome of a mission led by the Director of the Centre to DRC from 24 November to 3 December 2001.

VIII.13 Virunga National Park has been considerably affected by the war in eastern DRC and its impacts. More than 20,000 families are resident in the central and northern sectors of the Park, most of them undertaking fishing and livestock herding activities. Renegade militia groups are hiding in the forests in the northern and central sectors of the Park and subsist by poaching on wild animals. It is believed that several keystone species in the area, including elephants and hippos, are being hunted regularly and fishing intensity in the Lakes of the Virunga National Park is on the increase. Forests are being cleared for agriculture and settlements. In the northern sector, ICCN staff from Beni are beginning to increase patrolling operations as guards have started receiving payments that are being made available under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project. State of conservation in the central sector is of serious concern as staff are unable to enter the area for regular patrols and surveillance. The southern sector of Virunga is relatively stable and regularly patrolled; mountain gorilla population in the latter sector is stable and has increased from 325 to 355 over the last decade. Staff belonging to protected areas in southern Virunga co-operate with their counterparts in Uganda and Rwanda under the aegis of the International Gorilla Conservation

Programme (IGCP). The northern and central sectors, and the southern sectors are under the authority of two separate rebel Governments. ICCN staff in the two territories are gradually increasing contacts and collaboration with one another to implement activities under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project.

VIII.14 Guards in **Garamba National Park** have been prevented from receiving their monthly payments provided under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project because of misunderstandings between the Conservator of Garamba and the co-operating NGO, i.e. the International Rhino Foundation (IRF). These differences were discussed by the two parties in the presence of other ICCN personnel from Kinshasa and the rebel-held region of Beni/Bunia during a meeting in Nairobi immediately preceding the mission led by the Director of the Centre. It is expected that the payments to Garamba staff can now be delivered without any hindrance. Despite these difficulties in the execution of the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project, guards continue to carry out their patrol and surveillance duties regularly. The population of the northern white rhinos in this site continues to be stable around 30 individuals.

VIII.15 Kahuzi-Biega National Park is perhaps the most threatened of the five sites despite the continuing presence of the the GTZ (Germany) financed project staff who pay the conservators and other senior staff. The guards and labourers are receiving payments under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project. Only 10% of the area is accessible to staff; most of the lowland sector (90% of the total area of the Park) is inaccessible due to the presence of armed groups and renegade militias. Coltan mining was rampant in this site at the time of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001 but has been reduced since then due to the sharp decline in the price of coltan. But miners who were camped in the Park have remained, resorting to poaching and gold mining. Park staff and GTZ Project personnel have made some contacts with armed groups along the borders of the inaccessible sector and have been able to enter into informal negotiations with them to seek support for protecting wildlife. Their task has been made difficult because site staff are not armed. The leaders of the rebel Government in Goma have agreed to address the possibility of providing arms and ammunition to the staff and progress in this regard will be monitored over the next few months.

VIII.16 In the **Okapi Wildlife Reserve** the guards and labourers have received payments under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF project dating back to October 2000 and the NGO partner assisting the Project to deliver payments to the site, i.e. Gilman International Conservation (GIC), has continued paying other supervisory staff, such as the conservators. Hence, the staff morale is rather high. A third of the area still remains inaccessible to staff, an improvement compared to last year when more than half the surface area of the Reserve was not accessible to the staff. Co-operation between staff and military authorities is improving and the mission team met with the Governor responsible for the area who committed to visit the area and dialogue with military

groups and local communities to bring about further improvements to the conservation of the site. The Conservator of the Reserve informed the mission that after a long period of time, no known cases of elephant poaching have been reported in the month of October 2001. In the short-to-medium term this site has the best potential among the five sites of DRC for recovery subject to the continuation of the current trend recovery.

VIII.17 The 36,000-square kilometer **Salonga National Park** is the only site under the direct responsibility of ICCN, Kinshasa; although about 20% of the area in the southeastern sector is controlled by the rebel authorities in Goma. The partner NGO, namely Zoological Society of Milwaukee (ZSM), has hired local staff who brave long distances and insecure access conditions to pay guards, labourers and other staff from support made available under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project. Poaching in the site continues; the number of staff working in the Park is totally inadequate for the huge area where access is extremely difficult. The ability of ICCN, Kinshasa, to better manage this and other protected areas under its authority may improve when a GTZ project, that was temporarily suspended in June 2001, re-starts operations in January 2002. This GTZ project may recommence payments to several ICCN-Kinshasa staff and provide other basic needs such as vehicles and travel allowances that would enable ICCN to better protect Salonga and other protected areas under its direct supervision.

VIII.18 The mission led by the Director of the Centre visited Kinshasa, as well as Goma, Beni and Bunia, which now serve as seats of rebel Government authorities in the eastern parts of DRC. The mission met with ICCN staff in all destinations as well as senior decision-makers, including Heads of the rebel administration in Goma, Beni and Bunia. The Director and his team met with representatives of staff from all five World Heritage sites and visited a guard post at the southwestern border of Virunga. The mission's flight in the eastern parts of DRC traced a south-north route along the western boundary of the Virunga National Park providing an overview of the site's state of conservation.

VIII.19 The Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) of the United States of America has applauded the dedication of the guards of protected areas of the DRC. The Director General of ICCN (Kinshasa) accepted an award on behalf of the guards of the protected areas of DRC at a ceremony in Hawaii in June 2001. The financial contribution of approximately US\$5,000 provided by members of SCB were used to provide medals to all the guards and labourers (approximately 1,000 individuals) of the five World Heritage sites; the Director of the Centre handed over medals to individual representatives of each site in simple ceremonies held during the mission. A part of the US\$5,000 collected will be used to provide small sums of cash compensation to widows of guards who lost their lives in the line of duty.

VIII.20 In accordance with the request of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, a detailed report (English and

French) on the progress of the UNESCO/DRC/UNF-UNFIP Project is included as document WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.4. The Minister of Environment of DRC in Kinshasa described the project to the Director of the Centre as a "project of hope" since it arrived at a time when no other donor was willing to provide support to staff of the five World Heritage sites. In the absence of monthly support payments to guards, training and monitoring and equipment and other amenities provided under the project, many of the staff might have deserted the Park.

VIII.21 The ICCN authorities in Kinshasa and in the rebel regions of Goma, Beni and Bunia also welcomed the Belgium Government-financed project to support local communities to work with staff to conserve the World Heritage sites. This aspect of the conservation agenda was not adequately financed under the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project. Hence, the Belgium contribution of 300,000 Euros over the 4-year period overlapping with that of the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project is seen as a critically important contribution for the success of the overall effort to sustain the conservation status of the five sites. The first planning workshop to identify site specific community support activities to be implemented under the UNESCO/Belgium Government Project has been scheduled for mid-February 2002 and will be held in Beni, at the boundary of the northern sector of the Virunga National Park. The workshop will be organized by a local NGO working in and around Virunga that has been established and supported by the WWF Regional Programme for Eastern Africa.

VIII.22 The Committee was informed of the important logistical and other support provided by the UN Organization Mission in the Congo (MONUC) both for travel of the mission team and in assisting partners such as ZSM to deliver UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project payments to staff in Salonga National Park. MONUC has staff in Kinshasa, Goma, Beni and Bunia and in several other parts of DRC and operates regular flights between these destinations that are open (at no cost) to other UN staff and their collaborating NGOs and DRC counterparts. MONUC, other UN agencies, bi and multilateral donors and a growing number of conservation NGOs who are entering the country as the peace process under the Lusaka Agreement slowly takes root, are likely to play a major role in reviving the conservation status of World Heritage sites in the DRC.

VIII.23 In the long-term, the return of peace and stability are essential to conservation of World Heritage sites and other protected areas and habitats in the DRC. The Centre will attempt to match resources provided by the UNF, the Government of Belgium and with other donors to expand sustainable development options in areas surrounding the five sites with a view to minimising pressure on resources within the sites. While demilitarizing the Parks and unarming renegade militias hiding in protected areas, including the World Heritage sites, is likely to be a difficult task, representatives of several aid organizations and the DRC and rebel military forces believe many such

armed groups comprise deserters and youth who would accept a return to civilian life if alternative livelihood options are offered to them.

VIII.24 The Committee was pleased to note that the Director-General of UNESCO, in accordance with the wish of the Committee expressed at several of its previous sessions, has agreed to lead a mission to Kinshasa (DRC), Kampala (Uganda) and Kigali (Rwanda) in late March 2002. The mission led by the Director of the Centre informed all important personalities met, including authorities of MONUC and other UN bodies in the DRC, of the Director-General's mission. Several persons met expressed the hope that the visit of the Director-General to the three capitals could establish a basis for co-operation amongst the three countries for biodiversity conservation, including important endangered species such as the mountain and the eastern lowland gorillas. As the Lusaka Peace Agreement's execution progresses, opportunities for formal collaboration between the DRC, Uganda and Rwanda for the conservation of mountain and lowland gorillas in the ecosystems shared by the three countries are likely to become available.

VIII.25 The Committee learned that the Centre, encouraged by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, has initiated a study of gorilla habitats as a pilot activity for the UNESCO-ESA (European Space Agency) Co-operative Initiative to demonstrate the use of satellite images and other space-borne technologies in monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. This initiative will generate state-of-the-art information on land-use changes in and around the two sites of significance as gorilla habitats; i.e. Virunga for the mountain gorilla and Kahuzi Biega for the eastern lowland gorilla. Similar studies on habitats of other apes such as the chimpanzees and the bonobos that inhabit Salonga are also foreseen as part of UNESCO collaboration with UNEP under the Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP) recently launched by UNEP.

VIII.26 The Committee noted with satisfaction the outcome of the mission led by the Director of the Centre but expressed its serious concerns over the range of threats to the integrity of the five World Heritage sites in the DRC. Several delegates expressed their appreciation of the mission team's efforts to visit a region of uncertainty and security risks to further the cause of World Heritage conservation. The Committee appealed to the international community to live up to the spirit and ideal of international co-operation promoted by the World Heritage Convention and intervene in all possible ways to assist ICCN, site staff, partner NGOs and others to protect and preserve the World Heritage sites of the DRC. The Committee applauded the Governments of Belgium and Germany and other donors like the UNF and NGO partners of the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project for the crucial support they are already providing for the conservation of the five sites. The Committee welcomed the opportunity for close collaboration with MONUC and other UN bodies in the execution of conservation-support activities and missions.

VIII.27 The Committee urged the Centre to liaise with all concerned units in UNESCO to ensure effective execution of UNF and Belgium-financed projects by minimizing administrative and other delays. The Committee requested the Centre, IUCN and other partners to expand the search for projects and programmes that provide alternative livelihoods for communities inhabiting areas around the World Heritage sites. Such alternative livelihood options may also have a role in attracting individuals belonging to armed groups hiding inside the World Heritage sites and to re-integrate them into civilian life. The Committee emphasized the need to explore the feasibility for building long-term conservation financing mechanisms for the DRC, one of the principal objectives of the UNESCO/DRC/UNF Project. The Committee thanked the Director-General of UNESCO for agreeing to lead a mission to the DRC, Rwanda and Uganda and invited him to consider discussing an agenda of co-operation amongst the three countries for World Heritage conservation as an important component of the implementation of activities under the Lusaka Peace Agreement.

VIII.28 The Committee requested that the Centre and IUCN work together with all concerned partners to prepare a long-term integrated strategy for the conservation of World Heritage in the DRC incorporating economic, social, peace and capacity building and other relevant aspects. The Committee recognized the need to educate youth and other target groups on the importance of World Heritage conservation and use the culture of the people of the DRC, particularly their music and songs, to inculcate and transmit conservation values. The Committee decided to retain all the five sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee thanked the Secretariat for their strong commitment in undertaking this mission in difficult conditions.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

VIII.29 The Committee noted with interest the inclusion of Sangay as one of the Latin American pilot sites in the UN Foundation financed pilot project entitled: "Enhancing our heritage: monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage sites". The project will test out monitoring and management effectiveness evaluation tools developed by an IUCN/WCPA Task Force. The project management in co-operation with IUCN, both in Gland and in Latin America, is discussing the details for the organization of a national workshop where the development of indicators and benchmarks to monitor changes in the state of conservation of the site and linking their monitoring to the timing of the possible removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger will be discussed. IUCN noted that there may be potential for removing this site from the Danger List. The Committee invited the Centre and IUCN to submit a report on the outcome of that workshop to its twenty-sixth session in Hungary in June 2002 and submit regular progress reports on the execution of project activities to the subsequent annual sessions of the Committee. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

VIII.30 The Committee noted that the Bureau, at its twenty-fifth session held in June 2001, had reviewed a report of an IUCN/Centre mission that visited the site from 8 to 13 April 2001 and recommended the adoption of the following specific benchmarks for the future monitoring of the state of conservation of Simen and its eventual removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger: (a) the re-alignment of the boundary of the Park to exclude the villages along the boundary of the Park; (b) the extension of the Park to include at least Mesarerya and Lemalino Wildlife Reserves; (c) significant and sustainable reduction in the human population density within the Park, especially within the core area; and (d) effective conservation within the extended National Park of a larger population of Walia Ibex and Simien Fox. The Centre had transmitted the Bureau's recommendations to the Committee by a letter dated 11 July 2001, but has not yet received a response.

VIII.31 The Committee adopted the benchmarks proposed by the Bureau and referred to above as a basis for the future monitoring of progress in improving the state of conservation of Simen and invited the State Party to formally respond to the letter from the Centre transmitting the above-mentioned recommendations. The Committee urged the State Party and its site-level partners in project execution to be cognizant of the need to implement the project in close consultation with all stakeholders, and particularly local communities under consideration. The Committee recommended that the Centre and IUCN collaborate with the State Party to raise international awareness for the conservation of this site and mobilize necessary financial resources to implement rehabilitation measures and to ensure the eventual removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger as soon as possible. The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

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

VIII.32 The Committee noted that two tri-national (Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Liberia) meetings were held in Abidjan and Man, Côte d'Ivoire, on 11 September, and from 12 – 14 September 2001, respectively. The World Heritage site is shared by Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire; Liberia is yet to ratify the Convention. The meetings were jointly financed by the World Heritage Fund, the Rio Tinto Plc. and the Governments of Guinea, Côte d'Ivoire and Liberia, in cooperation with several conservation NGOs, notably Fauna and Flora International (FFI), Conservation International (CI), Bird Life International (BLI), and the Netherlands Committee for IUCN. These meetings were intended to contribute to the long-term conservation of the Mount Nimba Massif by: (i) establishing and encouraging contacts between technical staff, site managers, local decision-makers and local community representatives to share information and experience; and (ii) increasing harmonization of management planning and practice

among the three countries that share the Mount Nimba ecosystem.

VIII.33 The one-day seminar on the 11 September 2001 was designed to sensitise Government authorities on the importance of regional co-operation for the protection of Mount Nimba. The second, technical meeting from 12 to 14 September discussed in detail basic issues of cross-border co-operation, national and regional problems facing Mount Nimba, the value of a regional approach and biodiversity conservation at the regional level. The meeting put in place a strategy for continued dialogue for future cooperation for the conservation of the Mount Nimba ecosystem for the benefit of the three countries. The meeting in Man decided to hold a second meeting before the end of 2001 in Conakry, in the Republic of Guinea. Exact dates for the second meeting has not yet been communicated to the Centre.

VIII.34 The goal of the second meeting is to “initiate a trilateral dialogue for the conservation of Mount Nimba”, and the objectives are to: validate the issues and problems identified by the Man meeting; identify the strategy and tools for the conservation of Mount Nimba; propose a protocol for long-term collaboration between the three countries for joint planning and conservation of Mount Nimba; and prioritise national and regional actions. The two meetings were the first trilateral event on Mount Nimba. Participants at the Man meeting included representatives from local Governments, local development interest groups, village leaders, protected area managers, UNESCO and the MAB Programme, mining industry, water and forest management authorities and groups concerned with refugees and settlements. The meetings also invited the participation, for the first time, of Rio Tinto, a mining company, to dialogue with conservation stakeholders interested in the long-term protection of Mount Nimba.

VIII.35 The GEF Focal point at UNDP in Guinea and Mr Salamady Toure, the Director of CEGEN, have informed the Centre that the first three components of the GEF/PDF-B grants for the Mount Nimba (UNDP-GEF Project Gui/2000/31 financed by the World Heritage Fund and GEF) have been completed. The activities of this project comprise the following: (a) identification of the elements for the preparation of guidelines for integrated management of Mount Nimba and its surroundings; (b) building local and national technical and institutional capacity with a view to improving management; (c) establishing support services, such as communication, monitoring, promotion and alternative livelihood options for communities to ensure Mount Nimba conservation; and (d) preparation of a detailed long-term, Integrated Development Project for the Mount Nimba region. UNDP and the Centre are currently discussing the elaboration of the Integrated Development Project for Mt. Nimba as part of a UNDP-GEF Project that may last over a period of 7 to 10 years with a total budget of US\$8m. GEF has agreed in principle to provide US\$6m; additional resources will be sought from other donors. The Centre, UNDP/Conakry and other partners concerned are currently discussing the

best way forward for elaborating the project document early and the roles of the different institutions concerned in the project execution, co-ordination and management. It is hoped that the design of that project will include benchmarks and success indicators that could facilitate the Committee's efforts to track the state of conservation of the site and its eventual considerations concerning the removal of Mount Nimba from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

VIII.36 In Man, discussions were also held concerning the setting up of a Mount Nimba Foundation. Guinea is still keen to establish the Foundation to enable it to put in place sustained support mechanisms for Mount Nimba. At Man the participants were informed that Côte d'Ivoire is setting up an agency for the management of protected areas with financial assistance from the World Bank and the European Union. This agency will have responsibility for the management of Mount Nimba and other World Heritage sites in Côte d'Ivoire and the mandate to mobilize funds from international sources for Côte d'Ivoire. It would therefore be difficult to set up a common Foundation for all three countries sharing Mount Nimba. The Man meeting requested the Centre and FFI to assist Guinea with a consultant to study the feasibility of setting up a Foundation, and look into the possibility of utilising some of the funds that will become available under the GEF project as initial seed money for establishing the Foundation.

VIII.37 The Committee may recall that a donor's Round Table meeting was held at the Centre for Scientific and Technical Documentation (CEDUST) in Conakry in April 1996 and that the conclusions of that Round Table were reported to the twentieth session of the Bureau in June 1996. The Guinean mining company NIMCO, reported at that time that it would donate US\$500,000 each year for the conservation of Mount Nimba as soon as the mine became operational. The company has since then left Guinea and the promised funds were never made available. The Guinean Government is currently negotiating with other mining companies mainly Billiton (from South Africa) and EURONIMBA (a concession of European Union). These two companies are currently studying various environment-friendly options on how to control polluted waste waters and avoid sedimentation and erosion into rivers which supply drinking water to people downstream. The companies estimate that around 80 million tons of tailing will be produced each year, and hope to construct a dam where the tailings can be contained and allowed to percolate down into the soil without runoff. The companies also plan to forgo the mining of about 50 million tons of rich iron-ore in some targeted areas of the mountain for environmental and ecological reasons. The companies are studying ways to avoid bringing a large work force and their families near the mining areas by relocating living quarters away from the mining zone.

VIII.38 To guarantee the application of rigorous environmental management standards, an "International Memorandum of Understanding" or Accord is to be

established between the mining companies and the Government of Guinea and will be overseen by UN Agencies (UNESCO-World Heritage Centre, UNEP, UNDP, FAO etc.) and international non-governmental organizations (IUCN, FFI, WWF, BLI etc). The Memorandum will bind the companies to "good behaviour" in biodiversity conservation vis-à-vis their mining activities near Mount Nimba Nature Reserve of Guinea. The companies have expressed interest to put aside US\$18 per ton of iron ore produced for the conservation of the environment in Guinea and particularly of the Mount Nimba area; annually, an estimated 800 million tons will be produced by the companies.

VIII.39 The mining activities in the Mount Nimba massif have to be carefully controlled for their environmental impacts. The parts of the Mount Nimba ecosystem in Liberia, the only part that is not World Heritage, has undergone significant transformation since the 1950s due to mining activities, shifting cultivation and human settlements. The area includes the East Nimba and West Nimba National Forests, gazetted in the 1960s. In the late 1970s IUCN recommended that these two forests be connected, other important adjacent areas added, and the entire area set aside as a strict nature reserve. The Liberian Mining Corporation continues to have a caretaker role in the administration of the affairs of Mount Nimba, while the Forestry Development Authority is the other major governmental authority involved in the area. There has been no organized conservation programme for Mount Nimba on the Liberian side as there has been in Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire.

VIII.40 The Committee congratulated the two States Parties, UNDP and the conservation NGOs for starting the tri-partite dialogue for the conservation of the overall Mount Nimba ecosystem and invited the Government of Liberia to consider becoming a signatory to the World Heritage Convention as soon as possible. In the meantime, the Committee invited the Government of Liberia to consider implementing the 1970 IUCN recommendation to gazette East and West Mount Nimba Forests as strict nature reserves, develop a project based on the two strict nature reserves to participate in the tri-national initiative and in due course and following ratification of the Convention, consider nominating the two strict nature reserves for inclusion in the World Heritage site currently shared by Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea. The Committee urged the Government of Liberia to co-operate with UNDP and the conservation NGOs to undertake a rapid biodiversity assessment of the two reserves to determine their potential for incorporation within the World Heritage site shared by Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire.

VIII.41 The Committee requested that the Centre and IUCN assist the three countries in organizing the second tri-national meeting in order to continue the dialogue and assist in the preparation of a detailed long-term, Integrated Development Project for Mount Nimba. The Committee asked the Centre to collaborate with all conservation NGOs to study the modalities for establishing the Foundation for Mount Nimba in Guinea, and the feasibility

to utilize parts of the GEF funds that are likely to be made available for the Integrated Development Project for Mount Nimba for launching the Foundation. The Committee requested that the States Parties, CEGEN and others co-operate to elaborate the International Memorandum of Understanding for thorough review by the collaborating UN agencies and conservation NGOs prior to its adoption by the Governments. The Committee decided that the site be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

VIII.42 The Committee was informed that the State Forest Administration of Honduras had informed the Centre in August 2001 of the actions taken to follow up on the recommendations of the IUCN mission to this site in October 2000. Principal elements of the report submitted by the Honduran authorities are:

- Compensation for people living inside the core zone of Rio Platano has started and the first 52 families out of 152 have voluntarily moved to areas outside after receiving 3.7 million lempiras from the Honduran Government. The Ministry of Finance has made available additional funds for the second phase of compensatory payments;
- Demarcation of boundaries of the core zone has begun and 26 km of the most critical stretches of the boundary have been marked in co-operation with local communities. Demarcation of the boundaries in the southern and western parts of the buffer zone has been initiated;
- A field office has been set up in response to the administrative and infrastructure needs of the World Heritage site protection in the region. Two more field offices will be set up in the near future;
- A multitemporal analysis on vegetation cover and expansion of the agricultural area within the reserve has been undertaken. This analysis allows systematic monitoring of the state of the ecosystem. Initial findings of the analysis points to a decrease in the rate of loss of the vegetation compared to the findings of a similar study undertaken during 1997-1999;
- A study of the threats on Rio Platano BR is being elaborated by the Regional Biosphere Reserve Programme (RBRP), Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Honduras and NGO's. The national workshop under the UN Foundation financed project, "Enhancing our heritage: monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage sites" is expected to be convened soon and will look at threats and state of conservation related issues. These initiatives will contribute towards improved monitoring of the site's conservation status;
- The first forest management plan was elaborated by the RBRP staff following the Transforma approach developed by CATIE (A regional Research and Training Institute in Costa Rica). Another plan for organisational and productive aspects for eight agroforestry cooperatives in specific locations in the southern part of the Reserve and locally co-ordinated, nine community-development plans are under

preparation. These plans will identify priority actions for social and community infrastructure and for facilitating co-management and protection of the Reserve. Establishment of a technical commission to prepare a legal instrument for defining the recognition of land use rights within the Reserve has been proposed;

- Action has been taken to reinforce the staff in charge of the management of the site. A forest technician and three guards have been hired. Coordination with other partners like TNC (The Nature Conservancy) and WWF, Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project, German Technical Co-operation and local NGOs has been strengthened;
- A three-year workplan of specific actions linking biodiversity conservation to sustainable tourism development in and around Rio Platano is to be finalized before the end of 2001; this work plan has been elaborated as part of the execution of another UN Foundation-financed global initiative attempting to link biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism development at World Heritage sites.

VIII.43 The Committee welcomed the range of initiatives undertaken by the State Party, and other partners including those undertaken as part of two UN Foundation financed projects that are contributing towards the implementation of the recommendations of the IUCN mission to the site undertaken in October 2000. These were endorsed by the Committee at its last session in Cairns, Australia. The Committee urged the Centre and IUCN to continue to collaborate with the State Party and partners to sustain the current momentum gained in improvements in the state of conservation of the site. The Committee recommended that a detailed assessment of the state of conservation of the site, including considerations of the possible removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, be prepared for submission to the twenty-seventh session of the Committee in June 2003. The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

VIII.44 The Committee was informed that at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001, the Bureau had noted that the mission to this site had been postponed from May to October 2001 due to climatic reasons. Despite regular contacts with the State Party and agreements of all parties concerned the proposed mission has been delayed again and is now scheduled for February 2002. Security risks in the area continue to prevail. Uncertainties linked to the organisation of regular field visits to this site has led the management of the UNESCO/IUCN/UNF-UNFIP Project "Enhancing our heritage: monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage Sites" to substitute Manas with the Keoladeo National Park as one of the three pilot sites for the project in South Asia (the other two sites being Kaziranga National Park of India and the Royal Chitwan National Park of Nepal).

VIII.45 The Committee was pleased to note that the Government of Bhutan has ratified the World Heritage

Convention in October 2001. It urged the joint Centre/IUCN mission to Manas in February 2002 to explore possibilities for initiating a dialogue between India and Bhutan for promoting trans-border collaboration in the management of the World Heritage site of Manas Wildlife Sanctuary of India and the possible nomination of the Royal Manas National Park of Bhutan as World Heritage. The Committee stressed the necessity to carry the mission to Manas without any further delays and recommended that a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and the implementation of rehabilitation measures accepted by the Bureau in 1997 be submitted to its twenty-sixth session in June 2002.

Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)

VIII.46 The Committee was informed that a workshop for members of the local Committee for the development and the management of the site was held in Iferouan, Niger from 19 to 24 September 2001 in which the Centre was represented. A "Feasibility and modality study on the project for the reintroduction of Red necked Ostriches for Air and Ténéré", undertaken with the assistance of National Wildlife Research Centre in Saudi Arabia, has been completed.

VIII.47 A mission for rapid evaluation of fauna in Air and Ténéré, financed by the World Heritage Fund contributions for the implementation of the emergency rehabilitation plan approved by the Committee at its twenty-third session in 1999, was undertaken from 5 to 27 March 2001. The Committee noted that IUCN had reviewed a copy of the *Rapid Wildlife Assessment Report* for Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves and observed that the principle species of large mammals had recovered to viable levels similar to those seen before the war. But the ostrich has totally disappeared, and the gazelle was rarely seen during the assessment mission in March 2001. IUCN had also noted that despite the recovery of many species, the overall state of conservation of the site remains threatened. IUCN has highlighted the following recommendations of the Report: (a) restart and strengthen surveillance activities; (b) establish regulations on tourist activities; (c) create a breeding centre for large Sahel-Saharan mammals and ostrich, with a view to reintroduce individuals and strengthen conservation of wild populations; (d) develop a wildlife census system to include the participation of stakeholders; and (e) develop reliable survey techniques for estimating the addax population.

VIII.48 The Committee was informed that the ostrich in Air and Ténéré is a North African sub species and is now found as a viable population only in Chad. IUCN is of the view that the re-introduction of ostrich by selecting individuals from the population in Chad is quite important because individuals from other sub-species in other countries of the region may not adapt to the specific conditions in Niger. Re-introduction is vital for generating benefits for the local community in the long-term as they will be able to undertake breeding programmes and make a living from the utilisation of the ostrich population and its

products. The Committee strongly supported the report's recommendations and invited the State Party to implement the recommendations of the *Rapid Wildlife Assessment Report*. The Committee noted that valuable advice on ostrich re-introduction programmes may be obtained from the ostrich specialist group of IUCN's Species Survival Commission (SSC). The re-establishment of the ostrich and addax (gazelle) populations of Air and Ténéré is likely to take several years and the site may have to be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger until such time when conditions for the recovery of these populations could be ensured.

VIII.49 The Committee was informed that the Fonds Francais de l'Environnement Mondiale (FFEM) has initiated a 5-year programme of support for equipment and the reintroduction of species. This programme is being implemented in co-operation with the "Direction Nationale de la Faune" and the IUCN Office in Niamey. Within the framework of a GEF programme concerned with the "Biodiversity of Sahara", UNDP and IUCN, Niamey, are also assisting with the implementation of selected aspects of rehabilitation and species reintroduction programmes as well as the establishment of a database for monitoring. IUCN Niamey is playing a wide-ranging support role in the development of several co-operative initiatives with other donors and assisting the Government of Niger to effectively conserve this important site. The Committee noted that the Centre has transmitted letters of appreciation to FFEM, Swiss Department of Technical Co-operation and DANIDA for their support to develop conservation projects for this site. The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the efforts of the State Party to implement the rehabilitation plan and generate wide-ranging donor support for the conservation of the site. The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal)

VIII.50 The Committee noted that in June 2001, the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau noted detailed findings of the results of the two-person mission undertaken to the site from 31 March to 10 April 2001, including mechanical and biological control measures being initiated to prevent the spread of the invasive species *Salvinia molesta*. The Committee noted the awareness, donor co-ordination and other co-operative activities needed for the effective eradication of this invasive species.

VIII.51 UNESCO's Division of Equipment Procurement is in the process of purchasing and delivering essential equipment foreseen as part of the project, for which the Committee approved a sum of US\$130,000 at its last session in Cairns, Australia. A regional workshop on invasive species was organized from 15 to 17 October 2001, in Djoudj, Senegal, with joint financial support from Ramsar, IUCN and the World Heritage Fund. The Chairperson approved an amount of US\$20,000 to enable the participation of World Heritage site managers at this workshop. The aim of the workshop was to work out modalities for a co-operative project on "Wetlands and

Harmful Invasive Species in Africa – Awareness and Information” involving IUCN, the Ramsar Convention Bureau, the MacArthur Foundation, Wetlands International, WWF International and others. Focusing on fresh water ecosystems, the programme aimed to define the best strategic tools and the most appropriate operational instruments that can help to achieve the prevention, control or the eradication of invasive species wherever they could have adverse impacts on ecological, economic and social functions and values of wetlands. The project led to the establishment of a network of expertise who could provide “rapid response services” and be accessed quickly by wetland managers in need of further information and assistance in the prevention and control of invasive species.

VIII.52 Preliminary information from the State Party indicate that biological control methods being tested out in the site may already be leading to considerable control of invasive species. The Committee requested that the Centre and IUCN obtain more detailed and quantitative information to validate such claims. The Committee requested that the Centre and IUCN collaborate with the State Party, the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, FAO and other partners to further efforts to control and eradicate *Salvinia molesta* from the Djoudj wetlands. The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)

VIII.53 The Committee was informed of the concerns of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau (June 2001) regarding the deterioration in the ecology of the Lake from 1999 to 2000 as lower than average amounts of rain fell in the area. The Sidi Barak Dam construction and its link to the Tunisian Water Grid have been completed; but water releases from the Dam to the Lake had not yet commenced. The Lake needs 280 million of cubic meters of water annually and the Sidi Barak Dam is expected to serve as the stabilizer compensating for any annual shortfalls caused by low rainfall and/or high rates of evapotranspiration. The Committee noted that the Observer of Tunisia had expressed the hope to the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau that the Bureau and the Committee would provide adequate time for determining the efforts of the State Party to rehabilitate Ichkeul and support the extension and strengthening of the scientific monitoring programme that has been set up by the State Party.

VIII.54 The Committee noted that IUCN had reviewed the report from the State Party, dated September 2001, on "Ecosystem status and safeguarding measures for Ickeul National Park". The report contains detailed information on actions taken to implement several earlier recommendations of the Bureau and the Committee made over the years and quantitative, time-series data on a number of parameters that may be useful in tracking changes in Lake ecology. IUCN has started negotiations with the State Party to select parameters and indicators for monitoring the state of conservation of this site and

establishing benchmarks, time-frames and conditions for the Committee's annual assessments of progress made by the State Party to rehabilitate the Ichkeul National Park. The Committee took note of the fact that the State Party has submitted an emergency assistance request from the World Heritage Fund for a sum of US\$50,000 that would be used for international expertise and national level activities to assist the State Party to refine the scientific monitoring programme it has developed and meet the needs of conservation monitoring and reporting to be agreed upon by the State Party and IUCN.

VIII.55 The Committee urged the State Party and IUCN to continue and finalize their negotiations soon and agree on benchmarks, time frames and conditions that could form the basis of the Committee's annual monitoring of the state of conservation of the site and for determining progress in State Party efforts to restore the Lake Ichkeul ecosystem. The Committee invited its Chairperson to consider the emergency assistance request submitted by the State Party and assist the State Party to take all necessary measures to rehabilitate the integrity of the World Heritage site. The Committee requested that a detailed report on the outcome of the negotiations between IUCN and the State Party be submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in June 2002. The Committee decided to retain the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda)

VIII.56 The Committee noted with satisfaction that security conditions in the Park have improved and that the Park was re-opened to visitors in July 2001 and that the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, based on an identification of the Park's needs with regard to purchase of equipment and materials had approved a sum of US\$64,000 as emergency assistance to the site. The UNESCO Division for Equipment Procurement is assisting the Centre and the State Party to purchase essential communication and other equipment requested urgently by the site management. The Committee urged the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to assess other needs that the site may require in order to fully recover its integrity and regain its role as an important visitor destination within the Ugandan network of protected areas. The Committee proposed that the Centre and IUCN discuss with the State Party to field a mission to the site in 2002 with a view to providing a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site, including an assessment of the feasibility of its early removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger to the twenty-seventh session of the World Heritage Committee in 2003.

World Heritage sites of the United States of America:

Everglades National Park

VIII.57 The State Party has updated the comprehensive report it submitted at the time of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau on this site. The Committee noted the

following specific improvements achieved between June and December 2001:

- The appropriation increases of the fiscal year 2002 over the previous year for Everglades restoration amounts to a sum of US\$31.4 million or a 37.4%;
- As of May 2001 104,340 acres or 95% of the authorized addition of lands are either in public ownership condemnation or referred for Declaration of Taking; only about 5,260 acres of the habitat earmarked for Park expansion remains to be acquired. Sufficient funds for the acquisition of this remaining tract of land have been earmarked; and
- The Everglades Strategic Plan is now available at the web site: <http://www.nps.gov/ever/current/strategicplan/>.

VIII.58 In response to a query from the Committee regarding the potential for an early removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Observer from the State Party committed to discuss the matter with relevant authorities in Washington D.C. and report to the Centre as soon as possible.

Yellowstone National Park

VIII.59 The State Party has updated the comprehensive report it submitted at the time of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau on this site. The Committee noted the following specific improvements, achieved between June and December 2001:

- The number of predatory lake trout fish removed through intensive gill netting and liberal angling regulations have increased from 28,000 (in the June 2001 report) to more than 43,000 in December 2001;
- Wooden water tanks at Indian Creek Campground were replaced in fall 2001; work in the contract awarded, in 2000, to line sewer lines at Lake and Mammoth Lewis Lake has started. But a backlog of work with regard to replacement or updating of smaller wastewater facilities remains to be attended to;
- The decision to ban the use of snowmobiles in place of multi-passenger snowcoaches, reported at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001, has been challenged by the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association and the Department of Interior has entered into a settlement agreement with the Association. As part of the settlement the National Park Service will prepare a supplemental EIS to analyze the ban on snowmobile use in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and the John D. Rockefeller Jr., Memorial Parkway and the alternatives to the ban. The process to prepare the supplemental EIS, invite public comment, carry out new research that may be needed, finalize, publish and begin execution of decisions would have awaited until the end of 2002. The outcome of the analysis will result either in the continuation of the ban or some form of continued snowmobile use.

VIII.60 The Committee recommended that the State Party, IUCN and the Centre discuss and develop action plans for

the two sites including benchmarks and conditions for monitoring progress in the restoration of the integrity of the two sites and for guiding the Committee's decisions concerning the eventual removal of the two sites from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested that the outcome of the discussions between State Party, IUCN and the Centre be reported to the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in June 2002. The Committee decided that both Everglades and Yellowstone be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

State of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Butrint (Albania)

VIII.61 The Committee examined the state of conservation of the site and urged the State Party to submit a report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations made by the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Butrint Foundation mission by 1 February 2002, for examination at its twenty-sixth session (June 2002).

Angkor (Cambodia)

VIII.62 The Committee examined the report on the state of conservation of Angkor and additional information presented concerning the progress being made by the national authorities together with support from UNESCO and relevant donors to implement the conservation and management plans of the APSARA Authorities.

VIII.63 The Committee, after having examined the report on the state of conservation of the site, commended the Royal Government of Cambodia for the significant efforts undertaken in the reorganization of the APSARA Authority. In the perspective of implementation in the near future of the Master Plan for Development of Cultural Tourism at Angkor, it invited APSARA to strengthen its capacities in the management of private investment requests, notably with regard to the archaeological park, and to call upon all national and international expertise necessary. Taking note of the continued progress being made by the International Co-ordination Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor (CIC) and to mark the tenth anniversary of the inscription of the site, the Committee requested that a report with technical details on all activities carried out over the past ten years be made available to the Committee for information. Finally, the Committee decided to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India)

VIII.64 The Committee examined the report on the state of conservation of the Group of Monuments at Hampi. The Committee was informed that the Centre organized a mission by an international rural planner in close co-operation with the national and state government

authorities responsible for the conservation and management of this large site. The expert mission assisted the authorities concerned to elaborate and carry out an impact assessment study related to the two bridges partially constructed within the site and to examine the feasibility and alternative sites for relocating these bridges. The Committee was informed that the Centre had received information concerning the progress being made in establishing a Hampi Management and Development Authority to co-ordinate, in a comprehensive manner, all conservation and development activities within the core World Heritage protected areas of Hampi.

VIII.65 The Delegate of India confirmed that necessary steps were being taken by the concerned authorities to establish the Hampi Management and Development Authority and to implement the recommendations of the UNESCO international expert. He informed the Committee that the report on the progress made would be submitted in time for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

VIII.66 The Committee welcomed the positive actions taken and being planned by the State Party and the World Heritage Centre to elaborate a comprehensive management plan for the site. The Committee congratulated the State Government of Karnataka and the Deputy Commissioner of Bellary for taking the necessary actions in removing a large number of illegal encroachments from within the World Heritage protected areas. The Committee requested the State Party and the Centre to continue its close co-operation in order to complete the needs assessment and feasibility studies as a matter of urgency, in order to ensure that an integrated conservation and development management plan be elaborated, adopted and implemented as soon as possible. The Committee requested the State Party and the Centre to report on the progress made in removing the threats to the site for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

Bahla Fort (Oman)

VIII.67 The Committee examined the report on the state of conservation of Bahla Fort and noted the significant progress made since the last Bureau session, especially concerning the conservation works being carried out within the Fort and on the two nearby Mosques. The Committee also noted that the preparation of a Management Plan has been finally undertaken, and the strong commitment, stressed by the Delegate of Oman, of the State Party towards the protection and presentation of this site.

VIII.68 The Committee commended the State Party for having started the preparation of the Management Plan, in close collaboration with the Centre, and for having submitted a request of international assistance for the organization of a Regional Seminar on the Conservation of Earthen Structures. The Committee invited the State Party to pursue its efforts towards the completion and full implementation of the Management Plan, and requested

the Centre to submit a report on its progress at the next session of the Bureau, in April 2002.

Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)

VIII.69 The Committee examined the report on the state of conservation of the Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore. The Committee was informed that the Director-General of the Department of Archaeology had informed the Centre on 3 December 2001 that all efforts were being made to implement the recommendations of the Committee, Bureau and UNESCO international expert missions to address the conservation and management issues facing the property. In particular, the Department of Archaeology was continuing its discussion with the Lahore Development Co-operation and the Lahore Commissioner to clarify the land-ownership of the area where the demolished 375-year old hydraulic works were located.

VIII.70 The Observer of Pakistan, assuring the Committee of her Government's continued commitment to the World Heritage Convention, expressed her Government's appreciation for the support of the World Heritage Committee and the Centre in enhancing the management of the site. She stated that the annual plan for 2002 had been recently adopted by the authorities which specifically addresses the recommendations of the Committee, Bureau and UNESCO expert missions organized to respond to the conservation and management needs of this site. Concerning the 375-year old hydraulic works that were partially demolished in 1999, the Observer informed the Committee that conservation and restoration work was being planned.

VIII.71 With reference to Article 5a of the Convention which calls for heritage conservation activities to be integrated within the overall comprehensive planning process for heritage areas, the Observer of Pakistan underscored the importance for the Committee to take into due consideration the conservation needs within the context of sustainable development, especially in highly populated urban areas such as Lahore.

VIII.72 The Committee welcomed the positive actions taken and being planned by the State Party and the World Heritage Centre for the rehabilitation of the Shalamar Gardens and in elaborating a comprehensive management plan for the site. The Committee requested the State Party and the Centre to continue its close co-operation to ensure that an integrated conservation, management and development plan be elaborated, adopted and implemented as soon as possible. The Committee requested the State Party and the Centre to report on the progress made in removing the threats facing the site for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

VIII.73 The World Heritage Committee took note of the second periodic report prepared by the the National Institute for Culture of Peru, on the implementation of the Master Plan of the site. It also noted that priority was

given to international fund-raising. Furthermore, as indicated in the first report, the dwellings, illegally constructed in situ, have been demolished. However, illegal cultivation continues at the site.

VIII.74 To remedy this situation, the high-level Chan Chan Commission was created, comprising representatives from the Ministries of Education and Agriculture. However, it has not yet identified a satisfactory solution. To contend with looting of tombs and other protection problems at the site, the surveillance staff has been reinforced. The question of introducing mounted police has also been considered, but due to lack of funds, the construction of the stables has not been undertaken. Furthermore, a multisectoral Committee including local authorities and a consultative experts' commission have been established.

VIII.75 The book collection of the documentation centre on earthen architecture has increased slightly and the workshop on the conservation of materials works in cooperation with the Universities of Carolina and Utah State. According to the report, the stockage of archaeological objects is carried out under optimal conditions.

VIII.76 The excavation works have continued in the north part of the Tschudi Palace, as well as conservation work on the structures and reliefs of the Huaca La Esmeralda and the Huaca Arco Iris, and in the sector of the Audiences. A new signposting and new access have improved the presentation of the site.

VIII.77 However, the Committee noted that a great part of the activities foreseen in the Master Plan for 2000 and 2001 have slowed down or been postponed due to lack of funds, including the indispensable drainage project which was postponed until 2002 and which should be carried out in cooperation with the National Research Council of Italy. Also, following the El Niño phenomenon and the ensuing rise in the underground water level, the waterproofing of the bases of the structure is becoming a matter of urgency. In fact, if it is true that climatic changes have encouraged the return of fauna and flora to their original state, these changes have negative and unexpected repercussions on the adobe structures.

VIII.78 The Committee took note of this information as well as that provided by the State Party concerning the Panamerican training courses carried out with the TERRA Group. It commended the important effort made by the State Party to submit a report on the site. However, it considered that the State Party should recognize the need to provide reports in a timely fashion and with sufficient information.

VIII.79 The Committee also noted the measures undertaken by the national authorities and urged the State Party to submit a more detailed report by 1 February 2002, on the implementation of the master plan, the legal response to questions concerning the encroachment of the site and the measures undertaken concerning the presence

of police for the protection of the site, to be examined at its twenty-sixth session. Furthermore, the Committee decided to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)

VIII.80 The Committee examined the report on the state of conservation of Zabid. It noted the positive development of the situation on the ground, especially with regard to the large mobilization of resources, both at the national and international level, resulting from the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000.

VIII.81 The Committee also noted the results of the first missions carried out by the Centre in the framework of the emergency assistance approved by the Bureau at its last session in June 2001. The very significant steps taken by the State Party in order to halt new constructions within the World Heritage site, and the recommendations of the Centre concerning the necessary steps for the future were recognized. These recommendations include:

- Urgent launching of a campaign for awareness raising and systematic information targeted at the local population.
- Creation of a 1 km wide buffer zone from Madrassa Al-Baysha, situated east of the town, including an arc of 225° in a clockwise direction up to the North entrance of the town.
- Creation of protection zones of a minimum width of 50m around the mosques and medersas (numbering 83) in the town.
- Strengthen and physically protect the historic residential ensembles of the town which are in danger of falling into ruin or collapsing (about 200 houses).
- Revitalisation of the Souk by undertaking effective measures to stimulate the economy.
- Include in the urban extension of the town, the area situated north/north-east of the historic town, in the framework of the new urban plan under preparation.
- Start immediate production by the brick oven and build others to be able to respond to the new demands.

VIII.82 The Committee commended the Yemeni authorities for their efforts and continued co-operation with the World Heritage Centre, and thanked the GTZ, the KFW and the Dutch authorities for their precious contributions and their interest in the Historic Town of Zabid. The Committee, furthermore, encouraged the Yemeni authorities to continue their efforts and immediately implement the seven urgent measures recommended by the World Heritage Centre mission of September/October 2001.

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

VIII.83 The Committee considered the decisions of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau (WHC-01/CONF.208/4) and the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10). The relevant section of the report of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau is attached as Annex IX to this report.

NATURAL HERITAGE

MINING AND WORLD HERITAGE

VIII.84 The Committee noted that the proceedings of the workshop on "Mining and World Heritage" were published by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME), IUCN and the World Heritage Centre and were distributed to all Committee members. The Committee furthermore noted that the proposal for the establishment of a Working Group on World Heritage and Mining, as proposed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session, and will be presented to its twenty-sixth session.

Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List examined by the Committee

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)

VIII.85 The Committee noted the concerns over the Territorial Development Plan (TDP), which it anticipates will lead to further incremental development within the remaining larger area. It requested the State Party to ensure that tourism development does not take place in the remaining TDP area in the future. The Committee urged that the mission invited by the State Party be carried out as soon as possible.

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)

VIII.86 The Committee welcomed the recommendations of IUCN, and called upon the State Party to take urgent action to halt illegal poaching in the Reserve, and requested a full report from the State Party on this situation by 1 February 2002. This report shall be submitted for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2002), at which time it will decide on the need for a mission to the site. Furthermore, the Committee commended the chief executives of major European logging firms active in Central Africa, representatives from various conservation NGOs (WCS, IUCN, WWF) and officials from the World Bank and the European Union for their initial efforts in bringing stakeholders together to tackle the environmental problems associated with logging operations. The code of conduct should be supported, and the Committee urged the CEO-AWG to strengthen its efforts to involve Asian companies in the work of the group and to undertake every

effort to include all logging companies working in Cameroon.

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

VIII.87 The Committee, recognising the continued and increasing threats posed to the marine and terrestrial flora and fauna of the Islands, urged the State Party to make all efforts to finalise the specific regulations under the Special Law and enforce them as soon as possible. The Committee commended the ruling by the State Party's Constitutional Court to uphold the Galapagos Special Law. It also commended the Ecuadorian Government for supporting the "Sea Shepherd" patrols in the Galapagos Marine Reserve, as well as efforts to protect the marine ecosystem in the Reserve. The Committee also commended the *Smart Voyager* initiative, given the nature of tourism visitation to the Galapagos and the impacts of tourism on the fragile environment and in light of the proposed Marine Reserve. It believed that consideration should be given to promoting similar schemes in other World Heritage sites. The Committee furthermore noted that the sea lion incident demonstrates the need to enhance the capacity of the Park to reinforce patrolling and control of the Islands.

Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya)

VIII.88 The Committee requested the State Party to invite a mission to the site as soon as possible to enable an independent assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage site.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

VIII.89 The Committee noted that the State Party had invited a UNESCO-IUCN mission to this site following the recommendation of the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. The mission took place from 25 August to 3 September 2001. IUCN and the Director of the UNESCO-Moscow Office, representing the World Heritage Centre, conducted the mission. The Committee was informed that the full report of this mission was presented to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau and that it noted in particular the series of recurrent problems and new potential threats that, according to IUCN, would seriously threaten the integrity of this site.

VIII.90 The Committee noted the Bureau's concern about a number of new potential threats to the integrity of this site including a project to develop a gas and oil pipeline to China, which was confirmed, and that the Government of the Republic of Buryatia had granted a license to Buryat Gas Company. The Committee was also informed that a number of Bureau members noted that no indication was received from the State Party concerning the inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that a number of consultation meetings on this matter were held between the Delegation of the Russian Federation, IUCN, the Director of the UNESCO Moscow office and staff members of the Centre. In conclusion, the need was recognized to consult and comment on the results of the mission to Lake Baikal.

VIII.91 The Delegate of the Russian Federation informed the Committee that his Government would like to review the full report of the mission in detail and that the authorities would be prepared to present a reply by 1 February 2002. He thanked the members of the mission and in particular the Director of the UNESCO Moscow Office for his support and co-operation to find a solution.

VIII.92 The Committee noted that little substantial progress has been achieved towards enhancing the protection of Lake Baikal, and addressing issues repeatedly raised by the Committee, and that there are new emerging threats that pose unprecedented risks to the integrity of this site. The Committee furthermore noted that international support is needed to enhance the capacity of the State Party to deal with the complex issues related to the conservation of this site.

VIII.93 The Committee furthermore noted the following as key milestones in assessing future progress:

- (1) Development and enforcement of all related regulations and by-laws required for the *Federal Baikal Law* to become fully operational. These regulations and by-laws should be developed through a participatory and transparent process involving local people and all key stakeholders dealing with the protection and management of this site.
- (2) Development and implementation of an integrated management plan for the whole Baikal region, with emphasis on the protection of the World Heritage site. Priority should be given to develop an adequate ecological zoning of this site to enforce the *Federal Baikal Law*. This plan needs to include a comprehensive monitoring system on the state of Lake Baikal. Adequate human and financial resources are required to ensure its long-term implementation.
- (3) Development and implementation of adequate institutional and co-ordination mechanisms for implementing the *Federal Baikal Law*, its regulations and by-laws. This could take the form of a renewed Baikal Commission or a similar institutional arrangement that would enhance co-ordination between federal and regional authorities while involving also NGOs, scientific institutions and other stakeholders.
- (4) Development and implementation of a comprehensive programme to adequately address the pollution problems affecting this site, giving particular priority to the case of BPPM, but also including other sources of pollution that are affecting the integrity of this site.
- (5) Detailed consideration of various scenarios for the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill, including total phasing out of the Mill. This requires a long-term strategy and must be associated with the development of

alternative livelihoods for local people as the BPPM is the main source of employment in the region.

VIII.94 Finally, the Committee requested that the State Party provides an urgent response by 1 February 2002 in relation to these issues, particularly on the development of a gas and oil pipeline to China, and the potential impacts of this project on the integrity of this site, as well as the proposed oil and gas exploration in the Selenga Delta. The Committee furthermore requested the World Heritage Centre to undertake all possible efforts to encourage the World Bank, GEF, UNF, and other relevant international donors to provide urgent support, in the form of soft loans, grants and projects, to enhance the State Party efforts to address the complex conservation and development issues facing Lake Baikal.

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation)

VIII.95 The Committee noted with concern threats to the Bystrinsky Nature Park and noted conflicting reports relating to the gold mine operation and its relationship to the World Heritage boundary. The Committee requested the Centre to work in consultation with the State Party to prepare a mission to the site to review the state of conservation and to ascertain whether a case exists for inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)

VIII.96 The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the IUCN/Centre mission, and requested the State Party to review the document and report back with an action plan for implementation of the recommendations by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002).

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)

VIII.97 The Committee requested the State Party to provide a report on the encroachment situation in the northern section of the World Heritage site and on the impacts of commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers on the integrity and values of this World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee.

Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List noted by the Committee

Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

Fraser Island (Australia)

The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)

Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)

Gros Morne National Park (Canada)

Nahanni National Park (Canada)

Los Katios National Park (Colombia)

Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst, (Hungary/Slovakia)

The Committee noted that the issues raised concern only the Slovak part of this transboundary site.

Sundarbans National Park (India)

The Delegate of India informed the Committee that there is no National Waterways Project that is planned or likely to impact this site.

Kaziranga National Park (India)

Komodo National Park (Indonesia)

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)

The Observer of Indonesia thanked the Australian authorities for their financial assistance. He informed the Committee that it would be difficult to comply with the deadline of 1 February and that a report could be provided by the end of March 2002.

Aeolian Islands (Italy)

The Observer of Italy confirmed that there was a court decision on 4 December 2001, which is not yet public, but that it is hoped to be available soon. She informed the Committee that the collaboration between the autonomous regional Government and the central Government has commenced and that a meeting will take place to find a solution.

Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia)

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania)

The Delegate of Egypt brought to the attention of the Committee the importance of protecting the wetlands, which are known to be important rest places for the migratory birds along their routes. He suggested that the World Heritage Centre should have a plan defining the wetlands, which are important for the birds and to use this information for establishing "satellite" World Heritage sites. IUCN informed of the co-operation between the World Heritage Centre and the Ramsar Convention as well as with Bird Life International for the protection of the wetlands. He also highlighted the importance of the surrounding areas to the World Heritage sites and the links with the Man and Biosphere programme for the protection of the sites. The Secretariat informed of the on-going discussions with the Secretariat of the Convention of Migratory Species to establish a Memorandum of Understanding between these two Conventions.

Sian Ka'an (Mexico)

The Delegate of Mexico informed that the confirmation of the Ecological Land-Use Plan is in its final phase and consequently she asked that the deadline for the report requested by the Bureau be set for 15 May 2002 for examination at the twenty-sixth session of the Committee in June.

Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)

Doñana National Park (Spain)

Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom)

St Kilda (United Kingdom)

Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)

Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America)

Canaima National Park (Venezuela)

MIXED (CULTURAL AND NATURAL) PROPERTIES

State of conservation reported of mixed properties examined by the Committee

Kakadu National Park (Australia)

VIII.98 The Committee noted the report of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau and new information provided by the State Party. The State Party considered that issues raised by Australian non-governmental organisations concerning the status of the Jabiluka mine site, located within an enclave, surrounded by Kakadu National Park, could have been more effectively addressed if they had first been raised with the relevant responsible authorities in Australia. The State Party provided information on Best Practice Technology, irrigation at Jabiluka and the reverse osmosis unit, the mineralised stockpile, and water inflow to the mine decline.

VIII.99 IUCN reported that there was continuing concern from some environmental NGOs and some representatives of Aboriginal Peoples, on water management and treatment issues, the possible extension of the Jabiluka stand-by period, the frequency of environmental performance reviews and rehabilitation options. Such matters should be examined by the independent scientific advisory committee agreed to in Cairns and there should be formal NGO representation on that committee.

VIII.100 ICOMOS commented on the importance of the intangible values of Kakadu National Park. ICOMOS was very pleased with the pause in development at Jabiluka as it provided the opportunity to discuss the difficult process of cultural mapping of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease. The ICOMOS Representative referred to the positive role to be played by Australia ICOMOS in this process.

VIII.101 The Committee noted that, as discussed in the June 2001 Bureau session, the Jabiluka project would remain on environmental management and standby mode until at least 2008-09. To ensure that the natural and cultural values of Kakadu National Park remain protected during this period, the Committee urged all parties and stakeholders to work together and share information in the development of agreed long-term strategies for protection.

VIII.102 The Committee welcomed the information that the Mirrar traditional owners were giving active consideration to a process proposed by the State Party, involving Australia ICOMOS, to use the Australian Heritage Commission `Protecting Heritage Places` process as a means to analyse, define and manage the cultural values of areas on Mirrar land, including the Jabiluka mineral lease. In order to ensure adequate time for engagement on these complex and sensitive issues, reporting on progress with this process and other ongoing measures to protect the cultural values of Kakadu National Park should be provided to the June 2003 session of the Committee.

VIII.103 The Committee noted a statement of the IUCN Council seeking the removal of the stockpile of the ore at Jabiluka, and rehabilitation of the mine site to a condition appropriate for inclusion within the Kakadu World Heritage area. The Committee noted the response of the State Party which advised that the Traditional Owners had refused permission for the removal of the stockpile and transport of ore to the Ranger mine for storage and that rehabilitation plans for the site continue to be formally reviewed annually.

VIII.104 The Committee welcomed the advice that the State Party would raise the IUCN suggestion of an NGO representative on the independent scientific advisory committee, the Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee (ARRTC), with the Chair of ARRTC. The Committee noted further claims, received on the eve of its meeting, on water management, review of environmental performance, assessment of rehabilitation, further involvement of the Mirrar people and the possible extension of the standby period at Jabiluka. The Committee noted the preliminary response of the State Party to these matters, and that the State Party, despite its concern to maintain the independence of the ARRTC and the statutory role of the Supervising Scientist, would refer these issues for the consideration, as appropriate, of the ARRTC and requested a report from the State Party for consideration of the Committee in June 2002.

Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

VIII.105 The Committee noted that an eruption of Mt. Ruapehu in 1995/1996 caused a large build-up of ash that blocked the outlet of Crater Lake. There is concern that when the Lake refills, a rapid collapse of the ash dam could occur followed by a major *lahar* (ash flow). Options to manage this risk need to take account of the protection of both the natural and the cultural values, as interference with the summit area and Crater Lake has implications for the protection of spiritual, traditional and cultural values to the Maori people.

VIII.106 The Committee noted IUCN's comments that subaquatic eruptions within the Crater Lake are a regular and ongoing natural feature. IUCN considers that proposed engineering works to manage the ash build-up at Crater Lake might establish a precedent within Tongariro

and other national parks. IUCN recommends that natural processes be allowed to function and measures be implemented to protect both public safety and infrastructure.

VIII.107 The Committee also noted that ICOMOS had recalled that the mountains of Tongariro National Park are sacred to the Maori and that a culturally appropriate solution needs to be found to the management of the ash build-up.

VIII.108 The Observer of New Zealand greeted the Committee and acknowledged the presence of the Paramount Chief of Tongariro, Tumu Te Heu Heu whose ancestors had gifted the sacred peaks of Tongariro to the Crown in 1887 making it the second oldest National Park in the world. He referred to the dilemma of needing to conserve the values of the Crater Lake whilst also taking into consideration public safety. He referred to the devastating *lahar* (ash flow) that had taken place in 1951 and had resulted in the death of 151 people. Finally he informed the Committee that the Minister for the Environment of New Zealand would be making a public announcement concerning the management of the ash build-up in the very near future. He informed the Committee that New Zealand would provide a report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2001 for consideration by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

VIII.109 The Committee requested the State Party to report on the state of conservation of Tongariro National Park and to specifically outline alternative options to the proposed engineering works so as to maintain the outstanding natural and cultural values of the site. The Committee requested the State Party to provide a report by 1 February 2002 for review by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

State of conservation reports of mixed properties noted by the Committee

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)

Further to the recommendation of the Bureau and following an update of information from ICOMOS, the Committee noted that a Management Plan for this property had recently been completed.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Cultural Properties that the Committee inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger

Abu Mena (Egypt)

VIII.110 The Committee decided the inscription of Abu Mena on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and requested the Egyptian authorities to co-ordinate with all the competent national institutions, and the World Heritage Centre, with a view to identifying rapidly the

necessary corrective measures to ensure the safeguarding of the site.

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)

VIII.111 The Committee, recalling previous discussions concerning the state of conservation of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, examined the information presented in WHC-01/CONF.208/4, the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission (September 2001) and decided to inscribed the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

VIII.112 The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Philippine authorities for facilitating the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the World Heritage site of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, as requested by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in December 2000. The Committee examined the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS mission and noted with deep concern that:

- Despite efforts to safeguard the property by the Banaue Rice Terraces Task Force (BRTTF) and Ifugao Terraces Commission (ITC), the BRTTF lacks full Government support and needs more resources, greater independence and an assurance of permanence;
- About 25-30% of the terraces are now abandoned, which has led to damage to some of the walls. This has arisen because parts of the irrigation system have been neglected, which in turn is due to people leaving the area. The situation is also aggravated by the effects of pest species of worms and snails;
- Despite good planning, irregular development is taking place, which threatens to erode the heritage landscape;
- International assistance has so far not been mobilized to help the area;
- Little progress has been made in addressing the needs of tourism. For example, access from Manila and within the property remains poor;
- As a result, the World Heritage values may be lost unless current trends are reversed within 10 years (maximum).

VIII.113 The Committee therefore endorsed the following recommendations made by the IUCN/ICOMOS mission:

- Establish a permanent and effective body to co-ordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the Ifugao Rice Terraces;
- Review existing management plans for further improvement;
- Develop a short and long-term strategy to finance the conservation of the Rice Terraces, drawn from national and international sources and from tourism;
-

- Develop a long term sustainable conservation policy to redress the problem and enhance management capacity.
- Develop a sustainable tourism industry that supports the future conservation of the rice terraces, placing priority on improving access to and within the site. Establish an exchange programme with other World Heritage sites which share similar conservation challenges.

VIII.114 The Observer of the Philippines informed the Bureau that his Government considered the inscription of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger, not as a dishonour but on the contrary, as an essential tool for mobilizing effective, decisive and rapid intervention to address the threats facing an endangered World Heritage property. Referring to the letter dated 26 November 2001 from the Minister of Tourism and Culture and the Chairperson of the Banaue Rice Terrace Task Force addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Observer confirmed his Government's nomination of this property for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the Government's request for urgent international assistance to address the alarming state of conservation of this property.

VIII.115 The Committee was informed that the Government of the Philippines concurred with the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission. The Observer stated that the following steps are being taken in order to address the recommendations of this mission:

- Establish by legislation, a permanent and effective authority to co-ordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the property;
- Involve all stakeholders including national government agencies, congressmen, provincial governors, representatives of municipalities, and private individuals in the re-evaluation and updating of the existing management plan for the protection of the site;
- Develop sustainable tourism industries which will support the future conservation of the Rice Terraces.

VIII.116 The Observer of the Philippines drew the Committee's attention to the fact that this property was the first organic evolving cultural landscape to be inscribed on the World Heritage List and a living monument manually built 1,000 years ago by the genius of the indigenous Ifugao people.

VIII.117 Underlining the vulnerability of properties such as the Rice Terraces where the relationship between human land-use and the environment is continuously evolving, the Observer hoped that the country and site-specific methodological framework elaborated for sustainable utilization of the Rice Terraces could later be adapted for the conservation of similar agricultural landscapes in other regions.

VIII.118 Drawing the attention of the Committee to the recently adopted *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* which encompasses the promotion and protection of indigenous cultures, the Observer of the Philippines expressed his Government's hope that the UNESCO World Heritage Committee would favourably endorse the request for international assistance to address the conservation and management issues of this traditionally owned and utilized property.

VIII.119 Taking into due consideration the conservation challenges and threats facing the property, the Committee decided to inscribe the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee commended the Philippine authorities for nominating this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, demonstrating positive use of this important mechanism.

VIII.120 Finally, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Bangkok Office to continue assisting the authorities in the elaboration of a long-term comprehensive management plan for the site. The Committee requested that a progress report on measures taken to elaborate the management plan and to enhance the conservation and development of the property be submitted for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

State of conservation reports of cultural properties examined by the Committee

City of Luxembourg: its Old Quarters and Fortifications (Luxembourg)

VIII.121 Following a meeting between the Delegation of Luxembourg, the Chairperson, the Secretariat and ICOMOS, the Bureau decided that the project concerning the building of a Judiciary Centre on the Saint Esprit Plateau of the City of Luxembourg should be examined by the Committee in the presence of the Secretary General of ICOMOS. The Committee noted that a revised project proposing substantial changes to the original plan was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre on 1 November 2001. This information was transmitted to ICOMOS which stressed that the State Party should be encouraged to study the alternative solution proposed by the Municipality of the City of Luxembourg to move some of the proposed buildings to another location. This solution would reduce the number of buildings on the site of the Saint Esprit Plateau and preserve the archaeological remains which were found there and which should be conserved in an open area.

VIII.122 The Secretary General of ICOMOS informed the Committee that based on the results of an expert mission, ICOMOS had expressed its concern as to the excessive size of the project and its potential impact both visual and on the integrity of the site. He also emphasized that recent important archaeological discoveries had been made at the site that called for safeguarding and presentation measures. However, he recalled that it was the Luxembourg

authorities who had taken the initiative to call upon UNESCO for advice with regard to this project and he informed the Committee that, in a spirit of open and constructive dialogue, consultations were ongoing between ICOMOS, the State Party and the Centre concerning the development of this project, with positive results so far. He also informed that further improvements to the revised project were still necessary and that the ICOMOS experts were at the disposal of the authorities for consultation.

VIII.123 The Observer of Luxembourg stressed that his country strived to maintain, as always, a policy of dialogue with UNESCO. He also informed that this project had been foreseen since 1991 and had recently been modified to take into account the recommendations made by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. He indicated that given the need to treat the recently discovered remains, the authorities proposed to remove a part of the buildings foreseen, notably a parking lot, so as to create an archaeological crypte providing a detailed visit of the site. The Observer of Luxembourg finally stated that regular consultations would be held with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS regarding this project.

VIII.124 The exemplary conduct of this dossier by the Luxembourg authorities was commended with the wish that this could be the case with each construction project within a World Heritage site or its proximity.

VIII.125 In response to the Delegate of Greece, who questioned the future treatment and protection of the excavation area, ICOMOS underlined that the proposed solution - the construction of a crypte - is very innovative and permitted visitors to discover the remains. The Delegate of Greece noted that post excavation research was not completed and requested that the decision adopted by the Committee take this query into consideration.

VIII.126 The Chairperson remarked that this project would be implemented and that the Luxembourg authorities had assured the Committee of the close collaboration they would maintain with ICOMOS and the Centre in this regard.

VIII.127 The Committee took note of the information transmitted by the State Party and thanked the authorities for the efforts made in the frame of the revision of the proposed project. It noted that the consultations were underway between ICOMOS, the State Party and the Centre, and requested the State Party to inform of the status of this project, as well as the projects regarding the archaeological excavations, to its next session in June 2002.

Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco)

VIII.128 The Committee examined the state of conservation of the site, as presented in Document WHC-01/CONF.208/4, and took note of the recommendation made by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth extraordinary session, contained in Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10, suggesting that the site might be inscribed on the List of

World Heritage in Danger, pending consultation with the State Party.

VIII.129 The Secretariat informed the Committee of a letter, received on 10 December 2001, and addressed to the Chairperson of the Committee, in which the Moroccan authorities listed a series of measures recently taken in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee at its last session in Cairns (2000), and reiterated the State Party's full commitment towards the preservation and presentation of the site.

VIII.130 The Observer of Morocco provided further details on the specific steps taken by the national authorities, mentioning in particular:

- The near completion of the administrative procedures for the listing of the entire site as a protected cultural site under the Law N. 22-80;
- The establishment of a Follow-up Inter-Ministerial Commission for the management and conservation of the site;
- The start of a consultation process with local communities to identify their needs and priorities with a view to the revitalization of the Ksar;
- The launching of selected infrastructure projects and the preparation of feasibility studies for initiatives related to the conservation and development of the site;
- The sensitization of representatives from local authorities on the importance of implementing urgent safeguarding and presentation measures.

VIII.131 The Observer of Morocco informed the Committee that a meeting had taken place in Rabat, on 13 November 2001, of a Commission including all the various institutions concerned, which has confirmed the above-mentioned decisions. Stressing once again the great importance that Morocco attaches to the preservation of this unique site, she expressed her Government's readiness to implement whatever decision the Committee would take and thanked the Committee for its interest in the Moroccan cultural heritage.

VIII.132 In view of these recent developments, the Committee, commending the State Party on the important preliminary measures taken in view of the safeguarding of the site, urged nevertheless the Moroccan authorities to proceed, in close co-operation with the World Heritage Centre, in the strengthening of the CERKAS, responsible for the site, and in the preparation and effective implementation of a Management and Safeguarding Plan for Ksar Ait Ben Haddou.

VIII.133 To this end, the Committee invited the State Party to submit as soon as possible a request of international assistance under the World Heritage Fund. The Committee, furthermore, requested the State Party to submit a detailed report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations made at the twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000), by 1 February 2002.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

VIII.134 The Committee recalled that it had:

- examined the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley at twenty-one sessions of the Committee and its Bureau since 1992;
- debated on the inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at each session upon examining the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Mission, the 1998 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Nepal Mission, and the reports submitted by the State Party on progress made in the implementation of the 16-point recommendation adopted by the Committee in 1993 and the 55 Recommendations for Enhanced Management and Time-Bound Action Plan for Corrective Measures adopted by the State Party in 1998;
- dispatched a High Level Mission in September 2000 headed by the former Chairperson of the Committee, and comprising the current Chairperson of the Committee, the Director of the World Heritage Centre among others, for consultations with His Majesty's Government of Nepal at the highest level on the merits of the in-danger listing as a tool for conservation;
- noted the conclusion of the High Level Mission which stated that whilst the major monuments were in good state of conservation, should no new measures be undertaken, the deterioration of the historic urban fabric will persist, irreversibly damaging the traditional architecture surrounding the public monuments, and consequently undermine the World Heritage values of this unique and universally significant site;
- expressed its disappointment at the twenty-fourth session, that the State Party was not convinced of the constructive objectives of the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a mechanism for strengthening further political commitment and mobilizing international technical co-operation and greater awareness at both national and international levels, and underlined the need to ensure the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, its Committee and the World Heritage List, while effectively implementing the mechanisms provided under the Convention in safeguarding the World Heritage properties, especially when the threats are ascertained and the process in the loss of the World Heritage values have already occurred; but,
- decided to defer consideration of the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until 2002 in view of the State Party's strong desire to avoid inscription on this List.

VIII.135 The Committee examined new information concerning:

- the demolition of the Saraswati Nani Temple within the World Heritage protected area of Patan Darban Square Monument Zone by the Guthi Samthan, the local guardians and owners of this public building; total reconstruction of the Temple reportedly using inappropriate new building material; removal and disappearance of the unique and exquisitely carved struts originally adorning this Temple. This Temple was included in the Kathmandu Valley Protective Inventory and figure in the 1979 nomination dossier submitted by HMG of Nepal;
- demolition of several historic buildings or illegal additions within the Seven Monuments Zones of Kathmandu Valley. A photo of an example of a typical illegal addition of a new floor with cantilevers to a historic building was shown.

VIII.136 The Centre informed the Committee that a progress report prepared by the Government of Nepal requested by the Committee was received on 8 December 2001. Neither the Centre nor the Bureau had sufficient time to examine the content of the report.

VIII.137 The Observer of Nepal, headed by the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Civil Aviation, reiterated her Government's strong commitment to ensure the implementation of the 16 Recommendations of the 1993 Joint Mission, and the 55 Recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan resulting from the 1998 Joint Mission. She expressed her appreciation for the favourable response to requests for technical and financial assistance which the Committee and UNESCO had been providing for Kathmandu Valley since the 1970s. With regard to the demolition of Saraswati Nani Temple, the Observer stated that the poor condition of the building necessitated demolition and reconstruction and assured the Committee that traditional building material and techniques were being used.

VIII.138 During the ensuing debate, the Committee expressed with deep concern, the loss of the authenticity and integrity of the historic urban fabric of Kathmandu Valley caused by the difficulties the authorities continued to face to control development. It was noted that should the Committee continue to defer inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger any further, the World Heritage values may be irretrievably lost. Concern was expressed about sending another High Level Mission, which may perhaps face difficulty in convincing the Government on the constructive objectives of the List of World Heritage in Danger and the need to ensure the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, its Committee and the World Heritage List.

VIII.139 The Committee took note of the deliberations of the Bureau at its twenty-fifth extraordinary session presented in WHC-01/CONF.208/4. Recalling that it had decided to allow two more years for the Nepalese

authorities to further implement the corrective measures against urban encroachment and alteration of the historic fabric in the seven Monument Zones to safeguard its integrity and authenticity during its twenty-fourth session, and taking into consideration the change in schedule of its annual meetings, the Committee:

- requested the State Party to submit the state of conservation report within the context of the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Reporting exercise by December 2002;
- dispatch another High Level Mission to be undertaken between December 2002 and June 2003, so that the findings and recommendations of this second High Level Mission could be examined by the Committee at its twenty-seventh session, where the inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be reconsidered.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)

VIII.140 The Observer of Israel noted with satisfaction the substantive progress that has been made with regard to this site. He informed of the positive dialogue between the mission members and the Polish authorities as well as the constructive discussions held between the Observer delegations of Poland and Israel during the Committee session in Helsinki, and reiterated the proposal of his Government to provide both technical and financial support to the Polish authorities.

VIII.141 In welcoming this good co-operation, the Observer of Poland reconfirmed that priorities are being defined and informed the Committee that progress in the bi-lateral talks with the Delegation of Israel have been made. Furthermore, he informed the Committee that the Polish authorities will soon submit a number of suggestions for the future work of the International Group of Experts, and expressed his hope that some of the major recommendations contained in the mission report could be followed and accomplished in the next two months.

VIII.142 The Committee took note of the report of the site visit to Auschwitz Concentration Camp and its surroundings and thanked the former Chairperson for his great commitment concerning this site. The Committee urged the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission as soon as possible and requested the authorities to provide a report by 1 February 2002 with details on the status and structure of the implementation of the recommendations and a timeframe.

Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania)

VIII.143 The Committee examined the state of conservation of this site and was informed of the construction project of a theme park, "Dracula Land", in the vicinity of Sighisoara, which is part of a Special Programme for tourism development for the region. The Committee noted that the Special Programme and the creation of an Interministerial Committee for its

monitoring had been approved by the authorities in July 2001, launched in November 2001 and that its implementation was foreseen for May 2002.

VIII.144 The Committee was informed that since the examination of the project by the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau, new information had been received concerning notably the location and the size of this project.

VIII.145 ICOMOS recalled that it remained concerned about the proximity of the theme park to the town centre of Sighisoara. He indicated that the documents provided by the State Party mention a distance of 6 km, whereas in reality it was only 1.5 km distance and that the potential visual impact on the town was a cause for concern. Whilst remarking that ICOMOS was not adverse to tourism development in this economically weak region, he added that the tourism generated by this park would constitute a mass tourism of a very different kind than that generated by cultural tourism experienced by the town itself. Finally, he again indicated that it was essential that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission be undertaken to the site without delay to evaluate the impact of the project.

VIII.146 The Observer of Romania thanked the Committee for its attention to the project. He indicated that a few years ago, the Romanian authorities had begun the restoration of a large part of the town of Sighisoara and an amount of US\$120,000 had already been invested in this activity. He also indicated that the safeguarding of this town is an important element of the Special Programme. The coordinator of the project, present during the examination of this issue, informed that the location of the park was foreseen to be 6 km from the town centre and that a dense forest of about 20-metre high trees separates the plateau upon which the construction of the park is foreseen. He drew the Committee's attention to the fact that access to this park could not be made directly from the town of Sighisoara. He also informed the Committee that the height of the buildings foreseen in the park is limited. In the name of the Ministry of Tourism, he invited a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission at an early date to the site to study the detailed plans of the project. He finally indicated that the environmental impact study of the project was being carried out and that the Romanian experts were at the disposal of the Centre and ICOMOS for all future information and collaboration.

VIII.147 The Committee noted with concern the building project of a theme park in the vicinity of the site, and its possible negative impact on the integrity and the environment of the World Heritage site. The Committee took note with disquiet of the information provided by the State Party and in particular the fact that the Romanian authorities had already approved the project as well as the implementation of the Special Programme foreseen for May 2002. The Committee requested the State Party to immediately undertake the environmental impact study foreseen and informed the State Party that assistance could be granted in this context. Furthermore, the Committee strongly encouraged the State Party to explore all possible

solutions for an alternative location for the construction of this theme park. The Committee requested that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission be undertaken to the site as soon as possible and that a report on the mission be made to the Committee at its twenty-sixth session (June 2002).

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)

VIII.148 The Committee examined the state of conservation of the site and took note that an emergency assistance request for an international technical workshop had been approved by the former Chairperson of the Committee. This workshop would also include the elaboration of a workplan for the safeguarding of the site.

VIII.149 The Delegate of the Russian Federation informed the Committee that the workshop will be held from 31 July to 5 August 2002. During this workshop the participants will be given the opportunity to study the project that has been developed and approved by experts. He thanked the Committee and the Director of the UNESCO Moscow Office for their support.

VIII.150 Speaking on behalf of ICCROM and ICOMOS, ICCROM congratulated the Russian authorities for their initiative to organise a workshop to develop a workplan for the safeguarding of the site. He stressed that the international workshop should, apart from looking at the severe structural problems of the Church of the Transfiguration, focus on the ensemble of buildings as well as on a wide set of issues: the biological deterioration of the wood, structural stability, conservation of icons and management of visitors. The initial multidisciplinary conservation plan, adopted for the site in 1995, although never implemented, remains an excellent starting point to address the "old" as well as the new issues such as the potential development of mineral deposits in the landscape around Kizhi Pogost. In conclusion, in addressing the structural problems, ICOMOS and ICCROM stressed the importance of providing a scientific review of all options available for the stabilisation of the Church in order to assure that an appropriate solution respecting the authenticity of the structure can be found.

VIII.151 The Committee took note of the information provided by ICCROM and thanked the authorities of the Russian Federation for having initiated the process to ensure the protection of the site. In view of the alarming state of conservation of the site, the Committee requested the Secretariat to work in close collaboration with the authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies with regard to the international workshop on conservation measures for Kizhi Pogost. Furthermore, the Committee requested the State Party to provide a detailed update of the situation, by 1 February 2003, and requested the Centre to provide a full report on the results of the workshop, in collaboration with the authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies, for its twenty-seventh session in June 2003.

State of conservation reports of cultural properties noted by the Committee

M'Zab Valley (Algeria)
Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)
Tipasa (Algeria)

Brasilia (Brazil)

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2003 for examination by the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau.

Historic District of Québec (Canada)

The Potala Palace and the Jokhang Temple Monastery, Lhasa (China)

Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (China)

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)

The Observer of the Dominican Republic recalled the efforts of her Government, particularly in the legal and the standard setting field, to protect cultural heritage and more especially the Colonial City of Santo Domingo. These new measures will be submitted to the national Congress in January 2002. Furthermore, she provided additional information on the situation of the six houses designed by Nicolás de Ovando and emphasized the need to take into account the recommendations of the ICOMOS mission to revert to the original use of these constructions which are the first colonial homes in Latin America and the Caribbean. After having noted the recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee also requested the State Party to seek a more compatible use for the site.

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Islamic Cairo (Egypt)

City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)

Classical Weimar (Germany)

Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany)

Roman Monuments, Cathedral of St Peter, and Church of Our Lady, Trier (Germany)

Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)

Acropolis, Athens (Greece)

Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2003 for examination by the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau.

Ellora Caves (India)

Ajanta Caves (India)

Historic Centre of Naples (Italy)

Tyre (Lebanon)

The Delegate of Lebanon informed the Committee of a World Bank Project on Protection and Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage, which may significantly contribute to the conservation of three of the five Lebanese World Heritage sites, including Tyre. More detailed information on the scope of activities of this project will hopefully be available for the next session of the Committee, in Budapest. The Delegate of Lebanon also mentioned that a meeting is being organized in Beirut, upon the initiative of the Minister of Culture, to raise awareness among representatives from local communities of the importance of World Heritage status and relative implications, and requested the Centre to participate.

The Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russian Federation)

The Delegate of the Russian Federation informed the Committee that the D-6 Krakovskaya oil platform in the Baltic Sea shelf, 22km off the coast of the Curonian Spit, was built in 1986 and that there was no oil extraction at the site. He notified the Committee that an official response would be sent by 1 February 2002.

The Observer of Lithuania informed the Committee that the Lithuanian Government had to date not received an official reply to their inquiries regarding the oil platform and that following the EIA the oil company had already obtained permission for oil extraction to commence in 2003. She further explained that the Lithuanian experts had never been given the opportunity to visit the platform, although there is an excellent transboundary co-operation at the World Heritage site.

ICOMOS pointed out that no information regarding this oil platform had been available at the time of the joint ICOMOS and IUCN evaluation mission of the nomination and that this would certainly have been taken into account in the evaluation of the site.

Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta)

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo, San Lorenzo (Panama)

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2003 for examination by the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau.

Chavin (Archaeological Site) (Peru)

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru)

Following changes in the cycle of the World Heritage statutory meetings, the time limits imposed on States Parties for the submission of the requested reports have been considerably reduced. With regard to the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the Committee stressed the need to submit these reports to the Bureau and not directly to the Committee. However, in view of the different degrees of urgency for each site, and after consultation with the State Party, the Committee requested that the state of conservation for this site be submitted by 1 February 2003 for examination by the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau.

Spišský Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia)

Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites (United Kingdom)

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)

IX. PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE AND BALANCED WORLD HERITAGE LIST

IX.1 The Secretariat highlighted the essential points contained in Document WHC-01/CONF.208/11 by recalling that the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List was adopted by

the Committee in 1994. At the request of the Committee, Regional Action Plans were developed by the Secretariat to meet the particular needs of each region which were approved by the Committee in 1999. The Secretariat reported that in Africa and the Pacific, global strategy actions have focused more on awareness raising and promotion for ratification in view of the important number of UNESCO Member States that have not yet ratified the Convention. In both these regions and also in the Caribbean and the Arab States, considerable work was being done to encourage States Parties to establish their national Tentative List and to identify potential sites from under-represented categories. Thematic studies and expert thematic meetings have been carried out in all regions. Important achievements have been made in elaborating the concepts of various types of cultural landscapes. In Asia, thematic studies and meetings with States Parties have focused on the categories of cultural properties most at risk due to the absence or weakness of legal protection (modern heritage, vernacular architecture of minority groups in SE Asia), as well as in the harmonization of the Tentative Lists of the five Central Asian States Parties.

IX.2 Particular mention was made of the following Global Strategy thematic studies and meetings: Meeting of States Parties and Experts on Global Strategy in Southeast Asia (Tana Toraja, Indonesia in April 2001); Meeting of States Parties on the Alpine Arc (Turin, Italy, July 2001); Thematic Meeting on Vineyard Cultural Landscapes (Tokai, Hungary, July 2001); Expert Meeting on Plantation Systems in the Caribbean (Paramaribo, Suriname, July 2001); Expert Meeting on Sacred Mountains in Asia-Pacific (Japan, September 2001); Expert Meeting on Desert Landscapes and Oasis Systems (Oasis Kharga, Egypt, September 2001); Regional Training Course on the Application of the Convention and its Role in Sustainable Development and Tourism in the Caribbean (September-October 2001); Capacity-building Workshop for Southwestern Indian Ocean Island Countries (Madagascar, October 2001); Sub-regional Workshop on Capacity-building and Institutional Development for Southern African Countries (Windhoek, Namibia, September 2001), ICCROM/UNESCO/CRATerre-supported Africa 2009 regional training course to promote representivity (July-September 2001), Sixth Meeting of the Pacific Islands Round Table (Suva, Fiji, October-November 2001); Workshop on Cultural Interpretation of Heritage Sites for Preservation and Tourism (Palau, July 2001).

IX.3 In determining Global Strategy activities for the 2002-2003 period, the Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to its five-part decision adopted at its twenty-fourth session concerning the Representivity of the List: 1. Respecting the Convention; 2. Use of the Tentative List as a planning tool to reduce imbalances; 3. Establishment of a priority system for nominations; 4. Resolution of the Twelfth General Assembly regarding representivity and 5. Capacity-building for under-represented regions.

IX.4 Several Committee members stressed the importance of the Resolution of the General Assembly

concerning the Representivity of the World Heritage List and that the substantive work on the analysis of the current World Heritage List and the tentative lists must be given top priority. New thematic studies and meetings should be carried out only upon the completion of this global analysis, and on the basis of the priorities identified for each region. A number of delegates stated that since 1994, many regional and thematic meetings have been convened, and the results of these meetings need to be reviewed before others are launched.

IX.5 ICOMOS informed the Committee that a number of thematic studies have been carried out or are in progress, including textile industries, rock art in Southern Africa and early agricultural landscapes in the Pacific.

IX.6 IUCN commended the Centre and stated that clear criteria are needed for future thematic workshops. The priority for IUCN lies in the coastal and marine ecosystems, boreal forests and geological sites. The World Parks Congress (South Africa, 2003) provides an excellent opportunity, as World Heritage and African Heritage would enjoy a high profile at this event.

IX.7 The Committee thanked the Secretariat for the document prepared but stated that the numerous activities proposed need to be prioritised. Members of the Committee noted the following points:

IX.8 For the Caribbean, the work proposed for coastal and marine sites has a high priority and needs to be linked to existing GEF/World Bank projects and other regional and sub-regional programmes and projects; that the Slave Route project also be given high priority for the Caribbean under the cultural heritage category; and that the proposed study and expert meeting on rock art are not priorities in view of extensive studies already existing on this subject. The Committee stressed the need to ensure complementarity of activities under the Global Strategy for a representative World Heritage List and the Periodic Reports.

IX.9 A number of delegates from Latin America underlined the importance of using the tentative lists as a planning tool and that the inclusion of sites on these lists indicated that they already meet minimum standards. Although agreement on the limitation of nominations is a major step forward, this should not negatively affect States Parties that are under-represented in the World Heritage List or having sites belonging to under-represented categories. States Parties that are already well represented on the List should voluntarily refrain from submitting nominations. It was mentioned that the Ibero-American network (Ushuaia, Argentina, 2002), would be an important forum to discuss potential natural heritage from the region.

IX.10 For the African region, priority should be given to the preparation of tentative lists and nominations from States Parties, and in the identification of under-represented categories. Given the capacity-building requirements in the majority of States Parties of this

region, the need to mobilize international co-operation was stressed. A number of African State Party representatives expressed concern over the demand for high quality documentation for the nomination files, often beyond the capacity of the African States Parties to provide.

IX.11 Concerning Asia, the Committee commended the Centre for the well-structured analysis by sub-region of the World Heritage List that provides a useful overview of the represented and under-represented categories in the region. The Delegate of India underscored the importance of identifying ancient routes and trade links within the south-east Asian sub-region. A standard presentation for all regions could be used as a strategic tool to assess the overall situation, and budget allocations should be made accordingly. The Committee noted the results of the regional thematic meeting on Sacred Mountains in Asia-Pacific and of the proceedings already published by the Government of Japan. The results should be also taken into account for discussions on criterion (vi), as many sites may only qualify for their relationship between the intangible values and the natural environment. It was stressed that the conditions of integrity need to be applied for cultural heritage in this region.

IX.12 The Observer of Australia referred to a number of partnerships in support of the World Heritage Global Strategy in the Asia-Pacific region, including the ACCU (Asia-Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO). He proposed that IUCN and the World Heritage Centre look at the impact of climate change in the region with reference to World Heritage sites, especially in marine and coastal ecosystems. He also referred to the support of New Zealand in funding a World Heritage Officer in the UNESCO Office in Apia, Samoa and called for the position to be continued by UNESCO in the future. He referred to the legal and technical assistance being provided in the region through the Asia-Pacific Focal Point for World Heritage Managers hosted by Australia and suggested a Memorandum of Understanding with the World Heritage Centre.

IX.13 Several observers of European States Parties congratulated the Centre for a number of thematic meetings carried out and the recommendations stemming from these, such as the vineyard thematic meeting. The recommendation for a global vineyard study was emphasized by a number of Committee members and observers to ensure the credibility of future nominations under this category. An appropriate delimitation of the wine growing area should be chosen for these sites. The Delegate of Hungary expressed his country's commitment to promote the co-ordination of the tentative lists within their sub-region.

IX.14 The Committee was informed that a number of States Parties are currently preparing transboundary nominations. Co-operation between countries should be encouraged to ensure a better representivity of the World Heritage List and solidarity between countries from different regions. The fact that forty-nine countries still have no tentative lists indicated the urgent need to extend

assistance in this field. The Committee agreed that transfrontier, serial and other nominations should be encouraged as well as links to the MAB programme.

IX.15 With regard to the Alpine Arc, the Committee noted that a new, co-ordinated and regional approach for international collaboration was promoted by the six countries of the Alpine region (Austria, Germany, France, Italy, Slovenia, Switzerland), and that following the expert meeting at Hallstatt (Austria, June 2000), two States Party meetings were convened (Turin, Italy, July 2001 and UNESCO Headquarters, October 2001) to discuss the diversity, values and composition of the Alpine Arc. Taking into account the complexity of such a regional approach, the countries agreed to schedule a follow-up meeting for the beginning of 2002. This process accompanied by international experts and the World Heritage Centre should encourage the States Parties to continue with this innovative and regional approach in World Heritage nomination.

IX.16 Commenting on the Secretariat's report on the Desert Landscape Meeting, organized in Egypt (September 2001), the Committee recalled the importance of this category of properties. It recommended that resources be allocated to further the process of identification of potential desert landscapes for possible inclusion on the World Heritage List, starting with those located across two or more countries. Committee members from the Arab region stated that this should be the focus rather than dispersing resources on less urgent initiatives, such as the proposed Thematic Study on Modern Heritage in the Arab States. In this respect, and taking into account that deserts are a common feature across several regions of the world,

the Committee stressed the desirability of a more intense inter-regional co-operation in this field, such as in the Mediterranean Action Plan. The Delegate of Egypt suggested that the year 2003 be declared an International Year of the Desert.

IX.17 Concerning priorities, particularly in the Arab region, the Committee insisted also on the importance of addressing heritage legislation and institutional building, as these are an essential precondition for the establishment of appropriate conservation practices.

IX.18 The Observer of ALECSO recalled the publication by his Organization (in 2001) of an Arab Biodiversity Strategy. He recommended that this document be translated into English and taken into account in future World Heritage programmes and activities in the region. IUCN recognized the gap in the representivity of natural heritage in the Arab Region and stated its intention to address it in the future.

IX.19 The Committee concluded its examination of Global Strategy activities by reiterating the need for the Secretariat to focus on the analysis of the World Heritage List and the national tentative lists as a priority, as well as on assistance to States Parties for the establishment and revision of these tentative lists as required. The Committee however noted that a conceptual discussion is needed to provide a framework for such analyses and also recognized the need to identify methodologies to define under-represented categories of heritage.

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

Tentative Lists

X.1 The Director of the World Heritage Centre indicated that all nominations were included in the Tentative Lists of the country concerned.

Changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

X.2 At the request of the Republic of Korea, because of the recent changes to the Romanisation system of Korean characters, the Committee approved the following changes to the names of properties included on the World Heritage List:

Existing Name (English / French)	Name change requested (English / French)
Sokkuram Grotto and Pulguksa Temple / Grotte de Sokkuram et temple Pulguksa	Seokguram Grotto and Bulguksa Temple / Grotte de Seokguram et temple Bulguksa
Haeinsa Temple Changgyong P'ango, the Depositories for the Tripitaka Koreana Woodblocks / Temple d'Haeinsa Changgyong P'ango, les dépôts des tablettes du Tripitaka Koreana	Haeinsa Temple Janggyeong Panjeon, the Depositories for the Tripitaka Koreana Woodblocks / Temple d'Haeinsa Janggyeong Panjeon, les dépôts des tablettes du Tripitaka Koreana
Chongmyo Shrine / Sanctuaire de Chongmyo	Jongmyo Shrine / Sanctuaire de Jongmyo

Existing Name (English / French)	Name change requested (English / French)
Ch'angdokkung Palace Complex / Ensemble du palais de Ch'angdokkung	Changdeokkung Palace Complex / Ensemble du palais de Changdeokkung
Hwasong Fortress / Forteresse de Hwasong	Hwaseong Fortress / Forteresse de Hwaseong
Kyongju Historic Areas / Zones historiques de Kyongju	Gyeongju Historic Areas / Zones historiques de Gyeongju
Koch'ang, Hwasun, and Kanghwa Dolmen Sites / Sites de dolmens de Koch'ang, Hwasun et Kanghwa	Gochang, Hwasun, and Ganghwa Dolmen Sites / Sites de dolmens de Gochang, Hwasun et Ganghwa

Examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger

X.3 Following the review of the state of conservation reports and the recommendations of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau, the Committee decided to inscribe the following properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- **Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)**
- **Abu Mena (Egypt)**

X.4 Furthermore, the Committee decided to remove **Iguaçu National Park (Brazil)** from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Examination of nominations of cultural, natural, and mixed properties to the World Heritage List

X.5 The Committee noted that the following two natural properties will be examined in 2002:

- **Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park (Viet Nam)**
- **Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Sanctuary (Russian Federation)**

X.6 The Committee was informed that the Guyanese authorities have withdrawn the nomination of **Kaieteur National Park** and that the Italian authorities requested that the proposed extension of **Crespi d'Adda** not be examined by the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

I. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

A. Properties which the Committee inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Historic Centre of Vienna
Id. N°	1033
State Party	Austria
Criteria	C (ii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the Historic Centre of Vienna on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (ii): The urban and architectural qualities of the Historic Centre of Vienna bear outstanding witness to a continuing interchange of values throughout the second millennium.

Criterion (iv): Three key periods of European cultural and political development – the Middle Ages, the Baroque period, and the *Gründerzeit* – are exceptionally well illustrated by the urban and architectural heritage of the Historic Centre of Vienna.

Criterion (vi): Since the 16th century Vienna has been universally acknowledged to be the musical capital of Europe.

While taking note of the efforts already made for the protection of the historic town of Vienna, the Committee recommended that the State Party undertake the necessary

measures to review the height and volume of the proposed new development near the Stadtpark, east of the Ringstrasse, so as not to impair the visual integrity of the historic town. Furthermore, the Committee recommended that special attention be given to continuous monitoring and control of any changes to the morphology of the historic building stock.

Property	Cultural Landscape of Fertő/Neusiedlersee
Id. N°	772 Rev
State Party	Austria/Hungary
Criteria	C (v)

The Committee inscribed the Cultural Landscape of Fertő/Neusiedlersee on the World Heritage List under criterion (v):

Criterion (v): The Fertő/Neusiedlersee has been the meeting place of different cultures for eight millennia, and this is graphically demonstrated by its varied landscape, the result of an evolutionary and symbiotic

process of human interaction with the physical environment.

The Committee encouraged the States Parties to provide within two years of inscription a revised management plan for the enlarged area resulting from the revised boundaries of the cultural landscape.

Although the site was originally nominated as a mixed site, the Committee did not inscribe Fertő/Neusiedlersee on the World Heritage List under natural criteria.

Property	Tsodilo
Id. N°	1021
State Party	Botswana
Criteria	C (i) (iii) (vi)

The Committee inscribed Tsodilo on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (iii), and (vi):

Criterion (i): For many thousands of years the rocky outcrops of Tsodilo in the harsh landscape of the Kalahari Desert have been visited and settled by humans, who have left rich traces of their presence in the form of outstanding rock art.

Criterion (iii): Tsodilo is a site that has witnessed visits and settlement by successive human communities for many millennia.

Criterion (vi): The Tsodilo outcrops have immense symbolic and religious significance for the human communities who continue to survive in this hostile environment.

The Delegate of Thailand, while supporting the inscription of the site, questioned the application of criterion (i), asking whether the rock art itself or the entire property was a "masterpiece of human creative genius". The representative of ICOMOS explained that criterion (i) was applicable to the rock art.

The Chairperson congratulated Botswana on the inscription of its first site on the World Heritage List. The Observer of Botswana emphasized that this is a milestone, illustrating the commitment of her country to fulfil the obligations of the Convention and to adhere to the Global Strategy.

Property	Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás
Id. N°	993 Rev
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Historic Centre of the Town of Goiás on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): In its layout and architecture the Historic Town of Goiás is an outstanding example of a European town admirably adapted to the climatic, geographical and cultural constraints of central South America.

Criterion (iv): Goiás represents the evolution of a form of urban structure and architecture characteristic of the colonial settlement of South America, making full use of local materials and techniques and conserving its exceptional setting.

Following comments from the Committee concerning the state of conservation of the site, the Observer of Brazil informed the Committee that major investments are under way to improve the conditions of the site.

Property	Yungang Grottoes
Id. N°	1039
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Yungang Grottoes on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv):

Criterion (i): The assemblage of statuary of the Yungang Grottoes is a masterpiece of early Chinese Buddhist cave art.

Criterion (ii): The Yungang cave art represent the successful fusion of Buddhist religious symbolic art from south and central Asia with Chinese cultural traditions, starting in the 5th century CE under Imperial auspices.

Criterion (iii): The power and endurance of Buddhist belief in China are vividly illustrated by the Yungang grottoes.

Criterion (iv): The Buddhist tradition of religious cave art achieved its first major impact at Yungang, where it developed its own distinct character and artistic power.

The Committee encouraged the State Party to continue the maintenance efforts and management planning for the site.

Property	Tugendhat Villa in Brno
Id. N°	1052
State Party	Czech Republic
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Tugendhat Villa in Brno on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): The German architect Mies van der Rohe applied the radical new concepts of the Modern Movement triumphantly to the Tugendhat Villa in the design of residential buildings.

Criterion (iv): Architecture was revolutionized by the Modern Movement in the 1920s and the work of Mies van der Rohe, epitomized by the Tugendhat Villa, played a major role in its worldwide diffusion and acceptance.

The Chairperson stressed the need for an in-depth discussion on the Modern Movement.

Property	Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs
Id. N°	873 Rev
State Party	France
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): At the beginning of the 2nd millennium Provins was one of several towns in the territory of the Counts of Champagne that became the venues for great annual trading fairs linking northern Europe with the Mediterranean world.

Criterion (iv): Provins preserves to a high degree the architecture and urban layout that characterize these great medieval fair towns.

The Delegate of Greece recalled her intervention made at the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001, underlining that nothing remained of the installations relating to the Trade Fair in the Medieval Town of Provins, while other cities preserved better examples.

Several delegates questioned the research carried out on medieval fair towns, and asked whether archaeological excavations had taken place at Provins. The Delegate of St Lucia requested the reasons for the change in the recommendation by ICOMOS from negative in 1996 to positive in 2001.

Property	The Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen
Id. N°	975
State Party	Germany
Criteria	C (ii) (iii)

The Committee inscribed the The Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iii):

Criterion (ii): The Zollverein XII Coal Mine Industrial Complex is an exceptional industrial monument by virtue of the fact that its buildings are outstanding examples of the application of the design concepts of the Modern Movement in architecture in a wholly industrial context.

Criterion (iii): The technological and other structures of Zollverein XII are representative of a crucial period in the development of traditional heavy industries in Europe, when sympathetic and positive use was made of architectural designs of outstanding quality.

The Observer of Germany informed the Committee that people from all over Europe had worked in the mine and that the recognition of this heritage is important for its future protection.

Property	Masada
Id. N°	1040
State Party	Israel
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the Masada National Park on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (iii): Masada is a symbol of the ancient Jewish Kingdom of Israel, of its violent destruction in the later 1st century CE, and of the subsequent Diaspora.

Criterion (iv): The Palace of Herod the Great at Masada is an outstanding example of a luxurious villa of the Early Roman Empire, whilst the camps and other fortifications that encircle the monument constitute the finest and most complete Roman siege works to have survived to the present day.

Criterion (vi): The tragic events during the last days of the Jewish refugees who occupied the fortress and palace of Masada make it a symbol both of Jewish cultural identity and, more universally, of the continuing human struggle between oppression and liberty.

Although the site was originally nominated as a mixed property, the Committee did not inscribe Masada National Park under natural criteria.

The Chairperson congratulated Israel on the inscription of its first site on the World Heritage List. In agreement with the State Party, the name of the property was changed to *Masada*.

Property	The Old City of Acre
Id. N°	1042
State Party	Israel
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (v)

The Committee inscribed The Old City of Acre on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii), and (v):

Criterion (ii): Acre is an exceptional historic town in that it preserves the substantial remains of its medieval Crusader buildings beneath the existing Moslem fortified town dating from the 18th and 19th centuries.

Criterion (iii): The remains of the Crusader town of Acre, both above and below the present-day street level, provide an exceptional picture of the layout and structures of the capital of the medieval Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem.

Criterion (v): Present-day Acre is an important example of an Ottoman walled town, with typical urban components such as the citadel, mosques, *khans*, and baths well preserved, partly built on top of the underlying Crusader structures.

A number of delegates commented that the texts contained in the ICOMOS evaluation report needed revision to accurately reflect the history of the site. ICOMOS agreed to

discuss appropriate amendments with the delegations concerned to reflect the history of the social and economic situation of the site and the inhabitants of the Old City.

The Committee recommended that the State Party incorporate into its management plan a coherent policy for the improvement of the economic and social condition of local residents of the Old City of Acre and to ensure that it remains a living city.

The Observer of Israel stated that the inscription of the site recognizes the heritage of the people of this multicultural centre, representing the entire region.

Property	Villa d'Este, Tivoli
Id. N°	1025
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)(vi)

The Committee inscribed the Villa d'Este, Tivoli on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii), (iii),(iv) and (vi):

Criterion (i): The Villa d'Este is one of the most outstanding examples of Renaissance culture at its apogee.

Criterion (ii): The gardens of the Villa d'Este had a profound influence on the development of garden design throughout Europe.

Criterion (iii): The principles of Renaissance design and aesthetics are illustrated in an exceptional manner by the gardens of the Villa d'Este.

Criterion (iv): The gardens of the Villa d'Este are among the earliest and finest of the *giardini delle meraviglie* and symbolize the flowering of Renaissance culture.

Criterion (vi): The Villa d'Este, with its palace and garden, bears exceptional testimony to the Italian Renaissance and has been a source of artistic inspiration ever since its creation.

Property	Lamu Old Town
Id. N°	1055
State Party	Kenya
Criteria	C (ii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed Lamu Old Town on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (ii): The architecture and urban structure of Lamu graphically demonstrate the cultural influences that have come together there over several hundred years from Europe, Arabia, and India, utilizing traditional Swahili techniques to produce a distinct culture.

Criterion (iv): The growth and decline of the seaports on the East African coast and interaction between the Bantu, Arabs, Persians, Indians, and Europeans represents a significant cultural and economic phase in the history of the region which finds its most outstanding expression in Lamu Old Town.

Criterion (vi): Its paramount trading role and its attraction for scholars and teachers gave Lamu an important religious function in the region. It continues to be a significant centre for education in Islamic and Swahili culture.

Property	Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	481
State Party	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi):

Criterion (iii): The Temple Complex of Vat Phou bears exceptional testimony to the cultures of south-east Asia, and in particular to the Khmer Empire which dominated the region in the 10th–14th centuries.

Criterion (iv): The Vat Phou complex is an outstanding example of the integration of a symbolic landscape of great spiritual significance to its natural surroundings.

Criterion (vi): Contrived to express the Hindu version of the relationship between nature and humanity, Vat Phou exhibits a remarkable complex of monuments and other structures over an extensive area between river and mountain, some of outstanding architecture, many containing great works of art, and all expressing intense religious conviction and commitment.

Property	Royal Hill of Ambohimanga
Id. N°	950
State Party	Madagascar
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the Royal Hill of Ambohimanga on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (iii): The Royal Hill of Ambohimanga is the most significant symbol of the cultural identity of the people of Madagascar.

Criterion (iv): The traditional design, materials, and layout of the Royal Hill of Ambohimanga are representative of the social and political structure of Malagassy society from at least the 16th century.

Criterion (vi): The Royal Hill of Ambohimanga is an exceptional example of a place where, over centuries, common human experience has been focused in memory, ritual, and prayer.

The Committee emphasized that the site is a classic example of an associative cultural landscape, which fully justifies the application of criterion (vi), linking the tangible and intangible values. The Observer of Madagascar informed the Committee that the inscription of the first cultural site on the World Heritage List would inspire the people of her country to protect their heritage.

Property	Medina of Essaouira (Formerly Mogador)
Id. N°	753 Rev
State Party	Morocco
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Medina of Essaouira (Formerly Mogador) on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): Essaouira is an outstanding and well preserved example of a late 18th century European fortified seaport town translated to a North African context.

Criterion (iv): With the opening up of Morocco to the rest of the world in the later 17th century Essaouira was laid out by a French architect who had been profoundly influenced by the work of Vauban at Saint-Malo. It has retained its European appearance to a substantial extent.

A number of delegates expressed their reservations as to the outstanding universal value of the site, as well as some concerns on the reported alterations that had taken place in the city, where inappropriate materials had been used for modern additions. ICOMOS informed the Committee that although some degree of integrity had been lost in the past, the degree of loss did not compromise the overall significance of the site. Adequate safeguarding measures and a comprehensive Management Plan were now in place, which would prevent further damage to the historic structures of the city.

Property	Churches of Peace in Jawor and Swidnica
Id. N°	1054
State Party	Poland
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the Churches of Peace in Jawor and Swidnica on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (iii): The Churches of Peace are outstanding testimony to an exceptional act of tolerance on the part of the Catholic Habsburg Emperor towards Protestant communities in Silesia in the period following the Thirty Years' War in Europe.

Criterion (iv): As a result of conditions imposed by the Emperor the Churches of Peace required the builders, to implement pioneering constructional and architectural solutions of a scale and complexity unknown ever before or since in wooden architecture. The success may be judged by their survival to the present day.

Criterion (vi): The Churches of Peace bear exceptional witness to a particular political development in Europe in the 17th century of great spiritual power and commitment.

The Observer of Germany noted that the symbolic importance of these two monuments was due to two factors, one historic and the other contemporary: the two

churches bear witness to an act of Tolerance that, at the time of their construction, was extremely rare. Furthermore, with regard to their state of conservation, they demonstrate close and fruitful co-operation between the two neighbouring countries, Poland and Germany. The cultural heritage of Silesia, formerly disputed by both countries, is today considered as common heritage for which Poland and Germany are responsible.

Property	Historic Centre of Guimarães
Id. N°	1031
State Party	Portugal
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Historic Centre of Guimarães on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii), and (iv):

Criterion (ii): Guimarães is of considerable universal significance by virtue of the fact that specialized building techniques developed there in the Middle Ages were transmitted to Portuguese colonies in Africa and the New World, becoming their characteristic feature.

Criterion (iii): The early history of Guimarães is closely associated with the establishment of Portuguese national identity and the Portuguese language in the 12th century.

Criterion (iv): An exceptionally well preserved town, Guimarães illustrates the evolution of particular building types from the medieval settlement to the present-day city, and particularly in the 15th–19th centuries.

Several delegates noted apparent inconsistencies in the ICOMOS evaluation report that were clarified.

Property	Alto Douro Wine Region
Id. N°	1046
State Party	Portugal
Criteria	C (iii) (iv) (v)

The Committee inscribed the Alto Douro Wine Region on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii), (iv), and (v):

Criterion (iii): The Alto Douro Region has been producing wine for nearly two thousand years and its landscape has been molded by human activities.

Criterion (iv): The components of the Alto Douro landscape are representative of the full range of activities associated with winemaking – terraces, *quintas* (wine-producing farm complexes), villages, chapels, and roads.

Criterion (v): The cultural landscape of the Alto Douro is an outstanding example of a traditional European wine-producing region, reflecting the evolution of this human activity over time.

The Committee requested the State Party to provide a report for its meeting in 2003, commenting on the implementation of the recent management plan and its

effectiveness, setting out details of the measures applied in the buffer zone.

Property	Aranjuez Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1044
State Party	Spain
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Aranjuez Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): Aranjuez represents the coming together of diverse cultural influences to create a cultural landscape that had a formative influence on further developments in this field.

Criterion (iv): The complex designed cultural landscape of Aranjuez, derived from a variety of sources, marks a seminal stage in the development of landscape design.

Property	The Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun
Id. N°	1027
State Party	Sweden
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (v)

The Committee inscribed The Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iii), and (v):

Criterion (ii): Copper mining at Falun was influenced by German technology, but this was to become the major producer of copper in the 17th century and exercised a profound influence on mining technology in all parts of the world for two centuries.

Criterion (iii): The entire Falun landscape is dominated by the remains of copper mining and production, which began as early as the 9th century and came to an end in the closing years of the 20th century.

Criterion (v): The successive stages in the economic and social evolution of the copper industry in the Falun region, from a form of “cottage industry” to full industrial production, can be seen in the abundant industrial, urban, and domestic remains characteristic of this industry that still survive.

Property	Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi
Id. N°	1022
State Party	Uganda
Criteria	C (i) (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (iii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (i): The Kasubi Tombs site is a masterpiece of human creativity both in its conception and in its execution.

Criterion (iii): The Kasubi Tombs site bears eloquent witness to the living cultural traditions of the Baganda.

Criterion (iv): The spatial organization of the Kasubi Tombs site represents the best extant example of a Baganda palace/architectural ensemble. Built in the finest traditions of Ganda architecture and palace design, it reflects technical achievements developed over many centuries.

Criterion (vi): The built and natural elements of the Kasubi Tombs site are charged with historical, traditional, and spiritual values. It is a major spiritual centre for the Baganda and is the most active religious place in the kingdom.

The Committee noted that the site combines the historical and spiritual values of a nation.

Property	Derwent Valley Mills
Id. N°	1030
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Derwent Valley Mills on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): The Derwent Valley saw the birth of the factory system, when new types of building were erected to house the new technology for spinning cotton developed by Richard Arkwright in the early 19th century.

Criterion (iv): In the Derwent Valley for the first time there was large-scale industrial production in a hitherto rural landscape. The need to provide housing and other facilities for workers and managers resulted in the creation of the first modern industrial towns.

Property	New Lanark
Id. N°	429 Rev
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	C (ii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee inscribed the New Lanark on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi):

Criterion (ii): When Richard Arkwright’s new factory system for textile production was brought to New Lanark the need to provide housing and other facilities to the workers and managers was recognized. It was there that Robert Owen created a model for industrial communities that was to spread across the world in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Criterion (iv): New Lanark saw the construction not only of well designed and equipped workers’ housing but also public buildings designed to improve their spiritual as well as their physical needs.

Criterion (vi): The name of New Lanark is synonymous with that of Robert Owen and his social philosophy in matters such as progressive education, factory reform, humane working practices, international cooperation, and garden cities, which was to have a profound

influence on social developments throughout the 19th century and beyond.

Property	Saltaire
Id. N°	1028
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	C (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Saltaire on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): Saltaire is an outstanding and well preserved example of a mid 19th century industrial town, the layout of which was to exert a major influence on the development of the “garden city” movement.

Criterion (iv): The layout and architecture of Saltaire admirably reflect mid 19th century philanthropic paternalism, as well as the important role played by the textile industry in economic and social development.

Property	Samarkand - Crossroads of Cultures
Id. N°	603 Rev
State Party	Uzbekistan
Criteria	C (i) (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Samarkand - Crossroads of Cultures on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii), and (iv).

Criterion (i): The architecture and townscape of Samarkand, situated at the crossroads of ancient cultures, are masterpieces of Islamic cultural creativity.

Criterion (ii): Ensembles in Samarkand such as the Bibi Khanum Mosque and Registan Square played a seminal role in the development of Islamic architecture over the entire region, from the Mediterranean to the Indian subcontinent.

Criterion (iv): The historic town of Samarkand illustrates in its art, architecture, and urban structure the most important stages of Central Asian cultural and political history from the 13th century to the present day.

The Committee noted with satisfaction the extension of the buffer zone to include the whole Timurid town, the archaeological area, Ulugh-Bek’s Observatory, and the 19th century development. It encouraged the city to continue with the preparation of an integrated management plan for the historic town as a whole and to report back to the Committee at its twenty-eighth session in 2004.

B. Extensions of Cultural Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa [<i>Extension to include the Norbulingka area</i>]
Id. N°	707 Ter
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i) (iv) (vi)

The Committee decided to approve the extension of the inscribed property, **Potala Palace and the Jokhang Temple Monastery, Lhasa**, to include the Norbulingka area, maintaining the existing criteria (i), (iv), and (vi).

The Committee noted that, because of development pressures in the city of Lhasa, particular attention be given to the mitigation of the changes in the areas surrounding the World Heritage properties.

Property	Painted Churches in the Troodos Region [<i>Extension to include the Church of Ayia Sotira, Palaichori</i>]
Id. N°	351 Bis
State Party	Cyprus
Criteria	C (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee decided to approve the extension of the Painted Churches in the Troodos Region, maintaining the existing criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

This serial inscription will henceforth include 10 structures:

DATE INSCRIBED	NAME	LOCATION
1985	<i>Church of Ayios Nikolaos (St. Nicholas) tis Steyis</i>	<i>Kakopetria</i>
1985	<i>Ayios Ionannis (St. John) Lambadhistis Monastery</i>	<i>Kalopanayiotis</i>
1985	<i>Church of Panayia (The Virgin) Phorviotissa (Asinou)</i>	<i>Nikitart</i>
1985	<i>Church of Panayia (The Virgin) tou Arakou</i>	<i>Lagouthera</i>
1985	<i>Church of Panayia (The Virgin)</i>	<i>Moutoullas</i>
1985	<i>Church of Archangelos Michael (Archangel Michael)</i>	<i>Pedhoulas</i>
1985	<i>Church of Timios Stavros (Holy Cross)</i>	<i>Pelendria</i>
1985	<i>Church of Panayia (The Virgin) Podhithou</i>	<i>Galata</i>
1985	<i>Church of Stavros (Holy Cross) Ayiasmati</i>	<i>Platanistasa</i>
2001	Church of Ayia Sotira (Transfiguration of the Savior)	Palaichori

Property	Mudejar Architecture of Aragon <i>[Extension of the Mudejar Architecture of Teruel]</i>
Id. N°	378 Bis
State Party	Spain
Criteria	C (iv)

The Committee decided to approve the extension of the Mudejar Architecture of Teruel, maintaining the existing criterion (iv). The State Party was urged to complete and implement the required management plan as soon as possible, and to take the necessary measures to guarantee that the relationship of the monuments with their historic setting be maintained. The State Party agreed to the change of the name to "*Mudejar Architecture of Aragon.*"

This serial inscription will henceforth include 10 structures:

DATE INSCRIBED	TOWN	NAME
1986	Teruel	Torre, techumbre y cimborrio de la catedral de Santa María de Mediavilla
1986	Teruel	Torre e iglesia de San Pedro
1986	Teruel	Torre de la iglesia de San Martín
1986	Teruel	Torre de la iglesia del Salvador
2001	Calatayud	Abside, claustro y torre de colegiata de Santa María
2001	Cervera de la Cañada	Iglesia parroquial de Santa Tecla
2001	Tobed	Iglesia de Santa María
2001	Zaragoza	Restos mudéjares de palacio de la Aljafería
2001	Zaragoza	Torre e iglesia parroquial de San Pablo
2001	Zaragoza	Abside, parroquieta y cimborrio de La Seo

C. Property which the Committee deferred

Property	The Bolgar Historical and Architectural Complex
Id. N°	981
State Party	Russian Federation

The Committee discussed extensively the authenticity and materials used for reconstruction at the site. Several delegates questioned whether the type of early documentary evidence supplied from the 19th century would be sufficient to guarantee authenticity for the reconstruction of the Great Minaret.

A number of interventions focused on the importance of the site as historical evidence for a nomadic empire. The Committee encouraged the State Party to submit a revised nomination dossier, which further elaborated the history of movements of people.

Furthermore, the Committee suggested that a workshop could be organized on the question of authenticity and reconstruction to provide clear guidance in this matter.

D. Property which the Committee did not inscribe on the World Heritage List

Property	Jurmala Wooden Construction (Dzintari District of Summer Cottages)
Id. N°	1036
State Party	Latvia

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

II. MIXED PROPERTY

Property	Karain Caves and Surroundings
Id. N°	1059
State Party	Turkey

The Committee decided not to inscribe the Karain Caves and Surroundings on the World Heritage List under natural criteria.

Concerning cultural values, the Committee noted that the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session decided that further consideration of this nomination be deferred, so that the State Party may prepare and present both a more comprehensive and scientifically well documented justification for inscription and an adequate management plan for the site.

III. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A. Properties which the Committee inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Brazilian Atlantic Islands: Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas Reserves
Id. N°	1000 Rev
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Brazilian Atlantic Islands: Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas Reserves on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (ii), (iii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): Fernando de Noronha / Rocas Atoll represents over half the insular coastal waters of the Southern Atlantic Ocean. These highly productive waters provide feeding ground for species such as tuna, billfish, cetaceans, sharks, and marine turtles as they migrate to the Eastern Atlantic coast of Africa. An oasis of marine life in relatively barren, open ocean,

the islands play a key role in the process of reproduction, dispersal and colonisation by marine organisms in the entire Tropical South Atlantic.

Criterion (iii): Baía dos Golfinhos is the only known place in the world with such a high population of resident dolphins and Rocas Atoll demonstrates a spectacular seascape at low tide when the exposed reef surrounding shallow lagoons and tidal pools forms a natural aquarium. Both sites have also exceptional submarine landscapes that have been recognised worldwide by a number of specialised diving literatures.

Criterion (iv): Fernando de Noronha / Rocas Atoll is a key site for the protection of biodiversity and endangered species in the Southern Atlantic. Providing a large proportion of the insular habitat of the South Atlantic, the site is a repository for the maintenance of marine biodiversity at the ocean basin level. It is important for the conservation of endangered and threatened species of marine turtles, particularly the hawksbill turtle. The site accommodates the largest concentration of tropical seabirds to be found in the Western Atlantic Ocean, and is a Global Centre of Bird Endemism. The site also contains the only remaining sample of the Insular Atlantic Forest and the only oceanic mangrove in the South Atlantic region.

The site consists of the Archipelago of Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas, a reef approximately 150 km to the west of the Archipelago.

Area	Location
National Marine Park of Fernando de Noronha	State of Pernambuco
Biological Marine Reserve of Rocas Atoll	State of Rio Grande do Norte

Property	Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks
Id. N°	1035
State Party	Brazil
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed the Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): The site has played a key role for millenia in maintaining the biodiversity of the Cerrado Ecoregion. Due to its central location and altitudinal variation, it has acted as a relatively stable species refuge when climate change has caused the Cerrado to move north-south or east-west. This role as a species refuge is ongoing as Earth enters another period of climate change.

Criterion (iv): The site contains samples of all key habitats that characterise the Cerrado ecoregion – one of Earth's oldest tropical ecosystems. It contains over 60% of all floral species and almost 80% of all vertebrate species described for the Cerrado. With the exception of the Giant Otter, all of the Cerrado's

endangered large mammals occur in the site. In addition, the site supports many rare small mammals and bird species that do not occur elsewhere in the Cerrado and a number of species new to science have been discovered in the Cerrado Protected Areas.

The site comprises two parts:

Park	Location	Size
Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park	Central Brazil Plateau, NE State of Goiás	235,970 ha
Emas National Park	Central Brazil Plateau, SW State of Goiás	131,386 ha

Property	Alejandro de Humboldt National Park
Id. N°	839 Rev
State Party	Cuba
Criteria	N (ii) (iv)

The Committee inscribed Alejandro de Humboldt National Park on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (ii) and (iv):

Criterion (ii): The size, altitudinal diversity, complex lithologies, and landform diversity of Alejandro de Humboldt National Park have resulted in a range of ecosystems and species unmatched in the Insular Caribbean. It was a Miocene-Pleistocene refuge site, particularly in the glacial eras, for the Caribbean biota. The fresh water rivers that flow off the peaks of the park are some of the largest in the insular Caribbean and because of this have high freshwater biological diversity. Because of the serpentine, peridotite, karst and pseudokarst geology of the region, the park is an excellent example of ongoing processes in the evolution of species and communities on underlying rocks that pose special challenges to plant survival.

Criterion (iv): Alejandro de Humboldt National Park contains the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of terrestrial biological diversity in the entire insular Caribbean. It contains 16 of 28 plant formations defined for Cuba, the largest island in the Caribbean, which is a unique biogeographic province. It is one of the most important sites for conservation of endemic flora in the entire Western Hemisphere – nearly 70% of the 1,302 spermatophytes already described, of an estimated total of 1,800-2,000, are endemic to the park. The park is one of the most biologically diverse terrestrial tropical ecosystems in an island setting anywhere on earth. Endemism rates for vertebrates and invertebrates found in the park are also very high. Many of these are threatened because of their small range. Because of their uniqueness and the fact that they represent unique evolutionary processes, they are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science and conservation.

The Committee requested that the management plan be finalized within a timeframe of 12 months and be sent to the World Heritage Centre in three copies.

Property	Central Sikhote-Alin
Id. N°	766 Rev
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	N (iv)

The Committee inscribed Central Sikhote-Alin on the World Heritage List under criterion (iv):

Criterion (iv): The nominated area is representative of one of the world's most distinctive natural regions. The combination of glacial history, climate and relief has allowed the development of the richest and most unusual temperate forests in the world. Compared to other temperate ecosystems, the level of endemic plants and invertebrates present in the region is extraordinarily high which has resulted in unusual assemblages of plants and animals. For example, subtropical species such as tiger and Himalayan bear share the same habitat with species typical of northern taiga such as brown bear and reindeer. The site is also important for the survival of endangered species such as the scaly-sided (Chinese) merganser, Blakiston's fish-owl and the Amur tiger.

This serial nomination consists of two protected areas in the Sikhote-Alin mountain range in the extreme southeast of the Russian Federation:

Name	Location
Sikhote-Alin Nature Preserve	Terney district
Goralij Zoological Preserve	Coastal zone on the Sea of Japan, N of Terney

The Committee encouraged the State Party to improve management of the Bikin River protected areas (Bikin Territory of Traditional Nature Use and Verkhnebikinski zakaznik) before nominating it as an extension.

Property	Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn
Id. N°	1037
State Party	Switzerland
Criteria	N (i)(ii)(iii)

The Committee inscribed the Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii), and (iii):

Criterion (i): The Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn region is the most glaciated area in the Alps and incorporates the Great Aletsch glacier, the largest and longest in western Eurasia. It is thus of significant scientific interest in the context of glacial history and ongoing processes, particularly related to climate change.

Criterion (ii): The Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn region provides a wide range of alpine and sub-alpine habitats. Superb examples of ecological succession exist, including the distinctive upper and lower tree-line of the Aletsch forest. The global phenomenon of

climatic change is particularly well illustrated in the region, as reflected in the varying rates of retreat of the different glaciers, in turn providing new substrates for ongoing ecological succession.

Criterion (iii): The impressive landscape of the Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn region has played an important role in European literature, art, mountaineering and alpine tourism. The aesthetics of the area have attracted an international clientele and it is globally recognised as one of the most spectacular mountain regions to visit.

Property	Dorset and East Devon Coast
Id. N°	1029
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria	N (i)

The Committee inscribed the Dorset and East Devon Coast on the World Heritage List under criterion (i):

Criterion (i): The Dorset and East Devon Coast provides an almost continuous sequence of Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous rock formations spanning the Mesozoic Era, documenting approximately 185 million years of Earth history. It also includes a range of internationally important fossil localities – vertebrate and invertebrate, marine and terrestrial - which have produced well-preserved and diverse evidence of life during Mesozoic times.

B. Extensions of Natural Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Galápagos Islands [<i>Extension to include the Galápagos Marine Reserve</i>]
Id. N°	1 Bis
State Party	Ecuador
Criteria	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee approved the extension of the Galápagos Islands by the addition of the Galápagos Marine Reserve, maintaining the existing natural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Marine Reserve adds substantially to the justification of the existing World Heritage site as one of the premier nature reserves on the planet. The Committee requested the Government of Ecuador to finalize as soon as possible the adoption of the regulations deriving from the Special Law for Galápagos.

The Committee stressed the importance of long-term protection and management of the site and noted that the extension will further enhance the protection of the site. The Committee commended the State Party on progress made and requested it to invite a mission to review the implementation of the regulations in late 2002.

Property	Lake Turkana National Parks <i>[Extension of Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks]</i>
Id. N°	801 Bis
State Party	Kenya
Criteria	N (i) (iv)

The Committee approved the extension of the extension of Sibiloi/Central Island by the addition of South Island National Park, maintaining the existing criteria (i) and (iv). As requested by the State Party, the new name of the site would be “*Lake Turkana National Parks*”.

This serial inscription includes three protected areas:

DATE INSCRIBED	PARK	AREA
1997	Sibiloi National Park	157,085 ha
1997	Central Island	500 ha
2001	South Island	3,900 ha

The Committee strongly encouraged the Kenyan authorities to complete the management plan for the three parks as an integrated unit.

Property	Volcanoes of Kamchatka <i>[Extension to include Kluchevskoy Nature Park]</i>
Id. N°	765 Bis
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee approved the extension of the Volcanoes of Kamchatka by the inclusion of the Kluchevskoy Nature Park as the sixth component. In addition to the 1996 inscription under criteria (i), (ii), and (iii), the Committee decided to inscribe the site also under criterion (iv).

Criterion (iv) The site contains an especially diverse range of palearctic flora, including a number of nationally threatened species and at least 16 endemics, and 33 mammal species, including internationally significant populations of sea lions and sea otter and a thriving population of brown bear, as well as 145 bird species. The rivers inside and adjacent contain the world's greatest known diversity of salmonid fish.

This serial inscription includes six protected areas:

Date inscribed	Name of Park	Area
1996	Kronotsky State Biosphere Nature Preserve	1,007 ha
1996	Bystrinsky Nature Park	1,500 ha
1996	Nalychevo Nature Park	265 ha
1996	Southwestern Tundra Nature Reserve	123 ha
1996	Southern Kamchatka Nature Park and the Southern Kamchatka State Nature Reserve	1,025 ha
2001	Kluchevskoy Nature Park	376 ha

C. Properties which the Committee did not inscribe on the World Heritage List

Property	Holy Tops (Svyati Gory)
Id. N°	1047
State Party	Ukraine

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Polissian Swamps and Slovechno-Ovruch Ridge
Id. N°	1048
State Party	Ukraine

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Kaniv's Hills (Kanivski Gory)
Id. N°	1049
State Party	Ukraine

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Karadag
Id. N°	1050
State Party	Ukraine

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Property	Podillian Ridge
Id. N°	1051
State Party	Ukraine

The Committee did not inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

Following the review of the five nominations from Ukraine, the Committee noted that potential sites for nomination could be identified by means of a World Heritage expert workshop, organised by the World Heritage Centre and the Ukrainian authorities. Such a workshop could develop an understanding of World Heritage requirements, help in the selection of appropriate sites and set the required standards for their management. Ideally, the workshop would involve natural heritage specialists from neighbouring countries as well as Ukrainian specialists. Cultural interests should also be involved, because several sites reviewed by IUCN have important cultural components.

The Identification of un-represented or less represented categories of natural and cultural properties

X.7 The Director of the World Heritage Centre introduced the topic by recalling the decision of the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns, Australia, in 2000 to limit, for a two-year trial period, the number of new nominations to be examined by the Committee in June 2003 to thirty. The Committee agreed to implement the decision according to a priority system:

1. States Parties with no sites on the List may submit up to three new nominations;
2. All other States Parties may submit only one new nomination;
3. If the number of new nominations is greater than thirty, then a selection process will be applied, based on whether the nomination falls into one or more un-represented or less-represented categories.

X.8 He noted that the Committee had also decided to consider nominations which had been deferred or referred from previous meetings, as well as extensions to sites already inscribed in addition to the thirty new nominations. He invited the Committee to consider the case of transboundary nominations, which he proposed as another category of nomination which could be excluded from the 30-nomination limit, as a means to encourage more nominations of this type.

X.9 The Director indicated that an examination of the number of States Parties which had actually submitted new nominations each year revealed that in only two cases over the life of the Convention had more than thirty States Parties submitted new nominations in any one year. The implication of this, he stressed, was that if each State Party submitted only one nomination, it was quite possible that the Secretariat would receive less than 30 nominations. In that case, no selection of nominations to be examined based on un- or less-represented categories would need to be made.

X.10 Finally, in the event that more than thirty nominations were received, the Director described several proposed selection processes that had been examined. In particular, he suggested that, to address the smaller number of natural sites on the World Heritage List, the Committee accept all natural nominations up to a certain specified limit.

X.11 A long discussion followed the Director's presentation. While some delegates questioned the decision of the previous Committee to limit the total number of nominations to be examined, and to limit the number of new nominations which a State Party could submit to one per year, other delegates recalled that these decisions had been taken as a result of long deliberation in the Twelfth and Thirteenth General Assemblies, in the Working Group on Representivity, and in the twenty-

fourth session of the Committee in Cairns. These meetings had consistently argued for a limit on the number of nominations examined by the Committee. This limit would give the Committee more time to take on its important role of reviewing the state of conservation of sites already inscribed and to develop a proactive approach to Periodic Reporting, and to have time for strategic discussions. It would also relieve the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies of a workload that had been growing larger each year.

X.12 Several delegates mentioned that the application of these rules would disadvantage large States Parties with multi-ethnic populations whose diverse heritage should be reflected in nominations to the World Heritage List.

X.13 Several observers reminded the Committee of the voluntary restraints requested of States Parties well-represented on the List by the resolutions of the General Assembly. It was noted that while some well-represented States Parties had refrained from nominating new sites, seven of the ten States Parties with the greatest number of sites had had new sites inscribed on the World Heritage List this year. Several delegates reminded the Committee that the decision once taken by the Cairns Committee should not be reopened at this stage, before the two-year trial proposed by the Committee had actually taken place. The Committee also noted that the initial first phase of this experiment would only be for one year and was to be evaluated in 2003.

X.14 Concerning the selection process recommended in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/12ADD, most delegates cautioned against using the preliminary cultural categories presented therein. In addition, while the proposed priority for natural nominations might be appropriate to some regions, there are more natural than cultural properties in Africa for example. The Committee regretted that the full analysis of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the World Heritage List requested by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns had not yet been undertaken. Delegates urged that in the budget discussions this activity be fully funded so that it could take place as soon as possible.

X.15 ICOMOS undertook to carry out a summary analysis of the existing List, to serve as the basis for a working group on a proposed methodology for selection of nominations, based on perceived under-represented regions and categories of property.

X.16 Several delegates took up the proposal that, for the nominations to be reviewed by the Committee in 2003 (to be received in the Centre by 1 February 2002), the April 2002 session of the Bureau should be asked for its guidance if the number of nominations exceeded the 30-nomination threshold.

The Committee came to the following consensus agreement:

X.17 The Committee confirmed that at its session in 2003 the number of new nominations examined would be

limited to a maximum of thirty, as decided at its twenty-fourth session in Cairns. In addition to the approved maximum number of nominations, the Committee would also consider nominations deferred or referred from previous meetings and extensions to the boundaries of already inscribed properties. The Committee may also decide to consider, on an emergency basis, situations falling under paragraph 67 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

XI.18 The Committee also confirmed that only one nomination per State Party would be accepted, except for those States with no sites on the World Heritage List, which might present up to three nominations.

XI.19 Transboundary nominations would not be counted within the limit of thirty nominations.

XI.20 If more than thirty nominations are received, the date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre would be considered as a secondary determining factor for the selection, as decided by the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Cairns.

XI.21 If for reasons of co-occurrence in the dates of presentation, more than thirty nominations are still received and acceptable, the issue would be referred to the April 2002 Bureau for a decision.

XI. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE GLOBAL TRAINING STRATEGY

XI.1 ICCROM presented the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/14, on a Global Training Strategy and Priority Action Plan (see Annex X), for the consideration of the Committee.

XI.2 The Committee took note that the proposed Strategy originated from a request that the Bureau had made in 1994, and was intended to improve the effectiveness of the Committee's use of the Fund in responding to training requests, but also to begin to move towards a more proactive approach in addressing training needs.

XI.3 ICCROM recalled that, at its last session in Cairns, the Committee had requested it to take the lead, in close co-operation with ICOMOS, IUCN and the Centre, to produce a synthesis of all previous efforts in order to prepare a comprehensive document integrating concern for both cultural and natural heritage.

XI.4 The Committee took further note of the structure of this proposed Strategy, composed of a general purpose and three main principles, with some suggested operational implications. The latter were included upon the specific request of the Chairperson of the Committee in March 2001.

XI.5 ICCROM explained that the general purpose of the Strategy was the strengthening of conservation of cultural and natural heritage worldwide, by increasing the

capacity of those responsible for, and involved with the management and conservation of World Heritage sites.

XI.6 On the three principles, it was clarified that they referred, respectively, to recognizing the cost-effectiveness of training for the achievement of the Committee's overall objectives, to the need to integrate training into the general World Heritage planning framework, and to ensuring the highest possible quality of the training activities carried out within the framework of the Convention. For each of these principles, the relative implications for the work of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies was described.

XI.7 ICCROM then introduced the Priority Action Plan, noting that this moved from needs analysis and identification of priorities (necessarily linked with the Periodic Reporting and Global Strategy exercises), to the articulation of possible training modules and programmes at global and regional levels. The need for the Committee to regularly review the general planning framework of the proposed training programmes for impact and effectiveness, and the importance of integrating into training modules existing regional resources and materials was emphasized.

XI.8 Among the possible priority areas for action, ICCROM mentioned a more effective implementation of the Convention, the improvement of site management and the strengthening of technical, scientific and traditional conservation skills. For each of these areas, a list of possible preliminary themes was provided, recalling that these had resulted from close consultations with all Advisory Bodies.

XI.9 In concluding its presentation, ICCROM stressed the importance of establishing an appropriate implementation process, with continued updating of priorities and related adjustment of programmes and modules, and reviewing of results. The Committee strongly commended ICCROM for the excellent work accomplished, in collaboration with the other Advisory Bodies and the Centre, and found the Global Training Strategy a very useful document, both comprehensive and well articulated. It also noted with satisfaction that the Hungarian proposal for the establishment of a Fellowship scheme had been integrated into the Global Training Strategy.

XI.10 After some remarks on the need to improve the French translation of the text, the Committee stressed that training activities carried out in the framework of the World Heritage Convention should contribute to improving conservation of cultural and natural heritage in general. The Committee also expressed its appreciation for the list of possible actions related to the Global Training Strategy, although it cautioned against undertaking too many initiatives, especially when these have already been developed by other bodies or States Parties.

XI.11 On the proposed areas of action and themes, IUCN suggested that these be defined taking into account

the priority programmes agreed upon by the Committee during the present session, such as the one on Forests. Among the technical skills, which could be the subject of training modules, some members of the Committee mentioned the conservation of wooden structures in view of their importance in all regions of the world.

XI.12 With regard to the introduction of a more proactive approach, the Committee recognized that this was a necessity, but warned the Secretariat against an exclusive top-down needs identification process, and stated that States Parties' requests should not be discouraged but better organized.

XI.13 The Committee approved the Global Training Strategy and the Priority Action Plan, and expressed the wish that the progress achieved on its implementation be reviewed regularly at Statutory Meetings.

XII. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

XII.1 The Secretariat introduced Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/16 on the proposed World Heritage Information Management Programme. It recalled that the strategy of this programme had previously been developed in consultation with interested States Parties and Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Information Programme must have wide participation and close co-ordination. If the necessary funds are secured, it will create significant savings in efficiency as well as improvement of the effectiveness of the Convention.

XII.2 The Programme is based on the following principles: (1) an incremental approach; (2) partnerships; (3) strengthening the capacity of the less developed States Parties to handle their own data and information; (4) coordinating and including in the proposed five-year Programme, the Periodic Reporting Exercise and the inclusion of geo-referenced data; (5) avoidance of duplication by working jointly with organizations/institutions already involved in conservation, presentation and preservation activities.

XII.3 Within the proposed partnership approach the Secretariat informed the Committee that joint co-operation with institutions had already been established. The following partnerships have been established with:

- Council of Europe, in order for the World Heritage Convention to take advantage of the HEREIN system. This co-operation will provide significant assistance to the work of gathering and disseminating World Heritage associated information.
- Nordic World Heritage Office, to take advantage of the Information Technology (IT) tool developed for the Nordic countries as an assistance tool to obtain country and site-related data.
- United Nations Environment Programme GRID Office in Geneva, in order to set up the basis for long-term cooperation to produce basic maps for World Heritage sites.

- International space agencies: This partnership will benefit the work of the Convention with free access to satellite data for the monitoring of World Heritage sites. In addition, the space agencies are willing to assist the Secretariat with the provision of experts and know-how so that this partnership benefits States Parties requesting such assistance.

XII.4 The Secretariat emphasized the need to support States Parties with the development and implementation of national World Heritage information systems.

XII.5 The Committee congratulated the Secretariat for the presentation and expressed its support and endorsement of the World Heritage Information Management Programme. The Committee underlined its particular appreciation for the Capacity Building aspects included in such a Programme, oriented to strengthen national and regional capacity to manage heritage data and information.

XII.6 The Committee underlined the need to have all the information of the system presented in languages other than the official ones. These additional languages are required to enable local end-users to have optimum understanding of the information stored and disseminated. Should this information be translated, the Committee expressed the need for high quality translations and for this to be done preferably, by people from the region.

XII.7 The Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the costs associated with translating and maintaining the information in additional languages. It proposed that funds could be sought to entrust this task to existing, recognized regional organizations. This will enable the establishment of partnerships at regional level not only to support regional language versions of World Heritage information but, what is more important, to strengthen regional capacity.

XII.8 The Committee encouraged and requested the Secretariat to make use of the existing Information Technology (IT) infrastructure of UNESCO. It also instructed the Secretariat to continue working jointly with other UNESCO sectors that have already developed similar information systems. The example of the "Man and the Biosphere Programme" was mentioned. The fact of working jointly with the overall communication and information strategy of UNESCO could bring some savings in the total amount of funding required to support the World Heritage Information Management Programme. The Committee requested the Secretariat to describe the links of the proposed Programme with the new IT system being developed by UNESCO.

XII.9 The Secretariat explained that use is already being made of the existing IT infrastructure of UNESCO (the servers of the World Heritage Centre are managed and maintained by the UNESCO Division of Information Technology), and it is in close contact with the Culture and Science Sectors. These sectors do not manage all information required by the World Heritage Convention.

The need for a separate World Heritage Information system remains valid. The new system being developed in UNESCO (FABS) is a financial system and will assist the Secretariat in its administrative tasks. Such a system is not designed to assist the Secretariat in managing data and information associated with the Convention.

XII.10 The Delegate of Hungary expressed his appreciation for the clarity of the presentation and supported the proposed Programme in the form of an open initiative. He indicated that funds have already been allocated at the national level in order to harmonize the information for the national World Heritage sites. He recalled that Hungary was one of the countries that initiated the HEREIN initiative. The Secretariat informed the Committee of current discussions towards a partnership with Hungary in the area of national heritage information management.

XII.11 An observer expressed support of the Programme, but indicated concerns of the use of such a technology by the less developed States Parties. The Secretariat recognized the difficulties for certain countries to have access to high-tech (expensive telecommunications services and non-availability of computers at office level). However, it was explained that the proposed integrated system would make the work of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies more efficient, thereby servicing these States Parties by dispatching rapidly requested information in paper format.

XII.12 The Chairperson concluded discussions on the subject. The Committee adopted the proposed World Heritage Information Management Programme under the co-ordination of the World Heritage Centre.

XIII. 30TH ANNIVERSARY EVENTS

XIII.1 As requested by the Committee, a specific item was devoted to the examination of events scheduled to take place during 2002 in celebration of the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention.

XIII.2 The Director of the Centre introduced this item giving some background concerning initiatives conducted in the past in celebration of anniversaries. He further noted that it was important to commemorate the adoption of the Convention as this would certainly give greater visibility to the Convention and promote its objectives. He further stressed that most of the events proposed to take place in 2002 would be participatory. Such occasions would provide experts and other actors with opportunities to assess the effectiveness of existing conservation tools and identify issues to be addressed in the future.

XIII.3 He recalled that the General Assembly of States Parties of the United Nations had just recently decided to proclaim 2002 as the UN Year of Cultural Heritage, in the aftermath of the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan, and underlined the need to establish linkages between the anniversary of the Convention and this decision.

XIII.4 The Director of the Centre drew the attention to a number of events scheduled in 2002 in addition to the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (Budapest, Hungary), that include the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the World Heritage Virtual Congress. He then provided extensive information to the Committee about the World Heritage International Congress of Experts, scheduled to take place in Venice, Italy from 14 to 16 November 2002, following a series of technical workshops taking place on 11 and 12 November 2002 in various cities that have accepted to host these workshops. He informed the Committee that this Congress was to be jointly organized by the Italian Government and UNESCO, following a mission of the Director-General of UNESCO to Italy in March 2001 and the subsequent decision of the Italian Government to contribute extra funding through a Funds-in-Trust framework for World Heritage activities.

XIII.5 In addition, he informed the Committee that the meeting would also receive funds from other donors and that a contribution would be made by UNESCO's Regional Office for Science and Technology in Europe (ROSTE), based in Venice, from extrabudgetary funding it receives for cultural activities.

XIII.6 The Director stressed the need for this Congress to be one of high level, involving public personalities and leading experts. In addition, he indicated that the Congress would be open to the media in order to ensure the visibility of the event for it to contribute to building the awareness of the public at large.

XIII.7 Lastly, the Director informed the Committee that the initiative had been included in the 2002-2003 UNESCO Programme and Budget that has been approved by the Executive Board and the General Conference.

XIII.8 While expressing support to activities aimed at celebrating the 30th anniversary and, more generally those promoting the work accomplished in implementing the Convention, and in particular to the organization of an International Congress of Experts, several delegates took the floor to stress the need to consult closely with the Committee and keep it involved in preparatory stages of all World Heritage activities in accordance with appropriate decision-making processes. Certain delegates asked for clarification concerning the agenda of the Congress, how it might directly contribute to the implementation of the Convention and its relation to the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee. Certain delegates informed the Committee that at the Executive Board they had raised legal questions concerning the distinction between UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee during the examination of the proposed programme and budget for 2002-2003.

XIII.9 Other delegates stressed the need to use the 30th anniversary and the events linked to it in a forward-looking manner, as an additional opportunity to assess the work already undertaken, examine achievements, and make new contributions.

XIII.10 A suggestion was made to invite the Bureau members, represented through their permanent delegations in Paris, to attend future meetings of the Steering Committee of the Congress, as it finalises the programme of the International Congress and other events linked to the 30th anniversary, as have been the Advisory Bodies.

XIII.11 Another suggestion was made regarding the need to encourage the inclusion of a theme relating to the recent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of States Parties concerning acts constituting “a crime against the common heritage of humanity” and the need to prevent the destruction of heritage.

XIII.12 The Secretariat was asked to report back to the Committee after the International Congress to enable the Committee to examine and evaluate the results of the Congress. ICOMOS suggested studying the possibility of establishing an International Day for World Heritage, based on existing examples.

XIII.13 In his response, the Director of the Centre made a clear distinction between the associated events of the session of the Committee in Budapest organised in celebration of the 30th anniversary of the Convention and the International Congress of Experts of Venice and made reference to the different scopes of the meetings and the difference in the type of participants that would attend.

XIII.14 He indicated that the objectives of the International Congress were designed within the overall context of the strategic reform process and were specifically linked to the development of the partnership initiatives for World Heritage conservation. He also underlined that the Congress would not be a policy-making meeting and had no decision-making power.

XIII.15 He welcomed the proposals made to involve the Bureau members in the Steering Committee of the Congress while recalling the need for this Steering Committee to be informal in its nature. He also invited States Parties to develop other initiatives at the national level. Finally, he thanked the Committee for the constructive discussion.

XIV. AWARENESS – BUILDING AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

XIV.1 The Chairperson then introduced Agenda item XIV concerning Awareness Building and Education Activities and, due to lack of time, asked the Committee to accept reviewing the work plan of activities proposed in document WHC-01/CONF.208/17 without hearing the Secretariat's presentation on this item.

XIV.2 The delegates demonstrated their support for the communication strategy in developing awareness activities and reiterated their unyielding support to activities such as the World Heritage Education project for Young People. It was suggested that activities in this programme also include awareness-raising with regard to wilful destruction

of heritage. The importance of involving universities in research and training was also stressed.

XIV.3 Questions were raised concerning specific activities proposed in the work plan, notably on the *World Heritage Review* and the new series of World Heritage Papers being proposed and underlined the need to ensure better co-ordination of these activities with other partners, including the Advisory Bodies, in order to strengthen the impact of these projects and avoid any duplication of efforts. The issue of quality control was also raised and the Centre was invited to consult with States Parties concerned before information materials are produced and used in promotional contexts, particularly with regard to the public service announcements under preparation.

XIV.4 The Committee debated on the proposed World Heritage Visual Identity and the need to examine this document more closely as similar initiatives may have already been undertaken at local and national levels and new information may be derived from existing experiences. The need to keep this new tool as flexible as possible and to take other visual identities designed by local management authorities into consideration was also emphasized. The design of the new World Heritage signature, illustrated in the draft Visual Identity manual, was considered positively, provided that a certain measure of flexibility be given to management and national authorities for the choice of language versions attached to this Signature as stipulated in the *Guidelines and Principles for the use of the World Heritage Emblem* contained in the *Operational Guidelines*. It was suggested that the current draft manual on the proposed World Heritage Visual Identity could be circulated to the members of the Committee for comments and that a new draft should be prepared for examination at the next session of the Bureau in April 2002. This proposal was approved by the Committee.

XIV.5 Following the comments made by delegates on this item, the Committee decided to approve the proposed work plan of Awareness-Building and Education activities. In addition, the Committee requested the Centre to study the process for ensuring the legal protection of the World Heritage Emblem and report on its findings during the next session of the Bureau.

International World Heritage Education Workshop

XIV.6 An International World Heritage Education Workshop, was held concurrently with the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee and hosted by the Finnish National Commission for UNESCO and the National Board of Education of Finland. The Workshop brought together sixteen participants (students, teachers and advisors) who were involved in major World Heritage Education events in 2001 as well as those preparing upcoming events in early 2002. The main objectives were to:

- Present recent World Heritage Education achievements and the results of the external World Heritage Education evaluation;

- Develop proposals for the integration of the World Heritage Education Kit in school curricula;
- Propose the future orientation for the World Heritage Education Project;
- Formulate recommendations for the 30th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention.

XIV.7 On the occasion of the Workshop, the Finnish version of the World Heritage Educational Resource Kit for Teachers "World Heritage in Young Hands", was launched.

XIV.8 One of the main results of the Workshop was the presentation made by four young people to the Committee on 15 December 2001 on:

1. The First World Heritage Youth Forum for Latin America and the Caribbean, Lima, Peru, whose main output was the Lima Declaration;
2. The World Heritage Marine Environmental Education Programme for Disadvantaged Youth, Belize;
3. The Third European Course in Restoration for Youth, Røros, Norway; and
4. The 10th International Youth Forum on World Heritage Education, Karlskrona, Sweden, where the participants developed the Karlskrona Recommendations.

XIV.9 During the presentation, the young people highlighted proposed activities for the 30th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention and for the enhancement and strengthening of the World Heritage Education Project. The presentations are attached to this report as Annex XI.

XV. REPORT ON THE PROPOSED WORLD HERITAGE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES COUNCIL OF EXPERTS (WHIPCOE)

XV.1 The Chairperson sincerely thanked Parks Canada for having hosted the WHIPCOE workshop in Winnipeg, Canada in early November 2001 and welcomed the following indigenous delegates to the session: Mr Tumu Te Heu Heu (Paramount Chief, Tongariro National Park, New Zealand), Mr Eru Manuera (General Manager, Maori Issues, Department of Conservation, New Zealand) and Mrs Josie Weninger (Field Unit Superintendent, Parks Canada). The Chairperson conveyed the Committee's respects to the Paramount Chief and thanked him for having traveled from New Zealand to attend the Committee session.

XV.2 Mrs Josie Weninger presented a report on the proposed WHIPCOE making reference to WHC-01/CONF.208/13. Her presentation summarized progress since the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001. She informed the Committee that the proposed purposes of WHIPCOE are, in co-operation with States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and indigenous peoples:

- (i) to serve as a network,
- (ii) to allow indigenous voices to be heard in protecting and promoting the world's natural and cultural heritage,
- (iii) to bring complementary indigenous competencies and expertise, and
- (iv) to support best practice management and, upon request, make recommendations for improvements.

XV.3 She also made reference to other aspects of the proposal, such as suggested functions, membership, the reporting process and the funding mechanisms of WHIPCOE.

XV.4 The Committee thanked Mrs Weninger for her excellent presentation and commended the WHIPCOE working group for their work. A number of Committee members, observers and the representatives of the Advisory Bodies commented that indigenous peoples have a special role with respect to certain World Heritage properties and that a network could provide a positive forum for an exchange of information and experience concerning their protection. It was proposed that indigenous peoples could meet on their own initiative, be included as part of State Party delegations to the Committee and were encouraged to be involved in UNESCO's work relating to the intangible heritage.

XV.5 The Committee raised a number of legal concerns and issues relating to the funding, legal status, role and relationships (with the States Parties, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Committee and World Heritage Centre). Some members of the Committee questioned the definition of indigenous peoples and the relevance of such a distinction in different regions of the world. As a result, the Committee did not approve the establishment of WHIPCOE as a consultative body of the Committee or as a network to report to the Committee. The Committee did not provide funding for a second meeting to discuss WHIPCOE as proposed in WHC-01/CONF.208/13. However, the Committee encouraged professional research and exchange of views on the subject.

XVI. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 2002-2003

XVI.1 The Director of the Centre presented the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/18 concerning agenda item 15 on the World Heritage Fund, the income and forecasts, the work plan and the budget for 2002-2003. This document also presents in annex the budgets proposed by the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM), the accounts of the World Heritage Fund as at 31 December 2000 and the provisional accounts and income of the World Heritage Fund as at 31 October 2001.

XVI.2 He called the attention of the Committee to the decisions to be taken during this session:

- Take note of the approved financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for 2000 and the provisional accounts for 2001, as at 31 October 2001;
- Examine the budget of the World Heritage Fund proposed for 2002-2003 and approve its ceiling and different allocations by chapter and component;
- Take a decision on the ceilings for international assistance, as proposed by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau in June 2001;
- Study the situation of the World Heritage Fund and the mandatory and voluntary contributions, and the way to implement the Convention by improving the financial resources of the Fund taking into consideration the draft resolution of the thirteenth General Assembly for an additional contribution to the Fund.

XVI.3 The Director of the Centre stressed that for the first time he submitted for the approval of the Committee a biennial budget (2002-2003), according to the decision taken by the Committee in Cairns in 2000 to adjust the budget of the Fund to the biennial budget cycle of the Regular Programme of UNESCO. He indicated that the presentation of the biennial budget would be improved for 2004-2005 based on discussions of a new format and a new organization of the chapters, reflecting the present reforms and the new strategic orientations. This revised structure and the adjustments to the current budget will be presented to the next Committee session in Budapest for approval (Agenda items 13 and 14).

XVI.4 The Director then presented the following points:

- The situation of current reserves from States Parties contributions, notably increased by the payment by the Russian Federation of all its outstanding dues (\$US1,500,000);
- Other available resources for the implementation of the Convention (Regular Programme Budget, extrabudgetary funds and income from promotional activities);
- The budget proposed for 2002-2003, for a total amount of 8.1 million US dollars (\$4,105,000 for 2002 and \$3,995,000 for 2003).

XVI.5 The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that despite the current improved state of the reserves, the proposed budget was reduced by 20% in comparison to 1999, and that the income-expenditure ratio of the Fund could not be maintained at the same level beyond the period 2002-2003. He then indicated that the budget ceiling for 2002-2003 had been established based on the recommendations of the Comptroller who suggested setting it at about 8 million dollars for the biennium, so as to maintain a certain liquidity of the Fund's reserves. The gradual reduction of the reserves of the Fund is due to:

- Stagnation of contributions to the Fund and their minimum ceiling (\$27);
- The outstanding dues of mandatory contributions which concerns 51 States Parties;

- (\$474,780) and some voluntary contributions (\$915,313);
- A relatively high implementation rate of activities, which does not permit a substantial replenishment of the operational reserve.

XVI.6 The Director then evoked the pending questions concerning the current budget.

- The establishment of a separate bank account for the World Heritage Fund, to avoid tedious enquiries concerning contributions made to the Fund, paid into the UNESCO bank account at the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York;
- The ten-month time period between the Committee in June and the Bureau in April and the eventual modifications to be made to the current system for authorization of expenditure;
- The level of budget ceilings authorized by the Chairperson of the Committee.

XVI.7 Before the chapter-by-chapter examination of the budget, the Chairperson invited comments from the Committee members. A delegate expressed the wish of the informal working group on the budget which met prior to the debate, that the budget of the Fund be presented in a new simplified format providing an overall view of all the sources of income, real and projected expenditures, and taking into account the current reforms and strategic orientations. Several delegates endorsed the establishment of a separate bank account for contributions to the Fund and asked that a proposal be made along these lines. The Committee requested that coherence between the budget of the Fund and the activities under extrabudgetary resources, be highlighted, and an appropriate work plan be elaborated. Concern was expressed with regard to the outstanding dues, which amounted to the additional allocation that the Director-General requested the General Conference of UNESCO to grant to the Centre to reinforce its activities, but which was not approved. The Committee expressed appreciation for the commitment and dynamism of the Centre in the preparation and the implementation of the programme and budget despite the limited resources available. A delegate indicated that the item dealing with the budget was placed too late in the Committee agenda and that the time remaining for discussion was too limited for in-depth discussion. It was suggested that the Centre take necessary measures to restructure the budget in line with the current reform process.

XVI.8 The Director of the Centre responded to the observations of the delegates and reaffirmed that the budget of the Fund required a better presentation, and more clarity to enable rapid decision-making by the Committee. He stressed that the Centre would be pleased to receive any suggestions from the Committee concerning the budget presentation and whether or not to discuss this agenda item at the outset of its session.

XVI.9 He confirmed that the extrabudgetary resources allocated to the World Heritage Centre were integrated into the extrabudgetary fund system received by UNESCO

and that the amount of 13% generally received for overhead costs (5% for the UNFIP projects) were redistributed to the Centre up to amount of 6.5% (the balance being paid to UNESCO's central services), based on the actual outstanding expenditures and not the allocated budget.

XVI.10 Several delegates regretted that the total overhead costs paid by donors were not paid back to the Centre. They were concerned as to who made the choice of the activities financed by these projects, the donor or UNESCO and if their objectives were taken into account in the framework of the priorities of the Centre.

XVI.11 The Director indicated that before accepting any contribution, the Centre always entered into a dialogue with the donors and ensured that there was leeway to adjust the projects to take account of priority activities. For example, Belgium is supplementing the funds received from the UNF through extrabudgetary funding.

XVI.12 The Director then presented the draft budget chapter-by-chapter:

Chapter I – Implementation of the Convention (\$320,000 for 2002; \$330,000 for 2003)

XVI.13 The Director noted that this Chapter should in the future comprise other budget lines concerning the services of the Advisory Bodies.

XVI.14 Some delegates intervened with regard to the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and requested that sufficient budget be allocated to cover the follow up activities of the working group in 2002 and the publication of the Guidelines and their dissemination.

Chapter II – Establishment of the World Heritage List (\$935,000 for 2002; \$820,000 for 2003)

XVI.15 Several delegates requested that the amounts allocated to the new budget line "Global Framework Studies" which should regroup the analysis of the World Heritage List and the studies of the Tentative Lists be increased. Certain delegates proposed using the funds foreseen for the "Thematic Studies" by the Advisory Bodies for these analyses. These studies should be undertaken by the Advisory Bodies concerned and the amounts allocated directly to them. Other delegates expressed their concern in the reduction of the amounts allocated to ICOMOS whilst the number of evaluations would remain unchanged. ICOMOS intervened to confirm that it had no financial resources other than those of the Fund, and that it adjusted its activities in function to the budget allocated: a reduction would entail de facto a decrease in their activities. IUCN added that it noted the reductions in the budget, was seriously concerned about 2003, and informed the Committee that many experts provided services free of charge.

XVI.16 The Director of the Centre commended the Advisory Bodies on their valuable services unmatched

with the amounts actually allocated. He then indicated that the Centre will propose to the Committee an increase of allocations for 2003 to the Advisory Bodies to ensure that the evaluation continues under optimal conditions.

Chapter III – Technical implementation of the Convention (\$2,120,000 in 2002; \$2,150,000 in 2003)

XVI.17 The Director of the Centre then presented the proposed budget for the different types of international assistance (Preparatory Assistance, Technical Co-operation, Training, Promotion), the budget proposals for the ICCROM and IUCN projects and the annex activities. He proposed to include a new budget line devoted to the evaluation of international assistance devoted to the analysis on the use of the funds spent on assistance granted.

XVI.18 Some delegates expressed satisfaction with this initiative, requesting a systematic annual evaluation of international assistance, its cost/efficiency ratio for the operation and the modalities to be implemented. A delegate insisted on the implication of the Advisory Bodies in this process. In view of the involvement of some of the Advisory Bodies in the actual execution of international assistance activities, the Committee agreed to entrust the Director of the Centre to find the best modalities to carry out this evaluation. Other delegates requested that this chapter reflect the Committee's priorities and that certain categories of countries or regions should be excluded for the benefit of other priorities.

XVI.19 The Director of the Centre informed that the budget document indicated, for each type of assistance, the regional division of requests, their number, their type and their amount. He added that this assistance was based on requests presented by the countries and the allocation of funds made according to the priorities and after approval by the Committee, the Bureau or the Chairperson. He indicated that the proposed budget for Technical Co-operation had been reduced in comparison to previous years. However, this area of activities had benefited from considerable extrabudgetary resources.

XVI.20 Some delegates then asked information on the new programmes proposed by the Centre at the end of this chapter and expressed the wish that the Advisory Bodies be consulted on such initiatives.

Chapter IV – Monitoring the state of conservation of the sites (\$540,000 for 2002; \$505,000 for 2003)

XVI.21 For reactive monitoring, the amounts foreseen for ICOMOS and IUCN were increased by approximately 25% for 2002, thus covering the proposals of the Advisory Bodies for that year.

XVI.22 For periodic reports: Asia and the Pacific will submit periodic reports in 2002 and Latin America and the Caribbean in 2003. Financial allocations are foreseen in

2002 and 2003 to ensure monitoring activities for each region having already submitted their periodic reports.

XVI.23 Several delegates stated that the amounts foreseen for follow-up activities to periodic reporting were too low and barely credible and that the work would not be productive.

XVI.24 The Director of the Centre responded that although the amount is modest, the intention is to assist States Parties to obtain international assistance funds for these follow-up activities.

Chapter V – Awareness raising and Education (\$190,000 per year)

XVI.25 The Director presented this Chapter, which no longer includes statutory documentation and the WEB (Chapter I), and currently only includes awareness raising activities, partnerships with the tourism industry (the principal objective of which is to seek extrabudgetary resources) and Education activities, comprising in particular the youth programme for the preservation of the World Heritage and some activities with universities. Following the request of a delegate, the Director indicated that no part of the World Heritage Fund budget would be used for activities linked to the 30th Anniversary of the Convention in 2002 which will be entirely funded by extrabudgetary resources.

XVI.26 Several delegates expressed satisfaction with the awareness raising programme for young people for the preservation of World Heritage.

XVI.27 Following this presentation, members of the Committee made observations on different aspects of the budget before the adoption of the report. They once again insisted that funds be allocated for the analysis of the World Heritage List and the tentative lists (Chapter II) to define the priorities and different categories for

nomination. They were concerned about the low level of the 2003 budget, not sufficiently high to ensure these analyses and requested the Centre to make a new budget proposal for submission at the next Committee session in Budapest. The Advisory Bodies renewed their wish to provide assistance in the reorganization of the work in the framework of the programmes. ICOMOS proposed to use the funds allocated under the line “Other” to increase the amounts foreseen for the analyses of the Lists. A delegate finally insisted that the Centre prepare a long-term action programme to define targeted objectives and expected results.

XVI.28 The Director of the Centre undertook to revise the allocation of the funds proposed under Chapter II to reflect the wishes of the Committee members. In particular, the Director indicated that priority would be given to the increase in 2003 of the funds allocated for the Advisory Bodies’ activities, to guarantee at least the same level of funding for 2002. Moreover, the Director informed that the budget line “Other advisory services” of Chapter II would be suppressed and its amount (\$20,000) transferred to the activities for the analyses of the Lists to be shared equally between IUCN and ICOMOS. Each chapter was then approved with the budget ceiling proposed.

XVI.29 The Chairperson closed the debate on the Document WHC-01/CONF.208/18 and declared that the budget of the World Heritage Fund for 2002-2003 was approved for an amount of four million one hundred and five thousand dollars (\$4,105,000) for 2002 and three million nine hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars (\$3,995,000) for 2003.

XVI.30 The following table provides the details of the approved budget by Chapter and by component.

Approved Budget for 2002 and 2003

Chapters and components	Approved Budget 2002 (US\$)	Approved Budget 2003 (US\$)
Chapter I – Implementation of the Convention		
Participation in statutory meetings	50 000	60 000
<i>Operational Guidelines</i> : follow up, publication and dissemination	50 000	50 000
Information Management	100 000	100 000
Documentation , Registration & Statutory Web	100 000	100 000
Coordination with other conventions, programmes etc.	20 000	20 000
Sub-total Chapter I	320 000	330 000

Chapters and components	Approved Budget 2002	Approved Budget 2003
Chapter II – Establishment of the World Heritage List		
Global Strategy:	325 000	280 000
<i>Analyses of the List & Tentative Lists</i>	65 000	60 000
<i>Africa</i>	30 000	25 000
<i>Arab States</i>	30 000	25 000
<i>Asia, including Central Asia</i>	30 000	25 000
<i>Pacific</i>	30 000	25 000
<i>Europe & North America</i>	15 000	10 000
<i>Central & Eastern Europe</i>	20 000	15 000
<i>Latin America</i>	25 000	20 000
<i>Caribbean</i>	25 000	20 000
Thematic studies:		
<i>ICOMOS</i>	30 000	30 000
<i>IUCN</i>	25 000	25 000
Advisory services:		
<i>ICOMOS</i>	310 000	280 000
<i>IUCN</i>	300 000	260 000
Sub-total Advisory Services	610 000	540 000
Sub-total Chapter II	935 000	820 000
Chapter III – Technical Implementation of the World Heritage Convention		
Preparatory Assistance	370 000	400 000
Technical cooperation	650 000	600 000
<i>Including Africa 2003 Nature (IUCN/WHC):</i>		
(i) <i>contribution to IUCN for projects/activities preparation</i>	15 000	15 000
(ii) <i>earmarked for regional/national activities benefiting States Parties</i>	40 000	40 000
<i>Including other technical cooperation activities</i>	595 000	545 000
Training	800 000	800 000
<i>Including ICCROM support costs</i>	37 900	46 050
<i>Earmarked for ICCROM training activities</i>	69 400	60 000
<i>« Africa 2009 » (WHC/ICCROM)</i>	100 000	80 000
<i>Including IUCN</i>	30 000	30 000
<i>Including Africa 2003 Nature (IUCN/WHC):</i>		
(i) <i>earmarked for regional/national activities benefiting States Parties</i>	45 000	45 000
- <i>Including other training activities</i>	517 700	538 950
Evaluation of International Assistance	30 000	30 000
Programme initiatives	200 000	250 000
Support to promotional activities	70 000	70 000
Sub-total Chapter III	2 120 000	2 150 000

Chapters & Components	Approved Budget 2002	Approved Budget 2003
Chapter IV – Monitoring of the State of Conservation of sites		
Reactive monitoring	220 000	200 000
<i>Including ICOMOS</i>	80 000	80 000
<i>Including IUCN</i>	80 000	60 000
Support to State Parties for submission of periodic reports (Article 29):		
<i>Africa</i>	0	0
<i>Arab States</i>	0	0
<i>Asia & Pacific</i>	130 000	0
<i>Europe & North America Pacific</i>	20 000	20 000
<i>Eastern & Central Europe</i>	30 000	40 000
<i>Latin America & Caribbean</i>	70 000	145 000
	250 000	205 000
Follow-up to periodic reporting:		
<i>Arab States</i>	30 000	25 000
<i>Africa</i>	40 000	30 000
<i>Asia & Pacific</i>	0	45 000
Sub-total Chapter IV	540 000	505 000
Chapter V – Awareness & Education		
Awareness-building	100 000	100 000
Partnerships with tourism industries	10 000	10 000
Education & cooperation with the Universities	80 000	80 000
Sub-total Chapter V	190 000	190 000
TOTAL WHF BUDGET	4 105 000	3 995 000
Emergency Reserve Fund	600 000	600 000
Promotional activities and services	283 000	273 000
GRAND TOTAL	4 988 000	4 868 000

XVII. INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Information on International Assistance – Towards a Programme Approach

XVII.1 The Secretariat informed the Committee that document WHC-01/CONF.208/19 provides an analysis of international assistance under the World Heritage Fund based on the review of more than 1200 requests approved from 1978 to the end-of September 2001, and proposals of four thematic programmes aimed to address some of the major conservation problems of World Heritage sites. The Secretariat recalled that these programme proposals were

developed for consideration by the Committee at the request of the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session which endorsed the strategic orientations in the use of the World Heritage Fund's international assistance. The overall aim, the Secretariat stated, was to use limited funds in a proactive way and to support conservation activities with a multiplier effect with demonstration value.

XVII.2 The Committee was informed that a total of about US\$27 million had been allocated since 1978 to support activities requested by the States Parties. Although the amount available annually for international assistance had increased significantly since 1992, the growing demand from States Parties of the developing world made it

impossible to respond adequately to all the requests. In terms of distribution of the cumulative amount, support to African States Parties represents some 27% (36 States Parties and 53 properties), Arab States 13% (18 States Parties and 52 properties), Asia-Pacific 21% (35 States Parties and 135 properties), Latin America and the Caribbean 24% (29 States Parties, 98 properties), Europe and North America 15% (49 States Parties and 352 properties).

XVII.3 The proposed 2002-2003 budget for international assistance (Chapter III of the budget) is composed of three sections: (1) States Parties request in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, for preparatory assistance, training, technical cooperation and on-site promotion, and emergency assistance for the amount of US\$4 million (for budget details see Chapter XV of this report), (2) World Heritage Programme Initiatives for the amount of US\$450,000 to launch four thematic programmes and (3) evaluation of international assistance for US\$60,000.

XVII.4 Stressing the need for multi-year programmes to ensure the sustainability of conservation policies and actions, the Secretariat referred to the mutually reinforcing relationship between Principles, Programmes, and Partners which would be the means to achieve "the credibility, conservation and capacity-building areas" advanced by the Delegate of Belgium.

XVII.5 The programmes would be guided by the principles laid out in the World Heritage Convention and other international conventions on the protection of heritage and the environment, as well as recommendations and charters of UNESCO, ICOMOS and IUCN. These principles would also serve to ensure that the partners to be solicited to support the programme activities would do so upon adhering to the conservation objectives of these international norms and standards.

XVII.6 The Committee was informed that the selection of the themes of the four programmes proposed for their consideration was based on the identification of the types of conservation problems that have resulted in the greater amount of international assistance in the past, cross-referenced with issues emerging from a review of the reactive monitoring reports and the findings from the periodic reports (Arab States, Africa and initial findings from the on-going exercise in Asia-Pacific). The rationale for the thematic programme, composed of sub-regional and site-specific activities is to address conservation issues prevalent in all regions through site-specific activities so that concrete lessons can serve to improve methodology .

XVII.7 Tourism management; conservation of forest sites; conservation management of cities and conservation of earthen structures were proposed.

XVII.8 The Secretariat provided the following justifications for the selection:

- Tourism - growing threats on World Heritage sites from tourism which, if sustainably managed could offer socio-economic development opportunities;
- Forests – since close to 60 of the natural sites on the World Heritage List are forests and that the lessons being learned from the large-scale UNESCO-UN Foundation projects in the tropical forest sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo can serve as case studies to enrich the programme;
- Cities – since close to 200 of the cultural sites on the List are historic centres or entire cities, and because 20% of the Fund's international assistance have served to address the challenge of urban heritage conservation;
- Earthen structures – since some 30 of the cultural sites on the List are included in this category, and due to the particularity of conservation of earthen heritage, and threats.

XVII.9 The Secretariat concluded its presentation by stating that in view of the many other categories of heritage and the wide range of conservation issues which need to be addressed in a systematic manner, it would be prepared to develop alternative programmes should the Committee wish to give priority to others. The Secretariat also drew the attention of the Committee to other programmes which can be developed for consideration by the Committee at Budapest, namely: risk preparedness; coastal and marine ecosystems; cultural landscapes; wooden heritage, and mural paintings.

XVII.10 The Committee expressed its appreciation for the clarity of the presentation and the justifications provided. Indicating strong support for the overall programming approach, the Committee however indicated the need for the programme to respond to the priorities established by the Committee and to create strong links with the results of the Global Strategy actions and Periodic Reporting. The Committee approved the four proposed themes of the programmes in this first series of initiatives and authorized the Centre to proceed in their development.

XVII.11 One Committee member requested the development of a programme for coastal marine and small island ecosystems, stressing the need to take advantage of the attention being given to this by GEF and environmental protection agencies. The Secretariat agreed to its importance and on-going activities in this area but indicated the need to avoid the dispersion of human and financial resources, especially in view of the attention needed to develop the forest programme.

XVII.12 ICCROM and ICOMOS expressed regret that they had not been adequately associated in the development of the thematic programmes and pilot case studies, although they had been consulted on the programme approach. ICCROM stressed that the programmes proposed by the Centre all have capacity-building focus where ICCROM has long years of experience. The Secretariat assured the Advisory Bodies that their involvement is foreseen and would be essential to the success of these initiatives.

XVIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

XVIII.1 During the Committee's twenty-fifth session, the Bureau met to examine all requests for decision by the Bureau and the Committee presented in Working Documents WHC-01/CONF.208/20 and WHC-01/CONF.208/20Add. The Bureau approved the following requests:

XVIII.2 Preparatory Assistance approved by the Bureau

XVIII.2.1 NATURAL Bahrain

Preparation of the nomination file of Hawar Islands: The Bureau approved **US\$30,000** for this activity, subject to the receipt of a detailed budget breakdown to be approved by the Chairperson. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the State Party to include within the activity a comparative study of the site with other coastal island protected areas in the Persian Gulf, Red Sea, and Arabian Sea. IUCN suggested that the professionals implementing this activity be encouraged to participate at the February 2002 expert workshop being organized in Vietnam within the framework of the UN Foundation project "Filling critical gaps and promoting multi-sites approach to new nominations in tropical coastal, marine and small islands ecosystems".

XVIII.3 Technical Co-operation approved by the Bureau

XVIII.3.1 CULTURAL United Republic of Tanzania

Preparation of a Management Plan for the Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani Songo Mnara and the extension to Kilwa Masoko: ICOMOS, while supporting this request, noted the need to examine further details on the budget breakdown. ICCROM expressed its support for this activity. Simultaneously, it recommended that the Bureau request the Centre to organize a reactive monitoring mission to the State Party to undertake consultations for the future nomination of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau approved **US\$24,320** for this activity, subject to the approval by the Chairperson of a detailed budget breakdown.

XVIII.3.2 CULTURAL Algeria

Rehabilitation of the traditional hydraulic system in M'Zab Valley and the organization of a training workshop: ICOMOS supported the request. The Bureau approved **US\$25,000** for this activity, subject to the State Party paying its arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

XVIII.3.3 CULTURAL Morocco

Rehabilitation and restoration of Bab Agnaou in the Medina of Marrakesh: ICOMOS, although supporting this request, recommended that the US\$4,400 requested for computer equipment be financed by the State Party. The Bureau approved this request for **US\$22,984** requesting the computer equipment to be financed by the State Party.

XVIII.3.4 CULTURAL Estonia

Regional Conference on "Alternatives to Historical Reconstruction in UNESCO World Heritage Cities" (16-18 May 2002): The Bureau approved **US\$28,000** for this activity, requesting the State Party to make all efforts in publishing the results of the Conference to complement the UNESCO World Heritage Cities Programme.

XVIII.4 Training Assistance approved by the Bureau

XVIII.4.1 NATURAL Senegal

Regional workshop for training in wetlands inventory methodologies: The Bureau was informed that IUCN, although endorsing the Workshop, had requested further information on the profile of participants, and had also noted the usefulness of involving the IUCN Senegal Office in projects in Djoudj or Diawling National Parks as trainers in addition to Ramsar Convention staff. The Bureau approved **US\$21,690** for this activity, subject to the State Party submitting the list of participants to be approved by the Chairperson and requesting that the IUCN Senegal Office be invited to participate in this Workshop.

XVIII.4.2 CULTURAL Pakistan

Regional seminar for systematic monitoring for enhanced management of World Cultural Heritage sites in South Asia: The Bureau approved **US\$26,596** for this activity, requesting the State Party to pay its arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

XVIII.4.3 CULTURAL Sri Lanka

National seminar for preparing Periodic Reports for Sri Lankan World Cultural Heritage properties to be reviewed by the World Heritage Committee in 2003: ICCROM supported the request. The Bureau approved **US\$25,000** for this activity.

XVIII.5 The Committee examined the recommendations of the Bureau and took the following decisions for international assistance requests:

XVIII.6 Technical Co-operation approved by the Committee

XVIII.6.1 NATURAL Seychelles

Enhancing the capacity of Aldabra Atoll management: The Secretariat informed the Committee that IUCN, while supporting the request had underlined the importance of ensuring that the boats and the engines purchased have minimal pollution and are easily maintained. The Committee approved **US\$44,150** for this activity, requesting the Centre to ensure through the UNESCO equipment purchasing unit that the engines purchased have minimum pollution emission and can be maintained.

XVIII.6.2 NATURAL Zimbabwe

Increasing the management capacity of Mosi-oa-tunya/Victoria Falls and Mana Pools National Parks: The Centre informed the Committee that the State Party had paid its dues to the World Heritage Fund, and that additional information concerning the assessment of the

current situation, particularly concerning existing equipment, had not yet reached the Centre. However, the Committee was informed that the State Party had assured the Centre that this additional information had been transmitted. Therefore, the Committee approved this request for an amount of **US\$63,708** on the condition that the Centre and IUCN receive the additional information, and the allocation of funds be made upon authorization by the Chairperson.

XVIII.6.3 CULTURAL The Philippines

Emergency Technical Co-operation for the enhancement of the conservation and management of the Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras: The Centre informed the Committee that the Advisory Bodies supported the request. The Committee approved **US\$75,000** subject to the State Party paying its dues to the World Heritage Fund, and requested that the national authorities implement the activity in close co-operation with the UNESCO Regional Advisor for Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region (UNESCO Bangkok Office).

XVIII.7 Training Assistance approved by the Committee

XVIII.7.1 NATURAL Côte d'Ivoire

National workshop on "Research contribution for the development and sustainable management of Tai National Park: The Committee approved **US\$30,514**, requesting the State Party to integrate the recommendations of IUCN in fine-tuning the objectives of the proposed activity, and urging the State Party to pay its arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

XVIII.7.2 CULTURAL WHC, ICCROM, CRATerre-EAG

AFRICA 2009: Conservation of Immoveable Cultural Heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Committee approved this request for the sub-Saharan African Region for an amount of **US\$100,000**, noting that the activity be implemented by the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and CRATerre-EAG, in accordance with established procedures governing the Africa 2009 training programme.

XVIII.7.3 CULTURAL Algeria

Workshop on mosaic conservation: The Centre informed the Committee that clarification on the points raised by ICCROM had been provided and that ICCROM supported the activity. The Committee approved this request for **US\$50,000**.

XVIII.7.4 CULTURAL Oman

Regional Seminar on the Conservation of Earthen Architecture: ICOMOS and ICCROM noted that the amount requested could be considered high, as the training workshop was only for three days. The Centre informed the Committee that the cost included travel support for participants from the region and that this seminar was an activity that could lead to a general capacity building for earthen architectural conservation in the Arab Region. The Committee approved **US\$43,340**, requesting the World Heritage Centre to co-ordinate the organization of this

training activity in close collaboration with CRATerre and the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture of Oman, ensuring that:

- (i) the detailed technical guidelines concerning baseline conservation, monitoring, and maintenance practices for earthen architecture in the region be included within the final publication;
- (ii) the proceedings and material resulting from the Workshop be widely distributed;
- (iii) a follow up strategy be discussed and adopted at the Seminar.

XVIII.7.5 CULTURAL Brazil

1st Territorial and Urban Conservation Specialization Distance Training Programme (ITUC/ALTD 2002) and 5th Territorial and Urban Conservation Specialization Course (ITUC/BR 2003) (Brazil): The Committee approved this request for **US\$43,300**, requesting the State Party:

- (i) to follow ICCROM's recommendation to raise the percentage of places for participants from outside Brazil to 25 %;
- (ii) to submit the results of the group work to the World Heritage Centre after the activity is completed;
- (iii) to pay its arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

XVIII.7.6 CULTURAL Brazil

XII CECRE specialization course on the conservation of monuments and rehabilitation of historical cities: The Committee approved this request for **US\$50,000**, requesting the State Party:

- (i) to include a substantial number of international trainees;
- (ii) to strengthen presentation of World Heritage themes in the CECRE programme;
- (iii) to publish the course proceedings at their own expense as assured in previous years;
- (iv) to pay its arrears to the World Heritage Fund.

XVIII.8 Emergency Assistance

XVIII.8.1 NATURAL Central African Republic

Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park Emergency Rehabilitation Plan: The Committee was informed that the requested clarifications had been received. IUCN expressed its support for the request. The Committee approved **US\$150,000** for this activity.

XVIII.9 The Committee reiterated that States Parties requesting international assistance should be requested to provide budget breakdown for the utilization of funds to be provided from the World Heritage Fund and for requests over **US\$100,000** to be more detailed.

XIX. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (APRIL 2002)

XIX.1 The Committee decided that the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee would be held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 8 to 13 April 2002.

XIX.2 The Committee decided that agenda items on reforms and strategic reflection should be considered by the Bureau early in the meeting to ensure enough time for debate, decision and report preparation.

XIX.3 The Committee requested that presentations to the Bureau and Committee be brief to allow time for discussion.

XIX.4 The Delegate of Hungary informed the Committee that a draft "Budapest Declaration on World Heritage" prepared by Hungary would be circulated to all States Parties for comment and then presented to the Bureau for discussion before being presented to the Committee for adoption.

XIX.5 The Reports on the 30 years of the *World Heritage Convention* (Item 2) will be presented to the Budapest session by experts and representatives of the Advisory Bodies. Proceedings of this item could be prepared for publication following the session.

XIX.6 The Provisional Agenda and Timetable is attached in Annex XII.

XX. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE 2002)

XX.1 The Committee gratefully accepted the offer from Hungary to host the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee in Budapest from 24 to 29 June 2002.

XX.2 In addressing the Committee, the Delegate of Hungary said that it was an honour for his Government to host the Committee session. An Internet site has been established to provide information on the organization of the Committee: <http://www.whc.bme.hu/>

XX.3 The Delegate of Lebanon requested inclusion of an item on the agenda on changes to the *Rules of Procedures* to not allow Observers to make interventions during examination of a nomination. The Delegate of the United Kingdom commented that in the case of Observers who were experts, they were often in a position to provide information to help the Committee make an informed decision.

XX.4 The Delegate of Belgium requested that the Report of the Secretariat (Item 5) be provided only as a written report for noting.

XX.5 The Provisional Agenda and Timetable is attached in Annex XIII.

XXI. OTHER BUSINESS

XXI.1 There was no other business.

XXII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

XXII.1 The Committee adopted the Report with a number of amendments, which have been taken into consideration in the preparation of the final version of the Report.

XXII.2 During the adoption of section X of the report a debate took place concerning the implementation of the Committee's decision on the selection of 30 nominations to be reviewed by the Committee in 2003. A number of Committee members sought clarification on the wording of paragraphs X.16 and X.21. It was agreed that if more than 30 complete and acceptable nominations are received by the Centre by 1 February 2002, the matter would be referred to the April 2002 Bureau for guidance.

XXII.3 With reference to the debate reflected in paragraph X.12, the Delegate of India recalled that while the Committee welcomed the decisions on reforms made in Cairns as a positive development, there are a number of inherent contradictions. In particular whilst aiming towards representativity and equity, the Committee should ensure that further imbalances are not accentuated between the un- and underrepresented and over-represented regions and categories. Countries with un- or underrepresented categories of heritage should not be debarred just because they are already overrepresented. India views the process as an inclusive one.

XXII.4 The Delegate of St. Lucia noted that there was a request for legal advice, as to whether it was possible for the Committee to amend a resolution of the General Assembly.

XXIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

XXIII.1 The Rapporteur thanked the Chairperson for the harmonious work in chairing the session and expressed his gratitude to the Finnish authorities, the delegates and observers for their contributions to the session and the report. He underlined that in the spirit of solidarity, progress had been made at this Committee meeting with regard to a number of items under discussion for a long time.

XXIII.2 On behalf of the Committee members and participants, the Delegate of Egypt thanked the Chairperson for his effective and wise chairmanship. He expressed his gratitude to the Director of the Centre and his team for serving the Committee in an admirable way

and stated that he will be looking forward to the next Committee session in Budapest, Hungary.

XXIII.3 In supporting this intervention, the Delegate of India commended the Chairperson on his excellent and fair management of the Committee session. She highlighted the fact that the next session will be an anniversary event and that the way has been paved for the revised Operational Guidelines, the review of the categories and a number of other issues defining the way ahead. She also thanked the Centre and its Director for their excellent work.

XXIII.4 The Delegates of Santa Lucia and Argentina also expressed their gratitude to the Chairperson, the Rapporteur, the Centre, the interpreters and translators and the Finnish Secretariat for the work achieved.

XXIII.5 The Delegate of Nigeria, attending his first Committee session and speaking on behalf of the African region, also expressed his gratitude to the Chairperson and all participants.

XXIII.6 The Delegate of the United Kingdom thanked the Chairperson on behalf of the European region for managing the session in a timely fashion as well as all those involved in its smooth running.

XXIII.7 The Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mr Francesco Bandarin, on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, expressed his gratitude to the Finnish authorities. With reference to the conclusions reached by the Committee on the establishment of an Indigenous Council of Experts, he stated that UNESCO will continue to support the initiatives relating to the promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in the framework of the United Nations International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (1995-2004). He sincerely thanked the Committee for its work and engagement and expressed the firm commitment of the Secretariat to serve the Committee in the best way possible to improve communication among all World Heritage partners, including the Advisory Bodies.

XXIII.8 The Chairperson thanked the Committee for the encouraging words and articulated his wish to continue the new working methods, which have been developed since the sessions in Marrakesh (1999) and Cairns (2000). He thanked all delegates, observers, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat for their constructive and active participation in the Committee's work and the Finnish authorities for having organized and provided the facilities for this session.

XXIII.9 The Chairperson then declared the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Twenty-fifth session/ Vingt-cinquième session

**Helsinki, Finland/ Helsinki, Finlande
11-16 December 2001/11-16 décembre 2001**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

I. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE/ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

H.E. Mr Lucio Garcia Del Solar
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Maria Susana Pataro
Direction Organisations Internationales
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Esmeralda 1212
BUENOS AIRES C1007 ABP

Mr Ariel W. Gonzalez
Secretary of Embassy
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis -7th floor
Paris 75015
FRANCE

Dr Patricia Marconi
Directora Regional
Administración de Parques Nacionales
Santa Fe 23
SALTA 4400

Mr Carlos Pernaut
Consultant
Secretariat of Culture and Communication
Alvear 1690
Buenos Aires 1014

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE

H.E. Mr Yves Haesendonck
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de la Belgique auprès de
l'UNESCO
4 Villa de Saxe
75007 PARIS
FRANCE

M. Edgard Goedleven
Chef de Division des Monuments et Sites
Ministère Communauté Flamande
Kon. Albert II - Laan 20 Bus 7
BRUXELLES 1000

Mme Bénédicte Selfslagh
Relations Internationales
Division du Patrimoine du Ministère de la Région
Wallonne
p/a 30 Avenue Junot
PARIS 75018
FRANCE

M. Philippe Thiéry
Directeur du Service Monuments et Sites
Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale
CCN, Rue du progrès 80bte 1
BRUXELLES 1030

Dr Paul Van Lindt
Ministère Communauté Flamande
Division des Monuments et Sites
Kon. Albert II - Laan 20 Bus 7
Bruxelles 1000

CHINA/CHINE

Mrs Shi Shu Yun
Deputy Secretary-General
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO
35, Damucang Hutong, Xidan
BEIJING 100816

Mr Zhi Jung Yang
Director
Dept. of Protection of Cultural Property
State Administration of Cultural Heritage
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street
BEIJING 100020

Mr Zhan Guo
Inspector
State Administration of Cultural Heritage
Secretary General ICOMOS/China
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street
BEIJING 100020

Mr Zhe Li
Deputy Director
International Organisations
Dept. of International Relations
Ministry of Construction
9, Sanlihe Road
BEIJING 100835

Ms Zuo Xiaoping
Deputy Director
Office of National Park
Ministry of Construction
9, Sanlihe Road
BEIJING 100835

Mr Chen Xicheng
Deputy Director
Construction Bureau of Yunan Province
KUNMING 650032

Ms WeiWei Sheng
Deputy-Director of Foreign Affairs
State Administration of Cultural Heritage
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street
BEIJING 100020

Mr Chamba Kelsang
Director
Administration of Potala Palace
LHASA, TIBET

Mr Zhi-Guo Li
Professor
State Administration of Cultural Heritage
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street
BEIJING 100020

Prof Liang Yongning
Professor
Kunming University of Science
Faculty of Land resources
KUNMING 660093

Official Chinese State Party Observers:

Fang-ming Li
City Council of Datong
1, Yungang Street
037007 Datong
Shanxi Province

Funzi Sun
Mayor
Datong Municipality
5, W.Yingbing Road
037008 Datong
Shanxi Province

Yuyi Zou
Vice Mayor
Datong Municipality
1, Yungang Street
037007 Datong
Shanxi Province

Dian Sheng Zhang
City Council of Datong
1, Yugang Street
031007 Datong
Shanxi Province

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

H.E. Mr Augusto Galan-Sarmiento
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de la Colombie auprès de
l'UNESCO
1 rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Katya Gonzalez
Directora de Patrimonio
Ministerio de Cultura
Calle 9 N° 8-31
BOGOTA 215

Mr Edgar Emilio Rodriguez-Bastidas
Coordinator Sistema de Informacion
Parques Nacionales
Carrera 10 N. 20-30, Piso 5
BOGOTA

EGYPT/EGYPTE

Dr. Gaballa Ali Gaballa
Secretary-General
Supreme Council of Antiquities
Ministry of Culture
CAIRO

Dr Samir Ghabbour
Rapporteur HAB Committee
Egypt National Commission
17 Kuwait St. Dokki
CAIRO

Zahi Hawass
Ministry Of Culture
CAIRO

Dr Mohamed Abdel Maksoud
General Director of Egyptian Antiquities S.C.N.
Cairo Abb Asiyia

FINLAND/FINLANDE

Mr Markku Linna
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education
P.O.Box 29
HELSINKI 00023

H.E. Mr Esko Hamilo
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Pekka Kangas
Director General
Ministry of the Environment
P.O.Box 380
HELSINKI 00131

Mr Kalevi Kivistö
Director General
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 29
HELSINKI 00023

Mr. Henrik Lilius
Director General
National Board of Antiquities
P.O. Box 913
HELSINKI 00100

Ms Aira Kalela
Director General
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 380
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Raija Mattila
Counsellor of Cultural Affairs
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 29
HELSINKI 00023

Mr Jukka-Pekka Flander
Senior Adviser
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 380
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Zabrina Holmström
Counsellor for Cultural Affairs, Secretary-General
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 29
HELSINKI 00023

Mr Pekka Kärki
Director of Department
National Board of Antiquities
P.O. Box 169
HELSINKI 00511

Ms Maire Mattinen
Chief Intendant
National Board of Antiquities
P.O. Box 169
HELSINKI 00511

Mr Ari Mäki
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Irma-Liisa Perttunen
Counsellor
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 127
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Paula Purhonen
Director of Department
National Board of Antiquities
P.O. Box 169
HELSINKI 00511

Ms Riitta Resch
Director
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 176
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Liisa Valjento
Counsellor
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 176
HELSINKI 00161

Mr Matti Vatiö
Director
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 380
HELSINKI 00131

Official Finnish State Party Observers:

Seppo Ala-Siuru
Municipal Manager
Lappi Municipal Office
P.O.Box 5
LAPPI 27231

Mr Jaakko Antti-Poika
Director
Governing Body of Suomenlinna
Suomenlinna C 40
HELSINKI 00190

Mr Pentti Koivu
Mayor
City of Rauma
Kanaalinranta 3
RAUMA 26100

Mr Lasse Lovén
Park Director
Finnish Forest Research Institute, Koli National Park
Ylä-Kolintie 22
KOLI 83960

Mr Eero Niinikoski
Director
UPM-Kymmene Corporation
KUUSANKOSKI 45700

Mr Matti Määttä
Regional Director
Forest and Park Service
Akselinkatu 8
SAVONLINNA 571 30

Seppo Ojala
Vicar
Petäjavesi Parish
Papintie 6
PETÄJÄVESI 41900

Ms Leena Rinkineva
Project Leader
The Kvarken Council
Kauppapuistikko 23 A
VAASA 65100

Ms Inker-Anni Sara
Secretary for Cultural Affairs
The Sami Parliament
INARI 99870

Mr Stig Östdahl
Managing Director
City of Nykarleby
Topeliusesplanaden 7
NYKARLEBY 66900

GREECE/GRECE

Ms Helene Methodiou
Conseiller pour la Culture
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 PARIS
FRANCE

Ms Helene Korca
Head of the Department
Greek and Foreign Archaeological Institutes
Ministry of Culture
Boubolinos 20
ATHENS 10286

Dr Niki Tselenti-Papadopoulou
Direction of Byzantins and Post-Byzantins Monuments
Ministry of Culture
Bouboulinos 20-22
ATHENS 10286

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Dr Tamás Fejérdy
President of Hungarian Committee of ICOMOS
National Office of Cultural Heritage
Tancsics Mihály n.1
BUDAPEST 1014

Dr János Tardy
Deputy Secretary of State
Ministry for Environment
Költö u. 21
BUDAPEST 1121

H.E. Dr Janos Jelen
Ambassador
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary
Nagy Imre tér 4
BUDAPEST 1027

Dr Zoltán Szilassy
Deputy Head of Department
Ministry for Environment
Költő u. 21
BUDAPEST 1121

Ms Edit Herboly
Staff
Hungarian World Heritage Committee
Szinház u.5-9
BUDAPEST 1014

Ms Julia Buda
Staff
Hungarian World Heritage Committee
Szinház u.5-9
BUDAPEST 1014

Dr Lia Korcsmáros-Bassa
Staff
Hungarian World Heritage Committee
Szinház u.5-9
BUDAPEST 1014

INDIA/INDE

Mr N. Gopaldaswami
Secretary/Dept. of Culture
Government of India
CII/39 Shahjahan Road
NEW DELHI 110001

H.E. Ms Neelam Sabharwal
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Umang Narula
Deputy Secretary
Government of India
Ministry of Tourism & Culture
Shastri Bhawan
NEW DELHI 110001

K. P. Poonacha
Director (Archaeology)
Archaeological Survey of India
Janpath
NEW DELHI

LEBANON/LIBAN

Ms Carla Jazzar
Délégué Permanent
Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 PARIS
FRANCE

Mr Jad Tabet
Expert patrimoine mondial
UNESCO
33bis Avenue Reille
PARIS 75014
FRANCE

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Dr Francisco Javier Lopez Morales
Director Patrimonio Mundial
Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH)
Puebla 95
MEXICO D.F 06700

Ms Viviana Kuri Haddad
Subdirectora Patrimonio Mundial
INAH
Puebla 95
MEXICO D.F 06700

Prof Salvador Diaz-Berrio F.
Profesor Posgrado
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana
Callejon Ojito n.9
Coyoacán
MÉXICO D.F. 04320

NIGERIA

H.E. Prof. Michael Omolewa
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Nigeria to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr Joseph Eboreime
Deputy Director
Ministry of Culture & Tourism
Plot 2018
Cotonou Crescent
Wuse Zone 6
ABUJA P.M.B 171

Ms Fatima Othman
Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Nigeria to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75732
FRANCE

OMAN

H.E. Dr Musa Jaffar Bin Hassan
Ambassadeur, Délégué Permanent
Délégation permanente de l'Oman auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 PARIS
FRANCE

Mr Hassan Allawati
D.G. of Finance & Administration
Ministry of National Heritage & Culture (M.N.H.C.)
P.O. Box 668
MUSCAT 113

Mr Hassan Al Jaberi
Archaeologist
Office of Adviser to H.M the Sultan
for Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 129, Mina Al Fahal 116

Mr Ahmed Alhajri
M.N.H.C.-Oman
P.O. Box 668
MUSCAT 113

Mr Sultan Albakri
M.N.H.C.-Oman
P.O. Box 668
MUSCAT 113

Mr Khalifa Al Shamsi
Archaeologist

PORTUGAL

H.E. Mr Marcello Mathias
Ambassador, Permanent delegate
Permanent Delegation of Portugal to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

H.E. Mr Filipe Guterres
Ambassador
Embassy of Portugal
Itäinen Puistotie 11 B
HELSINKI 00140
FINLAND

Prof José-Augusto Franca
National Commission for UNESCO
Rua Escola Politecnica 49-4
LISBON 1200-069

Ms Ana Maria Ribeiro Da Silva
Diplomat
Embassy of Portugal
Itäinen Puistotie
HELSINKI
FINLAND

Ms Francisca Abreu
Maire Adjoint Chargée de la Culture
Câmara Municipal de Guimarães
Largo Conego José Maria Gomes
GUIMARAES 4810-242

Ms Alexandra Gesta
Directeur du Cabinet Technique
Câmara Municipal de Guimarães
Largo Cónego José Maria Gomes
GUIMARAES 4710-242

Mr José Nobre
Directeur de la Culture
Câmara Municipal de Guimarães
Largo Conego José Maria Gomes
GUIMARAES 4810-242

REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIQUE DE COREE

Mr Kyung-surk Kim
Deputy Director General
Cultural Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade
SEOUL

Ms Jung-ae Huh
Assistant Director
Cultural Cooperation Division
Cultural Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade
SEOUL

Mr Seong-yong Park
Deputy Director for Culture
Korean National Commission for Unesco
CPO 64
SEOUL

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION/
FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

H.E. Mr Eugeny Sidorov
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de la Fédération de Russie auprès
de l'UNESCO
8, rue de Prony
PARIS
FRANCE

Prof. Igor Makovetsky
President
ICOMOS-Russie
1, Proezde Novadeitchy
MOSCOW 119435

Mr Vladimir Pichtchelev
Deputy Head of Division
Ministry of Nature Resources
B. Gruzinskaia 4/6
MOSCOW 123995

Prof. Rafael Valeev
Vice-Minister
Ministry of Culture
Novo-Svetlaya Str. 16-119
KAZAN 420004

Prof. Oleg Vasnetsov
Secretary General
National Commission of the Russian Federation for
UNESCO
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Smolenskaya-Sennaya Sq.32-34
MOSCOW 121200

Prof. Alexei Butorin
Director
Natural Heritage Protection Fund, Russian World Heritage
Viborgskaya, 8-3
MOSCOW 125 212

Prof. Natalia Potapova
Deputy Chief
Moscow State Dept. for Restoration of Heritage
19 Pyathitskaya St.
MOSCOW

Prof. Alexey Denisov
Bureau Member
ICOMOS-Russie
Shcolnay St. 426
MOSCOW 109544

Prof Tatiana Kameneva
Bureau Member
ICOMOS-Russie
Shcolnay St. 426
MOSCOW 109544

SAINT LUCIA/SAINTE LUCIE

Ms Vera Lacoeyilhe
Permanent Delegation of Saint Lucia to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Giles Romulus
Executive Director
St. Lucia National Trust
P.O. Box 595
CASTRIES

SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD

H.E. Ms Thuthukile Eskweyiya
Ambassador to France and Permanent Representative to
UNESCO
South African Embassy
59, Quai d'Orsay
PARIS 75007
FRANCE

Ms Maria Mbengashe
Chief Director
Dept. of Environmental Affairs & Tourism
Private Bag x 447
PRETORIA

Mr Makgolo Makgolo
Deputy Director
Dept. of Environmental Affairs & Tourism
Private Bag x 447
PRETORIA 001

Ms Louise Graham
Counsellor and Deputy Permanent Representative to
UNESCO
South African Embassy
59, Quai d'Orsay
PARIS 75007
FRANCE

THAILAND/THAILANDE

Prof. Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen
Chairman, National Committee for WHC of Thailand
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning (OEPP)
Piboon Wattana 7
Rama 6 Road
Phrayathai
BANGKOK 10400

Mr Arak Sunghitakul
Deputy Director General
Fine Arts Department
Napraphat Rd.
BANGKOK 10200

Mr. Borvornvate Rungrujee
Director of General Management Div.
Fine Art Department
81/1 Sri Ayuttaya Road
BANGKOK 10300

Dr Schwann Tunhikorn
Director
Natural Resources Conservation Office
Royal Forest Department
Paholyothin Rd. , Chatichak
BANGKOK 10900

Ms Siriporn Nanta
Assistant Secretary
National Committee for WHC of Thailand
OEPP Piboon Wattana
Rama 6 Road
BANGKOK 10400

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

H.E. Mr David Stanton
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
United Kingdom Delegation to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Paul Aalsey
DCMS
2-4 Cockspur Street
LONDON SW1Y 5DH

Mr Paul McCormack
DCMS
2-4 Cockspur Street
LONDON SW1Y 5DH

Dr Christopher Young
Head of World Heritage and International Policy
English Heritage
23 Savile Row
LONDON W1S 2ET

Ms Christine Atkinson
Deputy Permanent Delegate
United Kingdom Delegation to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr Tony Weighell
Science Advisor
UK Delegation
JNCC Monkstone House
City Road
PETERBOROUGH PE1 1JY

Mr Mark Watson
Historic Buildings Inspector
Historic Scotland
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
EDINBURGH EH9 1SH

Mr Tim Badman
World Heritage Nomination Officer
Dorset County Council
County Mall
DORCHESTER ST1 1X5

Prof. Denys Brunsden
Chairman
Dorset Coast Forum
c/o County Mall
DORCHESTER DT11XT

Mr Tim Whitfield
Project Manager
Capital of Culture
Bradford 2008
Merchants House
Peckover Street
Bradford BD1 58D

Mr Jim Arnold
Director
New Lanark Conservation Trust
New Lanark Mills
LANARK ML11 9DB

Mr Geoff Carlile
Member of Management Panel
Derwent Valley Mills Partnership
Sunny Brow, 71 Old Road
Derbyshire
DERBY DE456 2BN

Mr Barry Joyce
Chair Technical Panel
Derwent Valley Mills Partnership
40 St John Street
Wirksworth, Derbyshire
DERBY DE4 4DS

ZIMBABWE

Mr Dawson Munjeri
Executive Director
National Museums and Monuments
107 Rotten Row
Box CY 1485 Causeway
HARARE

Mr Epmarcus Walter Kanhanga
National Parks
P.O.Box CY 140
Causeway
HARARE

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

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

Dr Nicholas Stanley-Price
Director General
ICCRUM
Via di San Michele, 13
ROME 00153, ITALY

Mr Joseph King
Programme Manager
ICCRUM
Via di San Michele, 13
ROME 00153
ITALY

Mr Herbert Samuel Stovel
Programme Director
ICCRUM
Via di San Michele, 13
ROME 00153, ITALY

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

M. Jean-Louis Luxen
Secrétaire General
ICOMOS
49-51 Rue de la Fédération
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Regina Durighello
Assistant Coordinator
ICOMOS
49-51 Rue de la Fédération
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr Henry Cleere
Coordinator
ICOMOS
49-51 Rue de la Fédération
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr Jukka Jokilehto
ICOMOS
Via Anicia 6
ROME 00153
ITALY

Prof. Giora Solar
Treasurer General
ICOMOS
49-51 Rue De La Fédération
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Anna Nurmi-Nielsen
President of ICOMOS Finland
Rauma Museum
Kauppakatu 24
RAUMA 26100
FINLAND

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

Mr David Sheppard
Head, PPA
The World Conservation Union
Rue Mauverney 28
GLAND 1196
SWITZERLAND

Dr Jim Thorsell
Senior Adviser
IUCN
Rue Mauverney 28
GLAND 1196
SWITZERLAND

Mr Adrian Phillips
Vice Chair-World Heritage
IUNC World Commission on Protected Areas
2 The Old Rectory
DUMBLETON NEAR EVESHAM WR11 7TG
UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Rolf Hogan
Programme Officer
The World Conservation Union
Rue Mauverney 28
GLAND 1196
SWITZERLAND

III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

**(i) STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION/
ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

ANGOLA

Prof Pedro Massala Nsingui-Barros
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.
Délégation permanente de l'Angola auprès de l'UNESCO
1, Rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Mr Kevin Keefe
Assistant Secretary
World Heritage Branch, Environment Australia
GPO Box 787
CANBERRA 2601

Mr Matthew Peek
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO
4, Rue Jean Rey
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr David Walker
Director
International Section, World Heritage Branch
Department of the Environment and Heritage
GPO Box 787
CANBERRA ACT2601

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Dr Hans Horcicka
Director
Ministry of Culture
Schreyvogelg. 2
VIENNA 1014

Dr Manfred Wehdorn
Professor
University of Technology of Vienna
Kolbetergasse 3
VIENNA 1140

Dr Arnold Klotz
City Planning Director
City Planning Bureau
Rathaus
VIENNA 1082

Mr Franz Schuller
City of Vienna
Friedrich Schmidt Platz 5
VIENNA 1082

AZERBAIJAN/AZERBAIDJAN

Mr Rizvan Bayramov
Head of Department
Ministry of Culture
Government House, Ministry of Culture
BAKU 870016

BOTSWANA

Ms Tickey Pule
Director
Botswana National Museum
331 Independence Avenue
Private Bag 00114
GABORONE

BRAZIL/BRESIL

H.E. Mr Luiz Henrique Pereira Da Fonseca
Ambassador
Embassy of Brazil
Itäinen Puistotie 4 B 1
HELSINKI 00140
FINLAND

Mr Joao Lanari Bo
Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Brazil to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Marco Antonio Galvão
Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional
(IPHAN)
BRASILIA-DF

Mr J.Fernando Madeira Da Costa
Architect
IPHAN/ICOMOS Brazil
Colina UnB "A" 22
BRAZILIA DF 70910 900

Prof. Nasr Chaul
Presidente
Agencia Galanca de Cultura
Praça Civica n.2
GALANCA
BRAZIL

Dr Fernando Cupertino De Barros
Secretario
Secretaria de Saude
Av.Portugal 744

Mr José Pedro De Oliveira Costa
Secrétaire à la Biodiversité et Forêts
Ministère de l'Environnement
Esplanada Dos Ministerios-Bloco B
BRASILIA-DF

Mr Alcides Rodrigues
Vice Governador
Governo de Goiás
Rua 10 N.810
Apt. 501- Setor Oeste
GOIANIA 741 20020

Ms Raquel Rodrigues
Deputada
Assembléia Legislativa
Rua 10 N.810
Apt. 501-Setor Oeste
GOIANIA 74120020

Dr Sergio Abi-Sad Caldas
Minister-Counsellor
Brazilian Embassy
Itäinen Puistotie 4 B 1
HELSINKI 00140
FINLAND

Ms Brasilete Caiado
President
Movimento Pró-Cidade Goiás
Pca Dr Brasil Caiado
GOIAS

Mr Marco Antonio Veiga Almeida
Secretario
Prefeitura
Travessa Seminario
GOIAS

Ms Karla Morais
R. 1024 No. 351, Ap.401
S.P. Ludovico
GOIANA-GO

Dr. Agenor Curado
Deputado
Assembleia Legislativa
GOIANA-GO

CANADA

Dr Christina Cameron
Director General
Parks Canada
25 Eddy
HULL K1A 0M5

Mme Gisèle Cantin
Affaires Internationales
Parcs Canada
25 Eddy, 25-6-Y
HULL K1A 0M5

Ms Josie Weninger
Superintendent
Parks Canada
149 Mae Dougal Road
Box 750
FORT SMITH NWT X0E 0P0

CHILE/CHILI

Mr Alejandro Rogers
Chargé d'Affaires
Permanent Delegation of Chile to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Prof Antonio Garrido
First Secretary -Diplomat
Embassy of Chile in Finland
Erottajankatu 11 A 14
HELSINKI 00130
FINLAND

CROATIA/CROATIE

H.E. Mr Zeljko Bosnjak
Ambassador
Embassy of Croatia
Eteläesplanadi 12
HELSINKI 00130
FINLAND

Mr Zvonimir Sviben
Counsellor
Embassy of Croatia
Eteläesplanadi 12
HELSINKI 00130
FINLAND

CYPRUS/CHYPRE

Dr Sophocles Hadjisavvas
Director
Department of Antiquities
Museums Street 1
NICOSIA 1516

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Dr. Michal Benes
Chef de la Section de l'UNESCO
Ministère de la Culture
Milady Horakové 19
PRAGUE 160 00

DENMARK/DANEMARK

Ms Henriette Uggerly
Head of Section
Ministry of Cultural Affairs
Haraldsgade 53
COPENHAGEN 2100

Mr Torsten Ingerslev
Project Coordinator
Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland
Thoravej 8
COPENHAGEN 2400 NV
DENMARK

Prof. Naja Mikkelsen
Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland
Thoravej 8
COPENHAGEN 2400 NV

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC/
REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE**

Ms Teresa Del Pilar Contin De Perez
Direction General Monuments
Ataranzana #2
Colonial Zone
SANTO DOMINGO

Prof. Maria Cristina Guizado de Carias
Subdirector
Direction General Monuments
Ataranzana #2
Colonial Zone
SANTO DOMINGO
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

FRANCE

H.E. M. Jean Musitelli
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015

Mme Catherine Caro
Sous-Directeur
Ministère Environnement
20 Avenue De Segur
PARIS 75007

Mme Eva Caillart
Chargée de Mission
Ministère Culture
8 Rue Vivienne -DAPA
PARIS 75002

M. Olivier Poisson
Inspecteur Général des Monuments Historiques
Ministère de la Culture
2bis Rue Manuel
PERPIGNAN 66000

GAMBIA/GAMBIE

Mr Baba Ceesay
Principal Cultural Officer, Museums and Monuments
Division
National Council for Arts and Culture
Independence Drive
PMB 151
BANJUL

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Mr Frank Burbach
Auswärtiges Amt
1 Werderscher Markt
BERLIN 11013

Dr. Hans Caspary
Conservateur
State Conserv. Office
Schillerstrasse 44
MAINZ 55116

Dr. Birgitta Ringbeck
Head of Section
Ministry of Urban Development and Culture
Fürstenwall 25
DUSSELDORF 40219

Dr. Wolfgang Roters
Ministry of Urban Development and Culture
Fürstenwall 25
DUSSELDORF 40219

Mr Stefan Schwarz
Geschäftsführer
Entwicklungsgesellschaft Zollweiln
Gelsenkirchener Str. 181
ESSEN 45309

HOLY SEE/SAINT-SIEGE

Dr. Tullio Poli
Secretariat of State
Palazzo Apostolico
00120 Città del Vaticano

Prof. Kalevi Pöykkö
Josafatinkatu 9 A 27
HELSINKI 00510
FINLAND

ICELAND/ISLANDE

Prof. Margret Hallgrímsdóttir
State Antiquarian
National Museum of Iceland
Lyngas 7
GARDABAER 210

INDONESIA/INDONESIE

Mr Jose Tavares
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation Of Indonesia To UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

IRAN

Mr Javad Safaei
Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Iran to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr Abdolrasool Vatandoust
Director
Iranian Cultural Heritage Organisation
5, Nader Street
Hashtroudi Rd., Evin
P.O.Box 11365-4834
TEHERAN

ISRAEL

H.E. Mr Yitzhak Eldan
Ambassador, Permanent delegate
Permanent delegation of Israel to UNESCO
PARIS
FRANCE

Mr Michael Turner
Chair
Israel World Heritage Committee
25, Caspi Street
JERUSALEM 93554

Ms Hemda Golan
Deputy Legal Adviser
Ministry Of Foreign Affairs
6 Sharoni St Jerusalem

Mr David Harari
Managing Director
Old Acre Development Company
1, Weitzman St.
Old Akko, P.O.Box 1088
AKKO

Mr Israel Skop
Deputy District Manager
Israel Land Administration
Haniel, P.O.Box 501
HAIFA

Mr Mordechai Yedid
8 Beit Hakerem St.
JERUSALEM

ITALY/ITALIE

Cons. Mario Panaro
Chief of Bureau III
Ministry of Foreign Affairs-DGPC
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
ROME 00194

Dr Roberta Alberotanza
Chef de la Section n.1
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères-DGPC
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
ROME 00194

Ms Anna Elisa Zaffi
Programme Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs-DGPC
DGPCC, Ufficio III
Piazzale della Farnesina 1
ROME 00194

Mr Pasquale Bruno Malara
Expert
Italian Delegation
TORINO 10122

Ing. Luciano Marchetti
Soprintendente Regionale dell'Umbria
Ministero Beni e Attività Culturali
Piazza Della Repubblica 78
PERUGIA 06100

Arch. Giovanna Rossi
Programme Officer
Ministry of the Environment
Via Cristoforo Colombo 44
ROME 00147

JAPAN/JAPON

H.E. Mr Fumiaki Takahashi
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75732
FRANCE

Ms Naomi Takahashi
Official
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8919

Mr Norio Suzuki
Counsellor on Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8959

Dr Makoto Motonaka
Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Yousuke Hashimoto
Senior Specialist
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Tsuyoshi Hirasawa
Associate Specialist for Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Kazuhiko Nishi
Associate Specialist for Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Minoru Soeya
Assistant Director
Ministry of the Environment
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
TOKYO

Ms Kumiko Yoneda
Senior Research Scientist
Japan Wildlife Research Center
3-10-10 Shitaya
Taito-Ku
TOKYO

JORDAN/JORDANIE

Mr Abdel Sami Abu Dayyeh
Director General
Department of Antiquities
AMMAN 11196

KENYA

Mr Athman Lali Omar
Head Coastal Archaeology
National Museum of Kenya
Box 82412
MOMBASA

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE

H.E. Ms Ugne Karvelis
Ambassadeur, Délégué Permanent
Délégation permanente de la Lituanie auprès de
l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Ms Ina Marciulionyte
Vice Minister
Ministry of Culture
Basanaviciaus 5
VILNIUS 2001

LUXEMBOURG

Prof Guy Dockendorf
Director General
Ministry of Culture
20, Montée de la Pétrusse

Mr Jean-Pierre Kraemer
President of the National Commission for UNESCO
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Jean Herr
Architect
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Robert Krier
Architect
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Fernand Otto
Director Of The Administration Of Public Works
LUXEMBOURG

MADAGASCAR

Ms Malatiana Ravelonary
Directeur Patrimoine Culturel
Ministère de Culture
Antaninarenina
P.O.Box 760
ANTANANARIVO

Ms Ravaomalala Rasoanaivo-Randriamamonjy
Délégué Permanent Adjoint
Délégation Permanente auprès de l'UNESCO
40, rue du Général
PARIS 75008
FRANCE

MALTA/MALTE

Prof. Joseph Licari
Permanent Delegate of Malta to UNESCO
46, rue de Longchamp
PARIS 75116
FRANCE

Mr Mark Anthony Mifsud
Assistant Curator of Archaeology
National Museum of Archaeology
Republic Street
VALLETTA CMR 02

MOROCCO/MAROC

H.E. Prof. Aziza Bennani
Ambassadeur, Déléguée Permanente
Délégation Permanente du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Aziz Ouarrak
Chargé d'Affaires
Embassy of Morocco in Finland
Mikonkatu 8A
HELSINKI 00100
FINLAND

NEPAL

Ms Sannani Kansakar
Director General
Department of Archaeology
KATHMANDU

Ms Riddhi Pradhan
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Culture
Singha Durbar
KATHMANDU

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS

Dr Robert de Jong
Co-ordinator RDMZ World Heritage
Netherlands Dept. for Conservation
Broederplein 41
ZEIST 3703CD

NEW ZEALAND/NOUVELLE ZELANDE

Mr Tumu Teheuheu
Chief Executive
Tongariro WHS
1, Taaku Lane, Acacia Bay
TAUPO

Mr Eru Manuera
General Manager
Department of Conservation
59 Boulcott Street
WELLINGTON 6001

NICARAGUA

Ms Ximena Flores
Délégué Permanente
Délégation de Nicaragua auprès de l' UNESCO
1,rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

NORWAY/ NORVEGE

Mr Einar Holtane
Deputy Director General
Ministry of Environment
Myntgt. 2
OSLO 0030

Ms Berit Lein
Assistant Director General
Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
TRONDHEIM 7485

Mr Nils Marstein
Director General
Directorate for Cultural Heritage
Dronningens Gate 13
OSLO 0034

Prof. Dag Myklebust
Directorate for Cultural Heritage
Dronningens Gate 13
OSLO 0034

Mr Gaute Sønstebø
Senior Executive Officer
Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
TRONDHEIM 7485

Mr Per Morten Gullsvåg
Kultursjef
Dept.of Environment/Vega Commune
Gladstad
VEGA 8980

Ms Margrethe Wika
Miljövernsjef
Dept.of Environment/Vega Kommune
Gladstad
VEGA 8980

PAKISTAN

Dr Rukshana Zia
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Pakistan to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

PERU/PEROU

Mr Carlos Vasquez
Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

PHILIPPINES

H.E. Mr Hector Villarroel
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of the Philippines to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Augusto Villalon
National Commission for UNESCO
Pacific Plaza Towers
Pacific Avenue, Fort Bonifacio
TAGUIG, M.MANILA 1630

Mr Solomon Chumgalao
Congressman
Banalie, Irugao

POLAND/POLOGNE

Dr Andrzej Tomaszewski
Representant du Ministère
Ministère de Culture
Leszczynska 6 M. 14
WARSZAWA 00339

Dr Tomasz Orłowski
Secretary General
Polish National Commission for UNESCO
Palac Kultury i Nauki
WARSZAWA 00-901

ROMANIA/ROUMANIE

Mr Ion Opris
Secretary of State
Romanian Ministry of Culture
BUCHAREST

Mr Ion Buzatu
Diplomatic Councillor
Ministry of Tourism
17 Apolodor Street
BUCHAREST 74547

Mr Dan Covali
Architect
Ministry of Tourism
17 Apolodor Street
BUCHAREST 74547

SAUDI ARABIA/ARABIE SAOUDITE

Prof. Hussein Abu al-Hassan
Ministry Of Education
P.O. Box 3734
RIYADH 11481

Dr Abdullah Saud Al-Saud
Director General of Museums
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 3734
RIYADH 11481

SLOVAKIA/SLOVAKIE

Ms Viera Dvorakova
Vice Director
Institute for Heritage Preservation
Cesta Na #268
Erveny Most 6
BRATISLAVA 814 06

SLOVENIA/SLOVENIE

Ms Marjutka Hafner
State Under-Secretary
National Commission for UNESCO
Tivolska 50
LJUBLJANA 1000

Ms Zofija Klemen-Krek
Secretary General
National Commission for UNESCO
Tivolska 50
LJUBLJANA 1000

SPAIN/ESPAGNE

Prof Luis Lafuente
Subdirector General de Protección del Patrimonio
Historico
Spanish Ministry for Education, Culture and Sport
Plaza del Rey nº1
MADRID 28071

H.E. Mr Fernando Carderera
Ambassador of Spain to Finland
Embassy of Spain in Finland
Kallioliinantie 6
HELSINKI 00140
FINLAND

Prof Juan Manuel Gonzales de Linares
Counsellor
Embassy of Spain in Finland
Puistokatu 11 A 16
HELSINKI 00140
FINLAND

Prof Diego Fernandez
Chief of Service
Spanish Ministry for Education, Culture and Sport
Plaza del Rey nº1
MADRID 28071

Ms Carmen Anon
Conseiller
Ministerio Cultura
Puerto Santa Maria 49-1
MADRID 28043

Ms Iciar Alcalá
Cultural Heritage Manager
Government of Aragón
Pº Ruiseñores 26, Casa 2 1ºA
ZARAGOZA 50006

Mr José Manuel Molina García
Mayor
Ayuntamiento de Toledo
Plaza del Consistorio 1
TOLEDO 45071

Ms Abigail Pereta
Cultural Heritage Manager
Government of Aragón
C/ Mariano Barbsán 9, 8º Dch.
ZARAGOZA 50006

Ms María José Rodríguez-Relaño
Jefe de Servicio de Promoción
Comunidad de Madrid
Calle José Ortega y Gasset 91
MADRID 28006

Mr Carlos López
Jefe de Prensa
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez
Stuart
ARANJUEZ 28300

Ms María Gloria Encinas
Político
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez
Plaza de la Constitución
ARANJUEZ 28300

Ms María José Martínez
Técnico Político
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez
c/Stuart
ARANJUEZ

Ms Magdalena Merlos
Técnico Patrimonio
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez
c/Stuart
ARANJUEZ

Ms Teresa Suárez
Político
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez
c/Stuart
ARANJUEZ 28300

SWEDEN/SUEDE

Mr. Hans Enflo
Deputy Director
Ministry of Culture
STOCKHOLM 10333

Ms Birgitta Hoberg
Senior International Advisor
National Heritage Board
P.O. Box 5405
STOCKHOLM 11484

Ms Inger Erikson
Deputy Governor
County Administration
Orrholmsvägen 29
FALUN 79153

Mr Bo Berggren
Chairman of the Board
The Stora Kopparberget Foundation
FALUN 791 80

Mr Ulf Löfwall
County Antiquarian
County Administration
Åsgatan
FALUN 79184

Mr Jan-Olof Montelius
Chairman of The Cultural Board
The City of Falun
Falu Kommun
Kulturförvaltningen
FALUN 79183

Mr Sven Olsson
Kommunantikvarie
Falu Kommun
Morag. 4
FALUN 79172

Prof Mats-Rune Bergström
Principal Administrative Officer
County Administration of Västerbotten
Storgatan 71 B
UMEÅ 901 86

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE

H.E. Mr Denis Feldmeyer
Ambassadeur, Délégué Permanent
Délégation Permanente de la Suisse auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Dr. Meinrad Küttel
Head of Section
Swiss Agency for the Environment
BERN 3001

SYRIA/SYRIE

Prof. Jawdat Ibrahim
Vice Dean
Al-Bath University
P.O.Box 2236
Roda Al-Shabibi Street
RAMS

Dr Khairia Kasmieh
History Department
Damascus University
Mazza Avenue
DAMASCUS

TURKEY/TURQUIE

Mr Mehmet Gürkan
Urban Planner
Ministry of Culture
ANKARA 06100

Mr Celik Topcu
Ministry of Culture
ANKARA 06100

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Mohamed Saied
Directeur
Ministère de l'Environnement
12 rue du Cameroun
TUNIS 1002

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

Ms Sharon Cleary
Chief, Office of International Affairs
U.S. National Park Service
1849 C Street, N.W.
Rm 2252
WASHINGTON D.C. 20240

Ms Shirley Hart
U.S Observer to UNESCO
2 rue Gabriel
PARIS 75008
FRANCE

UZBEKISTAN/OUZBEKISTAN

H.E. Mr Tokmirjon Mamajonov
Ambassadeur
Ambassade d'Ouzbékistan
22 rue d'Aguesseau
PARIS 75008
FRANCE

**(ii) OTHER OBSERVERS/
AUTRES OBSERVATEURS**

BARBADOS/BARBADE

Ms Alistandra Cummins
Chairperson
Barbados National Commission for UNESCO
St. Ann's Garrison
St. Michael
BRIDGETOWN

**PERMANENT MISSION OF PALESTINE TO
UNESCO/
MISSION PERMANENTE D'OBSERVATION DE LA
PALESTINE AUPRES DE L'UNESCO**

Mr Ahmad Abdelrazek
Ambassador
Delegation of Palestine to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
PARIS 75015
FRANCE

Mr Zuheir Elwazer
Head of Palestine Delegation
Fredrikinkatu 25 A
HELSINKI
FINLAND

(iii) **INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/
ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES**

**THE ARAB LEAGUE
EDUCATIONAL CULTURAL
AND SCIENTIFIC
ORGANIZATION/
L'ORGANISATION ARABE
POUR L'ÉDUCATION, LA
CULTURE ET LA SCIENCE
(ALECSO)**

Dr Abdelaziz Daoulatli
Expert
P.O.Box 1120
TUNIS
TUNISIA

**COMMON WADDEN SEA
SECRETARIAT**

Mr Jens Enermark
Secretary General
Virchowstrasse 1
WILHELMSHAVEN 26382
GERMANY

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

Mr. Denis Ricard
Secretary General
OWHC
Saint-Nicolas Street
QUEBEC G1K 4A1
CANADA

**THE ORGANIZATION OF THE
ISLAMIC CONFERENCE/
L'ORGANISATION
DE LA CONFÉRENCE
ISLAMIQUE (OIC)**

Mr Abdelaziz Abougouche
Assistant Secretary General
P.O. Box 178
JEDDAH 21411
SAUDI ARABIA

**NORDIC WORLD HERITAGE
OFFICE/
BUREAU NORDIQUE DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Ms Anne-Kristin Endresen
Director
Nordic World Heritage Office
Dronningens Gate 13
P.O.Box 8196, Dep.
OSLO 0034
NORWAY

Prof. Synnove Vinsrygg
Senior International Advisor
Nordic World Heritage Office
P.O.Box 8196
OSLO 0034
NORWAY

**UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME (UNEP)/
Regional Office for Europe**

Ms Francoise Belmont
Deputy Director
15, Chemin des Anémones
CHATELAINE, GENEVE 1219
SWITZERLAND

(iv) **NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/
ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES**

**GETTY CONSERVATION
INSTITUTE**

Mr François LeBlanc
Head of Field Projects
1200 Getty Center Drive, Ste 700
LOS ANGELES CA 90049
USA

GLOBAL HERITAGE FUND

Mr Jeff Morgan
Executive Director
2191 Gordon Avenue
MENLO PARK 94025
USA

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE
FOR MEDITERRANEAN
CULTURAL LANDSCAPES**

Dr Carla Maurano
Director
International Centre for
Mediterranean Cultural Landscapes
Via Selva 7
AGROPOLI 84043
Italy

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL
OF MUSEUMS (ICOM)**

Ms Outi Peisa
Chairperson of Finnish National
Committee
ICOM
P.O.Box 4300
HELSINKI 00099

**INTERNATIONAL
FEDERATION OF
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
(IFLA)**

Dr. Hans Dorn
Chair Com. Historic Gardens and
Cultural Landscapes
Holbeinstrasse 17
FRANKFURT/MAIN 60596
GERMANY

**INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ARCHITECTS/ (IUA)
UNION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES (UIA)**

Ms Eija Salmi
The President of the Central Council (SAFA)
International Union of Architects
Torikatu 4 B 20
OULU 90100
FINLAND

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

Mr Ouhar Saad Touré
DGA
Avenue Attine
RABAT 10104
MOROCCO

THE GIBRALTAR MUSEUM

Prof. Clive Finlayson
Director
18-20 Bomb House Lane
P.O. Box 939
GIBRALTAR
UNITED KINGDOM

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Ms Cate Turk
Postgraduate Researcher
Dept. of Geography
Drummond Street
EDINBURGH EH8 9XP
UNITED KINGDOM

IV. HOST COUNTRY SECRETARIAT (FINLAND)

Ms Anu Ahoniemi
Ms Anne Brax
Ms Margaretha Ehrström
Ms Lea Halttunen
Ms Hanna Hämäläinen
Ms Satu Heikkinen
Ms Nina Heiska

Ms Raija Helpi
Mr Petja Hovinheimo
Ms Jonna Lehtinen
Ms Seija Linnanmäki
Ms Marjo Merivirta
Ms Lea Murto-Orava
Mr Karim Peltonen

Ms Sirkku Salomaa
Ms Päivi Salonen
Mr Eeva-Liisa Siru
Mr Kristian Slotte
Mr Hannu Vainonen
Ms Satu-Kaarina Virtala

V. UNESCO SECRETARIAT/SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO

Mr Koïchiro Matsuura
Director-General

Mr Mounir Bouchenaki
Assistant Director-General

World Heritage Centre

Mr Francesco Bandarin
Director

Ms Minja Yang
Deputy Director

Mr Natarajan Ishwaran
Ms Elizabeth Wangari
Ms Mechtild Rossler
Ms Carmen Negrin
Ms Josette Erfan
Mrs Sarah Titchen
Mr Giovanni Boccardi
Ms Junko Taniguchi
Ms Frédérique Robert
Ms Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy
Ms Marjaana Kokkonen
Mr Peter Stott
Mr Mario Hernandez
Ms Joanna Serna-Sullivan

Ms Alexandra zu Sayn-Wittgenstein
Ms Jane Degeorges
Ms Marianne Raabe
Ms Nina Dhumal
Ms Claire Servoz
Mr David Martel

Other UNESCO Sectors:

Mr Wolfgang Reuther
Director
UNESCO Moscow Office

Mr John Donaldson
Legal Advisor

Mr Roni Amelan
Press Officer, BPI

Dr Bernd von Droste
Adviser

Interpreters:

Mr Mourad Boulares
Chief Interpreter
Ms Antoinette Bourdelet
Ms Catherine Lattanzio-Hinthaas
Ms Chantal Bret
Mr Charles Speed
Mr David Shearer
Mme Odile Monpetit

Translators:

Ms Sabine de Valence
Ms Anne Sauvêtre
Ms Brigitte Guérin

**Speech by Mr. Henrik Lilius,
President of the World Heritage Committee
On the occasion of the Opening of the World Heritage Committee session
Helsinki, Finland, 11 December 2001**

Madam President,
Honourable Ministers,
Your Excellencies,
Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great pleasure to open the 25th session of the World Heritage Committee. I have the challenging task to chair this Committee session and to guide World Heritage during the next 6 months.

Let me begin by thanking our former Chairperson, Mr Peter King from Australia, for his immense personal commitment during the last year.

In 2001 we have made a lot of progress for the future of World Heritage and I would like to highlight some of the major issues.

During the meeting of the Drafting Group for the **revisions to the Operational Guidelines** which I was pleased to attend, we made a major step towards a user-friendly format of the main document. I hope that the revised *Guidelines* will guide us, and all partners in World Heritage conservation.

Concerning the **reform process**, following the 13th General Assembly of States Parties in October, we now have a World Heritage Committee, which is more representative of all regions and cultures of the world. I would especially like to welcome the new members of the Committee -- Argentina, India, Lebanon, Oman, Nigeria, Russia, Santa Lucia and the United Kingdom. Most of these new members of the Committee have also chosen to make a declaration to the General Assembly that they will limit their term of office to four rather than six years. This will allow a greater rotation of Committee membership and will open the way for new countries to contribute to the work of the Committee. This progressive step followed the most generous and forward-thinking example of the Italian Government in 1999, making their seat on the Committee available after only two of the six years of their mandate.

I will continue to follow your decisions with regard to the reform process. I am convinced that despite the enormous tasks in front of us, you will welcome the efforts achieved in such a short time.

In this regard I would also like to express my satisfaction with the preliminary **typology of sites** now under preparation. During the past years we have had some major achievements with respect to the representivity of the World Heritage List. We have moved the World Heritage List from cathedrals and other monuments to the concept of sites and landscapes, including technological heritage, vernacular architecture and the heritage of transport. On the natural side we have seen the inclusion of sites from a number of regions underrepresented and countries, such as Malaysia and Suriname. These are unique sites displaying the biological and geological diversity of our earth. However, there is much more to be developed in this regard - particularly for natural heritage, the Caribbean and the Pacific. Following the Committee's decision to only examine 30 new nominations in 2003, we will now have the time for a period of reflection about the categories and types of heritage on our national tentative lists and the World Heritage List. Our objective must be for the World Heritage List to represent a greater diversity of all cultures and environments.

The World Heritage List should represent the **democratic idea of sharing our heritage** with all of humankind. Every individual will find a site on the List with which it can relate and identify. The *Convention* is there to contribute to a better understanding of the cultural and natural diversity of the world. It helps people to be aware of social and cultural difference and to overcome conflict to find a peaceful solution to protect heritage in all parts of the world.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Committee for your trust and confidence in me and my election as Chairperson. It is a great pleasure for me working with you in the implementation of such a prestigious instrument as the *World Heritage Convention*. Furthermore, I very much appreciate the continuous commitment of UNESCO, its Director-General and the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff.

Thank you.

**Speech of the Director-General of UNESCO,
Mr Koïchiro Matsuura**

Madam President,
Honourable Ministers,
Your Excellencies,
Honourable Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you all to the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

First let me convey my sincere thanks to our hosts from Finland for organizing this session here in Helsinki. This is the first World Heritage Committee session to be held in the Nordic region, and our congratulations go to you for this. We are honoured, Madam President of Finland, by your presence here with us today, which we take as a further sign of your country's long-standing commitment to UNESCO and its action to protect the cultural and natural heritage of humankind.

The diversity of Finland's cultural and natural heritage provides a stunning setting for this meeting. We meet here within the walls of the modern grandeur of architect Alvar Aalto's Finlandia Hall. It is a testimony to the traditions of modern design and style for which Finland is renowned. Around us we have also admired the extraordinary innovation of Finland's wooden architecture and flown over the exceptional beauty of the wild landscapes of coast, lakes and peatlands.

Diversity – whether in education, science, culture or communication – was prominent on the agenda of UNESCO's recent session of the General Conference. One of the most important contributions to diversity was the adoption, by acclamation, of the *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, the first major international standard-setting instrument designed to promote cultural diversity. Cultural diversity has thereby been recognized by all Member States to be as vital for humankind as is biodiversity in the natural world. The protection of cultural diversity thus becomes an ethical imperative, inseparable from human identity and dignity.

This is an important source of satisfaction for me.

Underwater heritage that was previously outside the scope of existing legal instruments – now also has its own new convention: the *International Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage*, which was also adopted during our recent General Conference. This new *Convention* prohibits the pillage and destruction of ancient shipwrecks and sunken archaeological sites for commercial exploitation. It gives priority to in-situ preservation of heritage that has been under water for at least 100 years. International law on the protection of the cultural heritage is thus considerably reinforced by this *Convention*.

These are two major steps forward and I welcome them both wholeheartedly. At the same time, however, one cannot ignore the fact that much remains to be done in certain areas. We need to strengthen the fields of application of existing instruments and broaden the principle of protection to new areas of heritage.

I am thinking in particular of the shocking acts of deliberate destruction of heritage which we witnessed as helpless bystanders this year.

The demolition of the Bamiyan statues in Afghanistan has generated an overwhelming level of concern by the international community and civil society. This tragic case has highlighted the importance of effective prevention of such unacceptable behaviour, through a strengthening of sanctions if need be. It is in this context that the General Conference has invited me to prepare a *Draft Declaration against the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage*. The aim of the *Declaration* would be to reinforce provisions contained in existing international cultural heritage conventions such as the *World Heritage Convention*. Our legal instruments will mean nothing unless they can give a greater guarantee of protection. Commitment and action by each of the States Parties to the *Convention* is required.

Another area which calls for serious and urgent investigation is that of intangible heritage. As you know, even before assuming my present position in the Organization, as Chair of the World Heritage Committee I had been concerned with the need to broaden the scope of heritage protection. During my chairmanship, the acceptance by the Committee of customary law and traditional management was broadened, paving the way for international recognition of the vital role of traditional forms of governance. Intangible cultural values associated with sites are also increasingly recognized as an integral component of their world heritage values. However, there is an intrinsic limit to the World Heritage Convention which does not deal with intangible heritage as such.

It is my pleasure, therefore, to inform you that I have been authorized by the General Conference to begin preparatory work towards an international legal framework for the protection of intangible cultural heritage. This new convention will need to be elaborated in the coming years. We shall further define what is called intangible cultural heritage and examine the best form for a new standard-setting instrument on the protection of such cultural heritage. This will have to be developed with reference to the ground-breaking work of this Committee in the area of World Heritage cultural landscapes and the recognition of traditional culture and practice through World Heritage listing.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The international community is looking to UNESCO to rise to the challenge and add strength to all of its efforts to protect heritage. How can we meet such high expectations?

During my term as Chair of the Committee, and since then, in my capacity as Director-General of UNESCO, I stressed the importance of addressing the problem of heritage protection and conservation at its roots. To take proactive measures for preventive action, we must ensure that our conservation work is development-oriented, for conservation to be part of the development process.

I count on you, as members of the Committee to steer the future course of the Convention to make it a powerful tool for sustainable development, as it has proven to be for the protection of the environment. Official Development Assistance (ODA) funds of the OECD Member States alone, will amount to over US\$50 billion this year to support developing countries, including many social and economic infrastructural development projects. The recognition of the importance of World Heritage sites must serve to promote the attribution of ODA funds for the safeguarding and development of cultural and natural heritage and for the defence of diversity.

To strengthen the legal basis for heritage protection and for heritage conservation to become a vector for socio-economic development, a spirit of cooperation and genuine **partnership** with all sectors of society will be required. I think that we must continue to explore new forms of partnerships with the key actors of heritage conservation: local and regional governments, development co-operation agencies, universities, private foundations, the corporate sector and the growing number of NGOs. The multiplication of our efforts in the long term and the creation of a support network for World Heritage conservation through such partnerships will be vital and necessary to respond to the growing challenges facing World Heritage sites.

The year 2002 which marks the 30th Anniversary of the *Convention* and recently declared as the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage by the UN General Assembly will, I hope, provide an opportunity to broaden this partnership for World Heritage protection and management.

To this end the General Conference of UNESCO has approved a series of initiatives as part of the 30th Anniversary. The June session of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Budapest, Hungary will provide a timely opportunity to take stock of lessons learnt and chart our future course. With the generous support of the Italian Government, an international congress will be held in Venice in November 2002 to develop partnerships to support the strategic orientation of the *Convention* which I count on the Committee to develop.

As you know, much of the conservation responsibility and effort rests on the States Parties with key contributions from local and regional governments, public and private organizations. Many countries do not have the necessary technical and financial capacity to cope with this challenge. They rely on UNESCO, the World Heritage Fund and extrabudgetary resources made available by other States Parties and private foundations.

I wish to thank all those States Parties who have generously supported World Heritage in recent years. I also pay tribute to the United Nations Foundation which has granted a very large contribution to the World Heritage Centre to implement projects to benefit natural World Heritage sites, particularly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I encourage you to proceed, with the necessary caution and experimental attitude, to develop a stable and strong network of partners to support you. I encourage you to find the best way to promote and focus the positive energy of governments, local authorities, the private sector and civil society at large.

In concluding, and wishing this Committee well in its deliberations, I again give you my assurances that I will spare no effort in safeguarding the diversity of the worlds' cultural and natural heritage. I call on you all to support me in this challenge.

Thank you.

Speech by Tarja Halonen, President of the Republic of Finland

Ladies and gentlemen,

Heritage comprises of all the manifestations and messages of intellectual activity in our environment. Heritage mirrors a nation's soul and reflects personal identity in a chain from past to future generations.

In terms of heritage, be it cultural or natural, sustainable development will remain mere rhetoric without an operational content. It is essential to build sustainable development on sustainable ethics. We can ask ourselves whether our ethics is on a sound basis and do we truly cherish our intellectual, cultural and natural heritage, passing its message on to future generations?

Ten years ago the Conference on Environment and Development in Rio raised sustainable development as a central concept both in international cooperation and in national action. Every country bears the primary responsibility for sustainable development as well as for cultural and natural heritage. When the ethical norms in the management of cultural and natural heritage rest on a sound basis, sustainable development can be promoted in various ways.

In ecologically sustainable development, economic growth must be accommodated to the limits imposed by nature. This is a great challenge for political decision-making and technologies. International conventions and other common commitments increase our possibilities to foster our common heritage - fostering World Heritage is an element of sustainable development.

Socially just development means an aspiration to distribute welfare equitably. All people have the right to satisfy their basic needs. To achieve this goal, we must combat poverty and exclusion. For this work, education offers a vast range of possibilities. We have made a strong political commitment to education by adopting the Dakar Framework on "Education for All". This framework is an important step in achieving the goals of the Millennium Declaration to guarantee equal education for every boy and girl in this world. This challenge is particularly great concerning girls.

At the same time we must help also illiterate adults learn to read and write. Illiteracy hampers inter alia people's participation in common affairs and construction of the society. Thus illiteracy weakens democracy.

One fundamental characteristic of intellectual and creative heritage is that sharing does not decrease it, on the contrary. It is society's responsibility to create possibilities for such sharing. Education and culture are both essential tools for this.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let us look at heritage from the perspective of children and young people.

In children and young people, we have the key to a future society where cultural tolerance and respect for difference shall come true. Family primarily transmits traditions, but school also has a great responsibility for passing on heritage in all its forms. School lays the foundation for an appreciation of culture and for tolerance. We must encourage networking and co-operation between schools and we have to promote dialogue between cultures at all levels. There is a need for UNESCO to support its Member States in developing values education. This is education for peace, human rights and democracy in other words, education for the prevention of intolerance, discrimination and conflict. In this respect I see great potential in the World Heritage Education Project initiated by UNESCO. This project deserves our strong support.

Minorities are often left out from power centres. The position of minorities is essential in the preservation of indigenous cultures. By working together we can remove obstacles and ensure minorities the right to their own culture. Responsibility for nature and its diversity, for the living environment and cultural heritage cannot be conceded to others, it rests with everybody. I am pleased to note that this meeting will deliberate the establishment of a World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts. There is a close link between this Council and the Indigenous Peoples Forum established by the United Nations.

One paradox in the preservation of heritage is that we must conserve in order to renew. The vitality of culture is born out of diversity - in a society that gives peace, welfare and culture a chance.

The challenge facing the world is to reach across cultures, religions and history to forge a new vision for development that rests on a shared interest in sustainability, stability and prosperity. Such a vision offers the prospect of a more human, inclusive globalisation one that embraces cultural diversity.

I welcome therefore the decision of UNESCO's General Conference to focus the Organisation's cultural programme on diversity, intercultural pluralism and dialogue. Let us hope that the Declaration on Cultural Diversity adopted by the General Conference, will mark the take-off towards greater respect for the diversity of cultures, tolerance, dialogue and co-operation. The declaration is an important input to the observation of the International Year of Dialogue among Civilisations. Civilisations or cultures are changing, developing and adapting themselves to new

times and new realities through interaction with each other. This interaction creates multiethnic and multicultural societies, rich and diverse in their heritage.

Preserving heritage obviously means preserving its diversity. The current international context prompts us to sharpen our focus on this dialogue. Preservation of cultural diversity is inseparable from action to strengthen intercultural dialogue. Both are at the heart of mutual understanding.

The UN General Assembly has declared the year 2002 as United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage, which coincides with the 30th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention. This not only shows how highly we value our common heritage, but also underlines the need for safeguarding it for future generations. UNESCO, having a central role in this effort, faces compelling challenges in fulfilling this mission.

We have to keep in mind that the world heritage is about more than monuments and natural wonders. The intangible ideas and beliefs that constitute our collective memory must never be neglected.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me give a positive example from my own country, Finland gained her independence 84 years ago, we fought a civil war and we have had to fight three wars against foreign enemies. Still we have reached a high standard of living and in a recent OECD-study Finnish students scored highest marks in exams of reading and writing. In fact when comparing the national averages among OECD countries, Finland is above the average in reading, mathematics and natural sciences, We can thank our comprehensive education for the advancement in building a knowledge based society in Finland. By giving also girls equal possibility for education at all levels we have at least doubled our resources.

Let me conclude with a quotation from the Declaration on Cultural Diversity: "Heritage in all its forms must be preserved, enhanced and handed on to future generations as a record of human experience and aspirations, so as to foster creativity in all its diversity and to inspire genuine dialogue among cultures".

I wish the World Heritage Committee the best of success in its important work.

Address by the Minister of Culture of Finland, Ms Suvi Lindén

Madam President,
Mr Chairperson of the Committee,
Mr Director-General,
Distinguished delegates and observers,
Ladies and gentlemen,

Anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss has said that world culture is in fact global cooperation between cultures, in which each culture maintains its unique characteristics.

This is what the World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage Committee are all about. The protection of cultural heritage promotes dialogue between cultures. We must learn to understand and respect difference - to recognise its value as an intellectual and cultural wealth.

One vital objective for the World Heritage Committee is to achieve balance in the World Heritage List. The need to include new countries and new kinds of cultural heritage is a challenge to experts. Procedures and criteria must be defined in a way which enables us to protect the common heritage of humankind.

National resources are often inadequate for protecting cultural and natural heritage. Countries which have knowledge, know-how and economic resources play a key role in international cooperation. On the other hand, countries which have numerous sites on the World Heritage List need to hold back and help those countries which have no listed sites as yet. The protection of cultural heritage is a generally recognised value in all societies, but the resources available for the work vary greatly.

For a country, having sites on the list is a significant acknowledgment. A listed site gives publicity and draws positive attention to the town or region. At its best, it boosts self-respect, revitalises traditional skills and crafts, stimulates tourism and business. Having said this, I think it crucial to bear in mind that the ultimate aim is to protect the sites and not to use them for other purposes.

We must learn to see protection in a new way and develop new action models which accommodate the whole variety of global heritage. The current efforts made by the World Heritage Committee to simplify procedures and to renew the operational guidelines are an important step on this road. For instance, it would be very much easier to include the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples if the criteria of cultural and natural sites were combined into one set of guidelines.

All the manifestations of cultural heritage are fragile and subject to various hazards. Historical buildings and artefacts have always suffered in warfare. Heritage is often destroyed with a clear intent to undermine the

identity of a nation. Unesco's efforts to intervene in acts constituting a crime against the common human heritage are especially valuable and necessary in our days. In this work it is important to make use of existing instruments for safeguarding cultural property and heritage and commitment to them.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Finland greatly appreciates the work done by the World Heritage Committee and its secretariat, the World Heritage Centre, in implementing the World Heritage Convention.

Finland has actively taken part in its work since we became its member in 1997. For us hosting the 25th session of the World Heritage Committee is both an honour and a vote of confidence. Helsinki and the Finlandia Hall have been the venue of many important international meetings, which were often said to have proceeded in the "Helsinki spirit".

Side by side with this session, there is another Unesco event, the International Workshop on World Heritage Education, which is held at the near-by National Museum. I would like to refer to President Tarja Halonen's address and reiterate how important it is to encourage new generations to appreciate the value and significance of the world heritage.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those involved in the organisation of this session. Our gratitude is also due to the World Heritage Centre staff for their valuable input. I hope that this session will deliberate decisions in a positive spirit, with a view to making both the local and the global public appreciate the value of cultural and natural heritage and the role it plays in boosting identity and promoting mutual understanding.

Thank you.

**Speech of the Minister of Environment,
Minister for International Development Affairs, Finland,
Ms Satu Hassi**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have entered a new millennium with an enormous amount of ecological knowledge and awareness. Satellite technology has vastly improved our means of monitoring environmental changes in the atmosphere, on the continents and in the oceans – and in real time, too. Yet it still is difficult to obtain a global reaction to negative environmental changes. These are mainly anthropogenic, caused by man himself. To address such issues is the same as addressing established praxes within another state or a branch of industry, or interfering with long-established prerogatives or benefits of a group of people.

We know that natural vitality and biological diversity are waning from year to year. The WWF Living Planet Index states that one-third of the biological diversity of the world has been lost during the last 25 years. An increasing number of species dependent on indigenous biotopes, habitats and cultural landscapes lose out in competition with other species. Efficient land use, agriculture and forestry shrink or change the habitats of these species. In these situations our reactions have been all too slow, or else steps have been difficult to take on account of political or other reasons. Therefore, some species will unavoidably become extinct. Some, fortunately, can still be saved with special efforts.

The Convention on Cultural Heritage is an important instrument in our fight for the preservation of species. Many states possessing globally important threatened or rare species habitats have already ratified this Convention. It is important to make it known in states which have already ratified this Convention. It is important to make it known in states which have not yet begun ratification. For instance, the participation of countries in Africa has meant that game reserves or national parks, which we know from nature films, have been included as part of the World Heritage. In the spirit of the Convention they have thus become part of humanity's joint heritage, and all parties to the Convention carry the responsibility for their preservation. These areas can now also receive economic contributions from UNESCO.

The status of World Heritage sites means increased income from tourism, which is highly important for the African states. In some areas, eco-tourism has even expanded to the extent of becoming difficult to manage. But the states that are parties to the Convention are not alone in their fight against these problems. They can draw upon UNESCO's global funds of expertise as well to identify and solve the problems arising.

There is hardly anyone among us who doubts that the inclusion in the World Heritage of the African game parks,

the Galapagos Islands of Ecuador, Australia's Great Barrier Reef or the Brazilian rain forests is eminently justified. All these areas display habitats of globally unique species, or exceptional biodiversity.

The World Conservation Union, IUCN, plays a central role in the selection of new natural heritage sites to the World Heritage List. Many parties to the Convention, among them Finland, have realised that the IUCN draws a very neat line. This can be illustrated by the fact that although Finland ratified the Convention as early as 1987, so far we have not been able to provide a single natural heritage site to the List. Nevertheless, we keep on trying.

Finland appreciates the line taken by the IUCN and also adopted by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, based increasingly on conscious selection and a Global Strategy. As far as the natural heritage is concerned, the IUCN seems to stick strictly to the principle of the Seven Wonders of the World, that is, the List should only include objects of outstanding universal value, and among such, preferably only one of each, the best and most representative one of its kind. It is an excellent idea to name, as "hot spots", concentrations of biodiversity and areas defined by the WWF calling for urgent action. We support this policy, but I would like to mention that also in Finland there are some natural sites of unique value, such as the western coastline, where the landrise is the fastest in the world, and northernmost unbroken pine forest in the world close to lake Inari in Lapland.

Most of the natural heritage sites of the World Heritage List lie on land. The Global Strategy aims at more marine sites, for instance in the Pacific. I embrace this endeavour, too. So far, not nearly all ocean species have yet been found. Some researchers think the combined biological diversity of the oceans is more extensive than the land-bound diversity. On the other hand, the increasing sea traffic, unsustainable fishing practices and other kinds of over-exploitation and collection of the ocean's resources and, in places, wrongly placed and misguided tourism, constitute threats against the varied life in the oceans and their littoral areas.

Finland will continue along the lines adopted to work for the natural heritage, to promote the implementation of the Convention where the globally most valuable and also most threatened areas are to be found. In practice this means that in the Finnish development cooperation we promote democracy in the Convention states, give aid to help nominate World Heritage sites, both natural and cultural sites, and help set up proper administration and maintenance units for sites already included on the World Heritage List. Finland has also given aid to help preserving several World Heritage sites of those I would

like to mention the programme to protect environment at the Machu Picchu in Peru and the protection of the surroundings of the Lalibela rock churches in Ethiopia.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

On my own behalf I would like to wish all of you a very pleasant meeting and constructive lobbying during lunch and coffee breaks. As the Minister responsible for both Environment and Development Cooperation I hope that we receive tangible proposals for how Finland could in best way contribute to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in both fields, in the side of cultural heritage and in the side of natural heritage, both in Finland and in the poorer countries, which need the financial help of richer countries. The humankind is, anyway, one; and all of us are responsible for preserving the World Hetitage for the generations coming after us.

Statement by the Observer of Israel

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to address the issue of the presence of a PLO Representative in the meetings of the implementing bodies of the Convention and the Conference of the State Parties.

On November 23, 2001, an Egyptian proposal to amend the Rule 8.2 of the Rules of Procedure was submitted to Mr Bandarin. According to the proposal the words “permanent observer missions to UNESCO” will be inserted after the words “non-permanent organizations” so that permanent observer missions to UNESCO will also be listed among the various bodies that may be authorized by the Committee, to participate in its sessions. While the proposal was submitted in accordance to Rule 9.2, once again, it must be pointed out that the purpose of this proposal is clearly political since its implication will legitimize the presence of the PLO at the meetings of the Committee and hence contribute to its politization. Even if the proposal were to be accepted legally, the PLO will still not be able to take part in the Committee’s sessions, since Rule 8.2 allows for the participation of bodies which “have activities in the fields covered by the Convention”.

While such a presence was permitted at the Committee’s meeting in December 2000, it was understood that it would not set a precedent or become a justification for any future PLO participation in the meetings of the Committee. There is absolutely no justification in the Convention and Rules of Procedure for such participation. Suspension of the Rules of Procedure is clearly not the appropriate way to deal with the matter. Hence the participation of a PLO Representative at the Committee’s sessions has no legal basis.

Israel’s legal position on this matter, which was brought to the attention of the Committee in its last meeting in Australia and in further correspondence with Mr Bandarin and Chairman King, is based on the fact that Rule 8.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, requires that only States Parties to the Convention, which are not members of the Committee, may attend the sessions of the Committee as observers. Since the PLO Representative does not represent a Party to the Convention or a State for that matter, this Rule cannot be applied to the PLO Delegation.

Article 10(2) of the Convention and Rules 7, 8.2 and 8.3 deal with other appropriate participants that may take part in the meetings of the Committee and are not State Parties to the Convention: According to Rule 7 and Article 10(2) of the Convention “the Committee may at any time invite public or private organizations or individuals to participate in the meetings for consultations on particular problems”. According to Rules 8.2 and 8.3, various bodies, which “have activities in the fields covered by the Convention”

may be authorized by the Committee, to participate in the sessions of the Committee.

In view of the spirit of the Convention and its objectives, especially the professional character of the Committee, the aim of these articles is undoubtedly to enable the Committee to invite organizations or individuals for the sole purpose of professional consultation regarding aspects dealt with by the Convention. Clearly the PLO Representative does not fit these criteria and his presence is nothing but a politically motivated action by states intent on politicizing the work of this Committee and thus serves no substantive or functional purpose.

Giving the PLO Representative the opportunity to participate and express political views in the discussions of the Committee, a body whose deliberations are meant to be purely professional, is obviously in contraction to the letter and the spirit of the Convention and the Rules of Procedure. Moreover, in doing so, the Committee will itself contribute to the politization of a forum whose primary missions are to

1. Encourage countries to sign the Convention and ensure the protection of natural and cultural heritage, and
2. Encourage States Parties to the Convention to nominate sites within their national territory for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

In view of the above, I would respectively urge you, Mr Chairman, to prevent the politization of this Committee and thus decide not to permit the presence of a representative of the PLO at the deliberations of this Committee.

At the same time, I want to express my wish that the day will come soon after a peace agreement is reached, when Palestinian experts will join their Israeli counterparts in the work of this Committee on behalf of a State Party.

Thank you Mr Chairman.

Budget for Afghanistan Mission

Estimated Budget Breakdown for Fact-Finding & Consultative Mission: US\$32,000

(a) Travel Costs: US\$18,000

- International Airfare US\$1,500 x 4 persons = US\$6,000
(Director and Secretariat/World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS cultural heritage expert, IUCN natural heritage expert)
- Domestic Travel within Afghanistan US\$4,000 (approximate)
- Daily Subsistence Allowance 4 persons x US\$100 (average) x 15 days = US\$6,000
- Insurance and other miscellaneous costs US\$2,000

(b) Fees: US\$8,000
(International expert fees: US\$200 x 20 days x 2 experts = US\$8,000)

(c) Reporting costs: US\$2,000
(Photographic, cartographic, and other documentation costs)

(d) Organizational support: US\$4,000

Budget for Afghanistan Scientific Documentation

Estimated Budget Breakdown for Scientific Documentation: US\$17,000

- ICOMOS/ICCROM Co-ordination Services and Documentation costs for Cultural Heritage of Afghanistan US\$10,000
- IUCN Co-ordination Services and Documentation costs for Natural Heritage of Afghanistan US\$ 7,000

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

**Extract from the Report of the Rapporteur of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session
of the Bureau, Helsinki, Finland (7-8 December 2002) (WHC-01/CONF.208/4)**

PART I: Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for examination

NATURAL HERITAGE

MINING AND WORLD HERITAGE

III.1 The Bureau recalled that the results of the technical workshop on World Heritage and Mining were reviewed by the last session of the Committee. It was informed that the proceedings of the workshop were published by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME), IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. In July 2000 a copy was sent to all Committee members and in November 2001 to all new Committee members for information.

III.2 The Bureau also noted the change in the organization of the mining industry relating to the Global Mining Initiative's (GMI) decision to put in place a new organization. On 21 May 2001, the Board of Directors of the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) agreed to transform the organization into the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), to be based in London. ICMM has been given a broader mandate by the membership to focus principally on providing sustainable development leadership for the industry. An environmental scientist has been appointed the Secretary-General of ICMM in October 2001 and the inaugural meeting of the Governing Council of ICMM has been held on 24 October 2001 in London. Issues related to mining and biodiversity will continue to be a priority for this new organization. The membership comprises leading companies from the mining, metals and minerals industry (represented by their Chairmen/CEOs), as well as office bearers of regional, national and commodity associations.

III.3 The objectives of ICMM are as follows:

- to initiate, conduct, promote and communicate research and analysis into the interaction of the world's mining, mineral and metal industries with the economy, the environment and communities;
- to seek to lead change within these industries by stimulating discussion and coordinating activities between and among member companies, others involved with the industry and the industry's regional, national, commodity and international associations;
- to develop and communicate a clear and authoritative position on global issues affecting the future of the mining, mineral and metal industries;
- to determine and promote global best practice performance standards within these industries;

- to maintain a high-level dialogue with government and inter-governmental bodies, non-governmental and community organisations, academic and professional institutions and other stakeholders.

III.4 IUCN noted there are a number of initiatives underway at present relating to mining and the environment and reaffirmed its view that mining should not be permitted within World Heritage sites.

III.5 The Bureau noted that following the creation of ICMM, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN will review the proposal for the establishment of a Working Group on World Heritage and Mining, as proposed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session and will report back to the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee.

Africa

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)

III.6 The Bureau noted that two articles were published on illegal poaching in Cameroon, with particular mention of Dja Faunal Reserve.

III.7 IUCN noted that such a situation can negatively impact protected area relations with local people. IUCN reported that, in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and TRAFFIC, the wildlife monitoring programme of IUCN and WWF, convened a technical workshop in Yaounde, Cameroon from 17-20 September 2001. The workshop, entitled "Links Between Biodiversity Conservation, Livelihoods and Food Security and the Use of Wild Meat", aimed to: forge functional links among the species conservation, food security/community development and commercial sectors in order to identify means to address conservation and development concerns linked to the unsustainable use of wild fauna for food; contribute to the process of identifying, prioritising and planning practical responses to address priority conservation and development concerns related to the use of wild fauna for food; and provide input to a GEF proposal related to the use of wild fauna to contribute to sustainable livelihoods in Central Africa.

III.8 IUCN and the Centre noted that the UNESCO/FAO African World Heritage Forest Initiative (AWHFI) concept document, currently being developed for submission to the UNF Board for the July 2002 round of biodiversity grants, includes Dja Faunal Reserve. The Centre and IUCN observed with concern that the reports on poaching and logging, if accurately reported, suggest that it may be necessary to consider whether the site should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

They acknowledged that the problem is due to a combination of factors including law enforcement, political commitment, cultural differences, resources, and food availability. In light of the recent Wild Meat workshop it is hoped that prompt and effective action will be taken by the State Party to address these damaging trends.

III.9 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee welcomes the recommendations of IUCN, and calls upon the State Party to take urgent action to halt illegal poaching in the Reserve, and requests a full report from the State Party on this situation by 1 February 2002. This report shall be submitted for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2002), at which time it will decide on the need for a mission to the site. Furthermore, the Committee commends the chief executives of major European logging firms active in Central Africa, representatives from various conservation NGOs (WCS, IUCN, WWF) and officials from the World Bank and the European Union) for their initial efforts in bringing stakeholders together to tackle the environmental problems associated with logging operations. The code of conduct should be supported, and the Committee urges the CEO-AWG to strengthen its efforts to involve Asian companies in the work of the group and to undertake every effort to include all logging companies working in Cameroon.”

Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya)

III.10 The Centre and IUCN had received a letter from the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) noting that IUCN had requested KWS to nominate Mt Kenya World Heritage site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger, and expressing opposition to the ‘proposed de-listing of Mt Kenya World Heritage site’. The letter noted that the management of the site had recently been transferred from the Forest Department to the KWS with the aim of enhancing management and enforcement. The KWS reported that it had extended the boundaries of the site to include the natural forest, and was in the process of preparing an integrated management plan. IUCN had responded to the State Party by: clarifying its role as an Advisory Body; outlining the process involved in listing sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger; explaining the implications of inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and outlining the purpose of monitoring missions and the need for such missions to be approved by the State Party. The Centre and IUCN noted that the delay in receiving an invitation from the Kenyan State Party for a monitoring mission appears to be related to a misunderstanding on what was requested by the Bureau in June 2001. The KWS was of the understanding that the request for a mission with the view to considering whether the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger constituted automatic inclusion in this List, as well as subsequent removal from the World Heritage List.

III.11 The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee requests the State Party to invite a mission to the site as soon as possible to enable an independent assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage site.”

Banc d'Arguin National Park, Mauritania

III.12 The Bureau was informed that the issue of 23 June 2001 of the *New Scientist* included an article on Banc d'Arguin National Park. Entitled “Breaking the Banc: Africa’s largest marine sanctuary is failing”, the article describes the threat to the Park’s fish stocks posed by ‘tens of thousands of traditional fishermen’ and ‘hundreds of giant foreign trawlers’ that fish at the edge of the Park boundary. The article puts most blame on the large international trawler consortiums, many of them European (the largest European vessel can hold 7,000 tonnes of fish and is dedicated full time to Mauritanian waters), who have the financial power to buy fishing rights from the Mauritanian Government. It notes that the trawlers have displaced traditional fishermen who are increasing pressure to be allowed inside the Park and the World Heritage site.

III.13 The Centre and IUCN noted the importance of working with traditional fishermen to help address their concerns. A vital element of effective management of the coastal zone is the protection of key ecosystems such as those within the World Heritage site. The increasing involvement of international trawlers is a cause for grave concern as it can potentially negate such initiatives.

III.14 In September 2001 the Park reported to IUCN that two pre-exploration permits for petroleum exploration within the Park had been signed by the Government of Mauritania. The Park is currently seeking to undertake an urgent assessment of the legal situation in Mauritania and its obligations under international conventions, including the World Heritage Convention, in order to halt the exploration and production permits. It is seeking assistance to undertake this assessment. The Park reports that the situation with the proposed road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott, which will pass close to the boundary of the Park, remains inconclusive.

III.15 The Bureau welcomed the recommendations of IUCN and requested a report from the State Party by 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau. This report should address the following issues: the status of petroleum permits relating to oil exploration within the Park; threats to marine resources of the Park, and the status of the road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott.

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)

III.16 The Bureau learned that an IUCN/Centre monitoring mission to the site was undertaken from 5 to 15

July 2001. The full mission report was provided as an information document WHC-2001/CONF.207/INF.7. As suggested in the report, IUCN and the Centre proposed that an aerial survey should be conducted as a matter of urgency. This survey should determine the number and distribution of giant eland in Niokolo-Koba NP's eastern part and the adjacent Faleme Hunting Zone. Because of the present low density of giant eland, a total coverage of the primary giant eland area in Niokolo-Koba NP is recommended. A sample count following standardised methodology could be undertaken in the remaining areas of Niokolo-Koba NP and the Faleme Hunting Zone.

III.17 All National Park staff working in Niokolo-Koba or visiting the Park should be encouraged to record detailed giant eland information on standardised data sheets whenever possible. Observations should include standardised information such as date, habitat type, locality, group sizes and number of calves. Other regular visitors to Niokolo-Koba NP, such as tour operators, could also be encouraged to collect specific information on giant eland. It is desirable to protect a small number of giant eland outside Niokolo-Koba NP. The present six giant eland in Bandia Reserve could serve this purpose. No further captures and relocations of giant eland from Niokolo-Koba NP to areas outside the Park should be considered for the time being. A short field research project on giant eland should be considered for submission requesting support from the World Heritage Fund. This project should collect detailed population data, movements and habitat use. A one-year field project should be able to achieve the initial goals. Radio collaring of a few selected individuals would be essential to ensure that study animals could be reliably located.

III.18 Effective law enforcement (anti-poaching operations) will remain of critical importance, not only as far as the survival of giant eland is concerned but also other species in the Park. It was proposed that the services of a specialist consultant be sought to consider various alternative law-enforcement strategies. This must be done in close co-operation with National Parks' authorities as well as community representatives in the Niokolo-Koba region. The project "The protection, reproduction and veterinary control of large antelopes, such as the Derby eland" proposed by the Tropical and Sub-tropical Agronomy at the ITSZ CZU in Prague, should be reviewed by all key stakeholder groups. The project could play a major role in ensuring the survival of the giant eland.

III.19 The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee endorses the recommendations of the IUCN/Centre mission, and requests the State Party to review the document and report back with an action plan for implementation of the recommendations by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002)."

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)

III.20 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Centre and IUCN had received a report of extensive and increasing domestic crop cultivation in the Ngorongoro Crater and wider Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), 97% of which constitutes the World Heritage site. A letter from the Centre was addressed to the Permanent Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania to UNESCO requesting verification of the situation with the Ngorongoro Conservation Area authorities. The same letter was copied to the Frankfurt Zoological Society that has undertaken projects in NCA. Concerns have been raised over the expansion and the negative impacts on wildlife and the Masaai traditional pastoralism. Specifically the concerns raised relate to:

- Cultivation on very steep slopes;
- Growing pressure for alternative land use which has reduced most of the Masaai's grazing lands, making Ngorongoro the last sanctuary with intact grazing land;
- Steady increase in residents in Ngorongoro, mainly through immigration from other areas;
- Changes in the agricultural practices of the Masaai pastoralists.

III.21 In response to the above report, the Conservator of Ngorongoro in his letter to the Centre dated 7 August 2001, noted that in 1995 the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority commissioned a team of experts to consider the issue of domestic cultivation. The study concluded that the cultivation practised by the Masaai pastoralists was not a threat to conservation and pastoralism interests. It recommended cultivation carried out by non-Masaai pastoralists should be halted as it posed a threat to the integrity of the Conservation Area. It also noted that increasing numbers of immigrants who might not abide by Masaai relations and customs, could threaten the functioning of the Masaai's social institutions which regulate land use.

III.22 Further, the Conservator of Ngorongoro noted that the following actions have been enforced:

- Identification of immigrants and human and livestock census;
- Acquiring alternative land for cultivation outside the Conservation Area for resettling of immigrants and where domestic cultivation could be carried out;
- Follow up study to the 1995 study;
- Implementation of a DANIDA-funded project aimed at revitalising the livestock-based economy in order to ensure that cultivation remains secondary to livestock;
- Continuing the grain importation scheme to help the resident population gain access to grain at cost price, and therefore discourage crop cultivation.

III.23 The Frankfurt Zoological Society expressed concern that "without a decision from the government, cultivation will continue and threaten not only one of the

world's most famous wildlife areas but also one of the last grazing lands for the Maasai cattle”.

III.24 IUCN noted that the serious encroachment and destruction of the highland forests at the northern edge of the site continues. IUCN noted further that cultivation, even at a very low level, excludes use of the area by larger wildlife species in the long term, and that only a very small percentage of the NCA is suitable for cultivation because of rainfall, soil and slope conditions.

IUCN also noted that:

- the Ngorongoro Conservation Area was separated from the Serengeti and gazetted as a multi-use conservation area, hence sustainable use such as grazing is allowed;
- Limited subsistence cultivation was allowed in the early nineties due to food shortages, declining livestock and population growth. This alone was not a serious threat. What has become a serious threat is the commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers, and this is what needs to be addressed urgently;
- There is some disagreement about the impact of the Masaai practising agriculture within the NCA. There is the possibility that Masaai agriculture (distinct from traditional pastoralism or livestock rearing), is also negatively impacting on the site;
- The management of the NCA requires more effective scientific guidance.

III.25 The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee requests the State Party to provide a report on the encroachment situation in the northern section of the World Heritage site and on the impacts of commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers on the integrity and values of this World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee.”

Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)

III.26 The Bureau was informed that the Centre and IUCN had received several reports concerning the proposed Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric Project (ENP) in Kenya, and its potential impacts on the Serengeti and Mara ecosystems. The State-owned Kenya Electricity Generating Company is proposing to build three dams along the Ewaso Ng'iro River that would generate 180 MW of electricity and which would cost 350 million dollars by the time of completion in 2007. This scheme, if implemented, would link the Mara River system through a 3.5 km tunnel with the upper drainage of the Ewaso Ng'iro (south) River, thus reversing the Mara's flow into the Ewaso Ng'iro River, finally draining into Lake Natron in the east instead of Lake Victoria in the west.

III.27 There have been a series of Environmental Impact Assessments and discussions on the ENP which have held its implementation up. Potential impacts, if implemented, include downstream effects on Lake Natron in Tanzania (possible extension to the proposed Rift Valley Lake Reserves World Heritage site) and potential ecological impact on the Serengeti National Park. IUCN has received a report by the Frankfurt Zoological Society, which noted potential impacts of the project, if implemented, on the conservation of the Serengeti National Park:

- The main feature of the Serengeti Ecosystem, which extends across several protected areas, including the World Heritage site, is the wildebeest migration. Wildlife numbers in this system are controlled by the dry season rainfall (and consequent grass availability) in the Mara River system. Presently, the Serengeti Migration consists of approximately 1.2 million wildebeest and 200,000 zebras. This was an important feature at the time of the inscription of this site.
- If the Mara River were to dry up, most of the wildlife migrants would perish and the Serengeti Migration would collapse irreversibly. There is concern that though the ENP makes allowances for maintaining some water flow in the Mara River, even during severe droughts, these drought times would also produce the worst power shortages in Kenya. Consequently, there would be unpredictable pressure on the demand for channelling all available Mara water into the Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric project.
- Even under normal climatic conditions the project might endanger the Serengeti World Heritage Site and impact tourist revenues in Tanzania and Kenya. In June 2001, Tanzania National Parks, together with the Frankfurt Zoological Society and the Australian Institute for Marine Science developed an ecological model to test the possible impact of the Amala weir water diversion project on the Serengeti Migration (*Modeling the Impact on the Serengeti Ecosystem of the Proposed Amala Weir Water Diversion Project in Kenya*, Gereta, E., Wolanski, E., and Borner, M., 2001.).

It is understood that the East Africa Community has discussed this issue and the proposal has effectively been dropped for the time being.

III.28 IUCN has been notified that WWF East Africa Regional Office is commencing design of a *Mara River Catchment Basin Initiative*. This will focus on conserving the Mara River Catchment's unique biodiversity; ensuring the maintenance of natural functions by balancing the supply and demand of biodiversity products, and developing alternative livelihoods for communities. As part of the Initiative's preliminary phase, WWF has recently commissioned a report on the hydrology of the Kenyan side of the Mara River, in order to consider the land use changes and impacts of these on the flow and

quality of the River. IUCN noted that the Serengeti National Park is one of the field sites for the *Enhancing our Heritage Project* funded by the UNF. IUCN considered that there is merit in the State Parties of Kenya and Tanzania establishing a joint committee through the Commission on East Africa Cooperation arrangement to undertake further in-depth studies on the entire catchments of the Ewaso Ng'iro, Lake Natron, Mara River systems.

III.29 IUCN noted that the Serengeti is not only a World Heritage site and Biosphere Reserve, it is also the main tourist attraction in Tanzania, a country where tourism revenue is the largest foreign exchange earner. It also noted that the very reason that the Serengeti is a World Heritage site - the wildebeest migration, could be potentially threatened by any future implementation of the ENP. IUCN recognised that any negative impact on the dry season range of the wildebeest has potentially major ramifications for the very criteria on which the Serengeti listing is based. IUCN also noted that the Mara River is habitat for riverine forest containing many rare forest birds and other fauna, and upon which large populations of crocodiles and hippopotamus depend. It is clear that there is a high element of risk in the diversion of water from the Mara. The Mara diversion cannot be considered in isolation, it must be considered in the context of other ecological problems such as rapidly changing land use and deforestation in the catchments, as well as the impacts of climate change. Most serious ecological/environmental problems arise because of a complex combination of factors. In such cases, IUCN believes that the precautionary principle must be applied to avoid any actions that increase the risk of the Mara drying up.

III.30 The Bureau noted that the ENP project has been discussed by the East African Community and has been abandoned for the time being. The Bureau noted the potential impacts of any implementation of the ENP scheme on the Serengeti World Heritage site and requested that it be kept informed of developments by the State Parties of Tanzania and Kenya.

Asia and the Pacific

World Heritage Properties of Australia

Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

III.31 The Bureau was informed that on 10 September 2001 the Australian Government released a scientific report addressing the effect of land use activities on water quality in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. The report - *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* - recommends specific end-of-river pollution targets for 2011 for all 26 catchments adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef. The Plan was prepared by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) at the request of the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council and the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Heritage. A scientific working group reviewed available data and existing national water quality guidelines, prioritised catchments according to the ecological risk presented to

the Reef, and recommended minimum targets for pollutant loads that would halt the decline in water quality entering the reef. The Plan is available on the GBRMPA web site at: <http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au/> The Plan notes that over the last 150 years, the sediment load has increased by 300-900%, phosphate by 300 -1500%, total nitrogen by 200-400%, respectively and that pesticide residues are now detectable in sub-tidal sediments. For the 2001-2011 decade, the plan proposes the reduction of sediment by 38%, nitrogen by 39%, phosphorous by 47%, and chlorophyll by 30-60%, respectively. It is also proposed to reduce the detectable levels of heavy metals and pesticides.

III.32 The Plan recommends that the targets be incorporated into relevant plans under the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and the Natural Heritage Trust. For catchments not covered under the NAP, the report recommends that the State Government prepare, and submit to the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council, integrated catchment management plans that set out the action required to meet the water quality targets. The Plan suggests specific actions, notably a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory measures that need to be taken to improve the quality of water entering the World Heritage site including:

- Reforms to ensure that all environmentally significant activities in the catchments are subject to proper environmental impact assessment and approval processes and that conditions are attached to ensure activities are carried out in a manner that protects and improves water quality
- Promotion of 'constraint mapping' for current and future agricultural development
- Protection and rehabilitation of catchment areas at risk such as freshwater wetlands and riparian vegetation
- Establishment and enforcement of standards for sewage, wastewater and storm- water discharge from coastal developments to watercourses
- Promotion of environmental management plans for agricultural activities, which promote farming practices that minimise downstream impacts
- Promotion of full compliance to Industry Codes of Practice, and
- Initiation of public and catchment specific education programmes about the connectivity between land use and the impacts on the Reef.

III.33 WWF-Australia has estimated that the cost of a significant restoration programme to mitigate pollution and to clean up the waters flowing into the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) would be in excess of AU\$300 million. It has identified the following actions as key to success: (i) an immediate and permanent moratorium of land clearing in the GBR catchment; (ii) urgent legislative protection for coastal freshwater wetlands; (iii) all agricultural activities to be regulated under the Queensland Environment Protection Act 1994; (iv) fertiliser and pesticide use to be licensed; (v) legislative discharge limits for acid sulphate soil to be set; and (vi) a major GBR catchment riparian re-

vegetation and wetland restoration programme to be designed and financed.

III.34 IUCN had noted that the *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* initiative directly addresses one of the major issues raised in the ACIUCN report on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, relating to the need for more effective catchment management in lands adjacent to the Park.

III.35 The Observer of Australia noted that since the report has come out only recently, the Bureau should not yet urge specific actions to implement the Action Plan. Time should be given for the Australian authorities to consider relevant measures for implementation of the Plan. A meeting concerning the measures to be taken will take place shortly. Australia agreed to report back soon after the meeting.

III.36 The Bureau commended the State Party on the release of the Water Quality Action Plan, setting targets for improvements and the recommended actions to achieve the targets. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide regular reports to the Committee on the implementation of the Water Quality Action Plan as well as on the implementation of the Focused Recommendations and Framework for Management adopted for the site by the State Party and ACIUCN in 1999.

Fraser Island (Australia)

III.37 The Bureau noted that on 30 April 2001, a 9-year boy was killed by dingoes on Fraser Island. This was the first recorded death in Australia by dingoes of a human over 1 year of age. This death prompted a re-evaluation of the risk posed to humans by dingoes and a re-assessment of the management strategies outlined in the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy (March 2001). The revised Strategy is now with the Queensland Government awaiting approval.

III.38 Immediately following the incident, the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS) undertook a cull of 31 dingoes to reduce the immediate risk to people from habituated dingoes that were frequenting areas heavily used by people. This cull was a one-time operation. A Risk Assessment Report (*Risk Assessment: Risk to humans posed by the dingo population on Fraser Island, EPA, May 2001*) was commissioned by the Queensland Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Risk Assessment provides direction for the immediate management of dingoes on Fraser Island and provides site-specific management recommendations. As such, it is complementary to the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy. The Risk Assessment outlined some previously unused management options at particular sites, including: (a) fencing of campgrounds and recreational areas; (b) active deterrence of animals in the vicinity of popular visitor areas; (c) restriction on taking of food to certain locations; and (d) time restrictions for visitors at some sites. Additional island wide management approaches recommended include: (i) limiting visitor

numbers using a variety of approaches; (ii) significantly increasing fines and penalties for feeding dingoes; (iii) enhancing public education and awareness programmes; (iv) increasing enforcement through additional ranger presence; (v) increasing monitoring and research on the dingo.

III.39 The need for consultation with the Island's residents, tour operators, the Fraser Island Community Advisory Committee, native title claimants and the Island's World Heritage Area Management Committee on appropriate limits and mechanisms is emphasised in the Risk Assessment Report. IUCN has received expert advice that the impact of the cull is unlikely to have any adverse impacts on the long-term viability or survival of the dingo population. The Fraser Island dingo population is of great relevance and high importance to the status of Fraser Island as a World Heritage site. Although the Fraser Island dingo population is not 100% pure, Fraser Island represents the best opportunity to establish and maintain a self-sustaining population of wild genetically pure dingoes.

III.40 Elsewhere in Australia, and other range countries in Asia and Africa, most populations are, or will soon be, predominantly hybrid. The IUCN Canid Action Plan lists the dingo as a threatened species. With the 2nd edition of the Plan currently in preparation, the conservation status of the dingo is under review and may be upgraded to endangered.

III.41 Fraser Island does not have an exclusive Plan of Management, rather, it is catered for in the Great Sandy Region Management Plan (GSRMP). The GSRMP covers the Great Sandy Region National Park, of which Fraser Island is a part, and also adjacent marine areas and some lands outside the protected area. Released in 1994, it was prepared as a regional conservation plan with input from numerous government departments. It does not have statutory status. The GSRMP is about to undergo a detailed review. The process will involve substantial stakeholder and community input and is scheduled for completion in March 2003. The review is explicitly considering a specific management plan for the Fraser Island World Heritage property, as well as a commitment to new legislative requirements for the World Heritage site.

III.42 On the 27 July 2001 the Queensland Government announced the allocation of an extra AU\$1.75 million towards the management of Fraser Island. AU\$1 million has been earmarked this financial year for dingo management on the Island; the other AU\$750,000 is to be spent employing eight permanent rangers for the Island. The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that the Development Strategy has been recently released and that a copy of it will be provided for the Secretariat.

III.43 The Bureau commended the State Party/QPWS on the Risk Assessment and the draft Dingo Management Strategy and welcomed the State Party's consideration of a variety of options including the imposition of visitor

limits. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide further information on the visitor management strategy as it is developed. The Bureau welcomed the review of the GSRMP and its explicit recognition of Fraser Island as a World Heritage area requiring special management plans and legislative frameworks to protect the World Heritage site for perpetuity.

The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)

III.44 The Bureau was informed of details of the Government of Bangladesh plans to explore “Block 5” of the Sundarbans Reserve Forest for oil and gas. Shell has publicly declared that it has no plans for exploration activities in the Special Reserved Forest (SRF). The World Heritage site comprises three sections of the SRF at the coastal edge. Shell has furthermore acknowledged the following:

- The Sundarbans is also a Ramsar site. The Ramsar Convention has confirmed that the Ramsar site is synonymous with the SRF and does not extend beyond the SRF;
- Shell will carry out extensive environmental and social studies and stakeholder engagement before conducting any activities elsewhere in Block 5;
- As regards the socio-economic impact zone outside the northern peripheries of the SRF, Shell will be discussing the implications of oil and gas exploration with the Ministry of Environment and Forest;
- Shell recognizes that one of the main objectives of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) -Government of Bangladesh Sundarbans Biodiversity Conservation Project (SBCP) is to reduce the poverty level of the 3.5 million people living in the impact zone and provide them with alternative livelihood options in order to encourage them to leave the forest;
- By providing economic activities, and in the case of successful exploration of clean gas, Shell can add value to the objectives of the SBCP and be a party to providing sustainable development opportunities in the region;
- Shell-Bangladesh is aware of the need to consider the potential indirect impacts on the SRF of any of its future activities. Such activities, whether inside the socio-economic impact zone, or elsewhere in Block 5, will be continued only after full environmental and social impact assessments and in consultations with all stakeholders;
- The current phase of the project consists of exploration only. If hydrocarbons are discovered and it is decided subsequently to develop them, further EIA and SIA studies will be undertaken, together with continuing stakeholder consultations.

III.45 On 20 September 2001, Shell convened its first workshop in Dhaka to share information about the ensuing work programme, oil and gas exploration and emergent issues and questions. It distributed briefing papers to stakeholders and invited responses and discussion. A web site has been launched with updated information on Shell’s activities in Bangladesh: <http://www.shell.com/bd/>. The

Bureau noted that IUCN Bangladesh is in discussion with Shell about their activities and will continue to advise them as and when requested.

III.46 The Bureau learnt that the Steering Committee, established by the Government of Bangladesh for smooth implementation of the Sundarbans Biodiversity Conservation Project (SBCP), has invited IUCN Bangladesh to be a member. As part of the SBCP, IUCN Bangladesh will conduct independent monitoring of biodiversity of the Sundarbans, drawing on wetland, marine and protected area specialists from its international network. The UN Foundation has provided a planning grant for another project to be executed jointly by UNDP Offices in Bangladesh and India for promoting trans-border co-operation between the two countries for improving the World Heritage site’s biodiversity conservation. The planning grant project activities are underway and a larger proposal for possible financing by the UNF and UNDP will be the principal outcome of the planning phase. UNDP has appointed consultants for preparation of the project proposal.

III.47 A media report claims that “due to the high level of salinity, 30 Bengal Tigers have died within the past 10 years. Autopsy reports revealed that liver damage has caused the death of these Tigers”. The article mentions a proposal by the Bangladesh Forest Department for a five-year, US\$2 million project called “Tiger Project: Sundarbans” which, though proposed in 1991, has not been implemented. IUCN has received advice that salinity levels are not a special threat to the tigers in the Sundarbans as they have adapted to water with salinity levels higher than in other parts of its range in South Asia. There may well be indirect threats to the tigers if salinity-induced changes impact other components of its habitat; i.e. its principal prey species, and habitat structures and distribution.

III.48 The ‘crown death’ of Sundri trees, the dominant mangrove species in the Sundarbans, could be attributable to salinity, sedimentation, pest attack and natural successional processes, although salinity is frequently cited as the primary reason. The SBCP has initiated a study on the death of the Sundri trees. IUCN has received preliminary media reports of a planned ‘Biodiversity Project’ - comprised of an ‘Ecopark’ and mangrove arboretum - for Karamjal, situated in the Sundarbans East Zone under the Chandpai range. Karamjal is a captive breeding centre for many critically endangered species of the Sundarbans. The Ecopark will cover an area of 30 hectares and play a vital role in conserving forest resources while also being a tourist attraction for international visitors.

III.49 The Bureau commended the State Party for its efforts, in particular via the SBCP and other projects, to strengthen conservation of the site, and to provide alternative livelihood options to forest exploitation so that local communities acknowledge the positive influence World Heritage site protection has for the whole region. The Bureau welcomed Shell’s careful and transparent

planning of its hydro-carbon exploration activities in Block 5 and its commitment to undertake full social, economic and environmental impact studies before any production occurs, and to continuing open dialogue with stakeholders. The Bureau noted that proposals for oil and gas exploration are outside the boundaries of the World Heritage site and expressed its opposition to any mining or exploration activities within the site. All oil and gas exploration as well as other development activities in the vicinity of the World Heritage site must be carefully planned to minimise environmental and social impacts.

Sundarbans National Park (India)

III.50 The Bureau learned that the "Project Tiger status report" for 2001, prepared by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) of India, refers to a system of National Waterways through the mangrove forests of Sundarbans including the Tiger Reserve. If implemented, the project will affect the ecosystem adversely by large-scale human activities, dredging of streams and oil spills of numerous vessels carrying cargo.

III.51 The Bureau expressed its concern over the potential threats posed by the proposed National Waterways project to this site and requested that the State Party submit, before 1 February 2002, a detailed report on the project and its potential impacts on the site for review at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Kaziranga National Park (India)

III.52 The Bureau noted that the State Party had not yet provided the report requested before 15 September 2001 as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001. The Centre intends to organize an IUCN/Centre mission to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Assam, India, in February 2002, and that mission could visit Kaziranga National Park as well.

III.53 The Bureau reiterated its request, that the State Party submit a report on major management issues and welcomed the possibility of the IUCN/Centre mission visiting this site during its visit to Assam, India in February 2002. The Bureau recommended that an up-to-date state of conservation report on the site be submitted to its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Komodo National Park (Indonesia)

III.54 The Bureau was informed that the State Party had submitted a report on the state of conservation of the site using the format prescribed in the periodic reporting brochure and this report has been reviewed by IUCN. The Bureau learned that:

- The 25-year Management Plan for the site was completed in June 2000. The Plan comprises the expansion of the Park, to include an extension at Gili Banta and a connection to Gili Mota. The proposed extensions will add 504 square kilometres to the area of the Park, 479 sq.km. of which will be marine

habitat. The new Park would therefore comprise 27% terrestrial and 73% marine areas. The proposed extension is based on the high level of coral and fish diversity and associated aesthetic value and the importance of areas providing migratory corridors for cetaceans.

- The plan also includes a new zoning system for the Park, dividing the Park into 7 zones covering both marine and terrestrial environments as follows: core zone; wilderness zone with limited tourism; tourism zone; traditional use zone; pelagic use zone; special research and training zone; and traditional settlement zone. Regulations have been formulated for each zone. A map of the Park is being completed and will be disseminated widely.
- According to the ongoing coral reef and fish monitoring programme conducted by The Nature Conservancy of USA (TNC) and Park personnel, a slow recovery, i.e. 2% increase in hard coral per year, has been occurring around Komodo since 1996. Eight demersal fish spawning grounds have been identified within the Park waters. As a consequence, the Park has applied regulations to prohibit demersal fish exploitation during the spawning season.
- In the terrestrial sector, forest fires occur frequently, largely due to human activities during the dry season. Deer poaching has been a significant threat to the integrity of the Park, with poachers using fire to herd deer. Park patrols involve local police, navy and army personnel, as Park rangers are not equipped with firearms.
- A floating boat patrol, equipped with communication systems to allow contact with Park headquarters, has been added to the law enforcement programme. Overall, the incidences of dynamite and cyanide fishing and deer poaching have declined significantly with improved and intensified patrolling.
- Park regulations prohibit anyone from entering the Park without a permit, except local people practicing traditional fishing. Despite this prohibition, illegal entry by fishermen originating from other islands continues to be a major issue.

III.55 TNC has been working on an innovative management scheme for the Park, involving the private tourism sector and the Government of Indonesia (GOI) in a partnership to establish sustainable financing for the Park. IUCN has been playing a supportive role and providing some technical input, in co-operation with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) which is helping to support the project. The Indonesian Government formally wrote to the UNESCO Office in Jakarta, Indonesia, requesting UNESCO's views on the joint TNC/GOI/tourism sector initiative. The establishment of a tourism concession is seen as a sustainable financing mechanism to be tested within the framework of the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan and has been supported by IUCN and UNESCO. The need to closely monitor the work of the concession and all other projects designed to support the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan has however been stressed by all stakeholders.

III.56 The Bureau welcomed the several initiatives to strengthen protection of the site and acknowledged the important contributions that TNC, IFC, GEF, the tourism sector and other partners are making towards the long-term conservation and sustainable financing of Komodo National Park. The Bureau noted with concern that the illegal entry of outsiders from other islands continues and invited the GOI to consider providing increased resources for patrolling the marine environment of the Park, especially in the light of the recent extension to the marine component of the Park. The Bureau recommended that the State Party provide, by 1 February 2002, a status report on the establishment of the tourism management concession and a timeframe for nominating the extensions to the Park for inclusion in the World Heritage site, to enable the Bureau to review the information at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)

III.57 The Bureau was informed of the following steps taken by the WWF Office in Irian Jaya: (i) institutional strengthening of three local NGOs to develop skills in Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA), project planning and monitoring, identification and development of alternative income sources, community organisation, advocacy and communications; (ii) promoting community-based approaches to natural resources management by documenting traditional practices of the three main ethnic groups using the Park's resources; (iii) identifying alternative sources of income in order to minimise community dependence on forest resources; (iv) encouraging the recognition of community rights and knowledge and enhancing community participation in site management; and (v) co-operating with Park management to develop an overall management plan as well as plans for the utilisation of various management zones.

III.58 WWF-Indonesia has financed a range of activities up to the year 2001 and is in the process of submitting proposals for financing a number of new initiatives for the period 2001/2002 and beyond. The Bureau noted the following issues identified by WWF as requiring immediate attention:

- Organisation of an integrated planning workshop bringing together all concerned parties;
- Building transparent relationships amongst NGOs, ethnic communities, private sector and the Government;
- Establishment of an institution with multi-stakeholder representation for management of the area; and
- Financing programmes targeted to research, communities and institutional development and the overall long-term planning and development of the site.

III.59 The US\$30,000 grant approved by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau will be used for the organisation of a series of strategic planning workshops involving the participation of all stakeholders. The

Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Australian Government has approved AU\$250,000 for capacity building for the management of the site. The Delegate of Australia expressed the interest of his Government to work together with the Indonesian authorities, IUCN and the Centre to implement the capacity building project.

III.60 The Bureau noted the variety of support that is becoming available to the site for strategic planning, capacity building and NGO and community support initiatives. However, recommendations from these activities need to be implemented to ensure a positive impact on the conservation of this site. Hence, the Bureau encouraged relevant donors to support the implementation of recommended priority actions and to co-ordinate their activities. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to work through its partners, particularly the UNESCO Office, Jakarta and the IUCN Asia Regional Programme and IUCN/WCPA Vice-Chair for Southeast Asia to promote co-ordinated development and execution of projects and activities in support of Lorentz. The Bureau recalled that in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee made at the time of the site's inscription in the World Heritage List in 1999, a IUCN/Centre mission to the site is due in late 2002. The Bureau recommended that a full status report on the conservation of the site and the planning of its future management be submitted to the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau in April 2003.

Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia)

III.61 The Bureau learnt that the State Party is considering a proposal to enlarge Mulu World Heritage site to include Gunung Buda. The proposal however, is raising concern amongst indigenous groups and the wider conservation community because of the reported lack of inclusion of indigenous peoples and their claims in the decision to extend the Gunung Mulu World Heritage site. The recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples in Sarawak has been upheld by the historical legal decision on Rumah Nor. On the 12 May 2001, the High Court of Sarawak upheld the customary rights of the Iban village Rumah Nor when it found that the Borneo Paper and Pulp company, which had begun logging the forest claimed by the villagers, did not have the right to destroy Rumah Nor's rainforest.

III.62 Following this decision, the people of Gunung Buda lodged a claim with a land tribunal seeking an injunction to the rule that they should have a share in the management of the Gunung Buda area. The Government argued against this on the grounds that there was no properly surveyed boundary of their claimed lands, and so the claim was denied. Thus the indigenous peoples are opposing the inclusion of Gunung Buda in the Gunung Mulu World Heritage site.

III.63 The Bureau recalled that when it referred the nomination of Gunung Mulu to the State Party at its twenty-fourth session it had sought, amongst others, "...assurance that the new management plan addresses issues relating to local peoples' use of and benefits from

the Park as well as the new contractual arrangements for management of the Park...". The Committee, when it inscribed the site on the World Heritage List at its last session in Cairns, Australia, had suggested that the "...authorities be encouraged to review additions to the site for their World Heritage potential when the gazetting process is completed".

III.64 The Bureau was also informed of three on-going initiatives aimed at enhancing management of Gunung Mulu National Park:

- Implementation of the Plan for Management of the Park - This plan was reviewed as part of the evaluation of the nomination of the site. Current status includes examination of options for contracting out management of the Park to the private sector, while overall regulatory responsibility remains with the Ministry of Forestry, Department of National Parks of Sarawak. The Plan of Management for the Park has been drafted in a manner that supports this possibility;
- Community development for areas outside the Park; this initiative aims to develop options for better planning and development around the Park boundaries, particularly in the Mulu area, including issues of land title, planning processes etc. This initiative could enable locals to manage better, and benefit from, the opportunities that come with World Heritage listing;
- Preliminary drafting of a project concept to secure international assistance with capacity building for management of the Park - to focus on staff capacity and skills development.

III.65 The Bureau welcomed the possibility of the extension of the Park and noted with satisfaction the initiatives to improve site-management and staff capacity building. The Bureau however, invited the State Party to give due consideration to the involvement of indigenous peoples and other local communities in planning and implementing decisions regarding the extension of the site, and to seek their full co-operation in its management and in extending the site to include Gunung Buda. The Bureau recommended that the State Party provide a report, before 1 February 2002, on the results of its negotiations with indigenous communities for review by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)

III.66 The Bureau was informed that in response to its request at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001, the State Party has submitted a report, dated June 2000, entitled: "Environmental Impact Statement (EIA) for the Jagatpur Madi 33 kV Subtransmission Line Project". The report states that the transmission line will pass through approximately 6km of the Park and World Heritage site between Dhruvbaghat and Bankatta, and through 500 metres and 1,000 metres of buffer zone forests at the same two locations. The project foresees the erection of eleven-metre high concrete poles and the stringing of lines. It will be aligned along the existing Hulaki road and hence

require the clearing of a two-metre wide corridor. In total, 331 trees of endangered species - *Shorea robusta*; *Acacia catechu*, *Bombax ceiba* and *Cedrella toona* will be removed. The EIA has not yet been approved by the Government of Nepal.

III.67 According to the report, loss or alteration of habitat, construction disturbances to wild fauna, likely hunting and poaching by project workers, decline in water quality associated with erosion and silting, pollution from temporary workers' camps, and bird deaths from collision with the transmission lines are foreseen as negative impacts. Mitigation measures proposed include: reforestation of two hectares of community land near the Park with the guidance of the Park authorities; a Community Forest Support Programme in three locations to be implemented in conjunction with Park authorities; an Environmental Awareness for Conservation Programme (EAC) to be implemented by NGOs, and a Habitat Management Programme to be implemented by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife.

III.68 The Kasara Bridge is under construction over the Rapti River that constitutes the northern boundary of the Park and World Heritage site. No EIA was conducted for the project. Due to budget uncertainties and restrictions, the road will require a few years for completion. The road will pass through the Park and World Heritage site, but will partly follow the current designated Public Right of Way to Madi Village. The alignment from Kasara Bridge to the public right of way has not been decided. One option is to follow the Park/World Heritage site periphery along the Rapti River for 3-4 km.

III.69 The Bureau learnt that the provision of electricity will help reduce the need for kerosene for lighting and firewood for cooking, the two major sources of the local population, and also provide a source of fuel for lodges and hotels in the area. This should have a positive impact by reducing the amount of wood collected from the Park. Nevertheless, the Bureau was concerned about the impacts associated with the construction of the transmission line and road within the World Heritage site and noted the IUCN position that similar threats have prompted Danger Listing in other cases.

III.70 The Bureau noted that the State Party has not yet approved the plan to construct the transmission line through the Park and urged the State Party not to proceed with the plan to construct this line and seek alternatives that would have minimal impacts on the integrity of the Park. The Bureau noted that the Kasara Bridge and the associated road along the northern periphery of the Park might be a less impacting option to improve transport in the region. The Bureau recommended that the State Party take into due consideration these suggestions and inform the Centre of its decision on the proposed transmission line and the routing of the road and provide a detailed report on the status of the projects by 1 February 2002, for consideration at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)

III.71 The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session in November 2000 it had requested the Centre and IUCN to monitor developments with regard to the resolution of the dispute over land reclaimed by the Forest Department that had previously been leased to a private company. The private enterprise concerned, Sinharaja Plantations Organic (PVT) Ltd., has written to the Director of the Centre raising preliminary objections against the reacquisition of land released earlier by the Government for organic tea farming. In October 2001 the enterprise informed the Centre that it has placed the action of the Conservator of Forests to reclaim the land before the judiciary of Sri Lanka in order to claim compensation. The enterprise has requested the Bureau to refrain from arriving at any decisions concerning the parcel of land that it claims until the question has been settled legally.

III.72 The Bureau took note of the fact that the Forest Department of Sri Lanka and the Sinharaja Plantations Organic (PVT) Ltd., have entered a legal process regarding the 62 hectares parcel of land advised by IUCN to be outside of the World Heritage area. The Bureau requested IUCN to monitor the outcome of the legal process and report on their implications for the conservation of the site to the twenty-seventh session of the Committee in 2003.

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

III.73 In accordance with the request of the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000, the Ha Long Bay Management Department (HLBMD) submitted the sixth annual progress report on the conservation, management and promotion of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area. The Bureau learnt that IUCN reviewed the report and has expressed broad support for the efforts of the HLBMD to manage this extremely complex World Heritage site located in an intensive economic development zone.

III.74 The Bureau noted that the project proposal for the Institutional Capacity Building of the Halong Bay Management Department, prepared by IUCN-Vietnam, HLBMD and the Quang Ninh Provincial Authorities, has been widely circulated and finalised in close collaboration with relevant institutions and the Province. The proposal is currently being shared with potential donors. The UNESCO *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, financed by UNDP, has been completed and a final 135-page report on the feasibility study and a video have been transmitted to the Centre by the UNESCO Office in Vietnam on 17 October 2001. IUCN served as a member of the Steering Committee of this Project. Discussions have been held in collaboration with the Eco-Museum project and the Institutional Capacity Building project. The final proposal of the *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, envisages the development of an "Ecomuseum Hub" in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay and the design and elaboration of a variety of interpretation packages based on themes identified in the study.

III.75 The feasibility study follow-up places strong emphasis on the establishment of a project team of Vietnamese staff of the HLBMD supported by two international facilitators. Intensive capacity building and skills transfer, particularly in the fields of planning, data collection and integrated interpretative management of the area are proposed. A comprehensive analysis to develop strategic partnerships between the Ecomuseum and key stakeholders has been undertaken and a number of thematic areas for collaboration have been identified. For example, a theme on the fishing traditions of Ha Long will directly involve floating fishing villages, terrestrial fishing communities, boat builders and major institutions such as the Viet Nam Institute of Oceanography, the Institute of Marine Products and local authority agencies such as the provincial Fisheries Department.

III.76 The Bureau learnt that tourism has increased by 135% between 1997 and 2000 and is a critical management issue at this site. The Bureau noted IUCN's satisfaction with the fact that the direct management and control of the caves has been brought under the authority of HLBMD, and the expectation that this would ensure appropriate measures to present the caves, control tourism and minimise impacts. The Feasibility Study's effort to propose a "Ecomuseum Hub" and an Interpretative Management Plan aim to spread the visitor resources in and outside of Ha Long Bay and thereby support the intensity of visitation to the World Heritage site without reducing the number of tourists visiting the broader region. The feasibility study estimates that total cost of the development of the "Ecomuseum Hub" and other interpretation theme products is likely to cost US\$17 million over a 4-year period. The Quang Ninh Province has committed US\$3 million and intends to seek other funds from external sources.

III.77 During a visit to Japan in early October 2001, a representative from the Centre met with officials of the Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA). These officials confirmed that the Environmental Management of Ha Long Bay continues to be one of the priority projects of JICA and that discussions with the Government of Vietnam are underway in order to implement the Environmental Management Plan as soon as possible. The Delegate of Japan informed that more information regarding the JICA assistance will be provided at the Committee session.

III.78 The Bureau commended HLBMD efforts to conserve the site and acknowledged efforts of the State Party to support the development of a range of projects to address management issues at the site. Given the considerable international interest in the site, the Bureau urged the HLBMD to continue and strengthen its efforts to co-ordinate projects in order to ensure optimal use of resources and skills available via HLBMD's association with IUCN and UNESCO Offices in Vietnam and other partners. The Bureau reiterated the recommendation made at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session regarding the early implementation of the recommendations of the JICA/Government of Vietnam Environmental

Management Plan for Ha Long Bay and invited the State Party to submit by 1 February 2002 a progress report on what has been achieved in this regard for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Los Katios National Park (Colombia)

III.79 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that no invitation was received to carry out a mission to Los Katios following the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau. The Bureau learnt that an IUCN representative had visited Bogota, Colombia, in November 2001. IUCN noted that the Special Administrative Unit for National Parks of Colombia is increasingly implementing management activities in the area, and that it works with local communities to enhance their support of management activities.

III.80 The Bureau acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party towards the conservation of this site and recommended that it invites a field mission to the site when appropriate.

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

III.81 The Bureau was informed that a progress report was received on 10 October 2001 from the Director of the Charles Darwin Research Station noting the implementation of a number of programmes aiming to enhance the institutional capacity of the Park Administration. The report also noted the status of regulations concerning tourism, fisheries and quarantine, as well as progress achieved in the preparation of the Strategy 2010 for the Sustainable Development of the Islands.

III.82 *Galapagos Special Law*: On 18 September, 2001, Ecuador's Constitutional Court voted in favour of the Galapagos Special Law, following a day of public inquiry held in response to a lawsuit brought forward by the Association of Industrial Tuna Fishermen (ATUNEC), which challenged the Special Law's constitutionality. The final decision of the Constitutional Court of Judges - eight votes in favour and one abstention - represents an important achievement in the continued efforts to protect the Galapagos Islands under the regulations of the Special Law. Since its approval in March 1998, the Galapagos Special Law has faced continued attacks, primarily from the industrial fishing sector based in continental Ecuador, which seeks fishing rights inside the Galapagos Marine Reserve (proposed in entirety as an extension to the World Heritage site). The Special Law granted exclusive fishing rights in the Marine Reserve to artisanal fishermen and calls for a system of quotas and zoning to control fisheries. However, the Special Law can only be fully enforced after all the regulations and by-laws on key management issues such as fisheries have been approved. According to information received, dated 19 September 2001, two of the key regulations (on tourism and fisheries) are likely to be approved by the President's Office by the end of

November. The third regulation on quarantine, introduced species and agriculture is in the process of local consultation. The fourth regulation, which covers Environmental Management and pollution issues, is the least advanced. The President of Ecuador visited the site in November 2001 and reiterated the Government's support for the declaration of the Marine Reserve as a World Heritage site.

III.83 *Enforcement and Control of the Marine Reserve*: Earlier in 2001, the vessel *Sirenian*, owned and operated by the environmental NGO Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, commenced a five-year tour of duty to help the Galapagos National Park Service clamp down on illegal commercial fishing operations within 40 miles of the Islands. This collaborative operation, given a favourable ruling by the Ecuadorian Court, is the first conservation patrol of the Galapagos by a foreign vessel officially supported by the Ecuadorian Government. A loan by the Inter-American Development Bank for US\$10 million has been approved for enforcing controls in the Marine Reserve. Logistical assistance and institutional strengthening are the two most important elements of this project. Galapagos National Park hopes to purchase four more boats and a helicopter to cover the whole area. At the moment, the Park possesses two vessels, ten speedboats, twelve wooden boats and personnel of 50 to patrol the 133,000 km² marine area. Despite the assistance of the Ecuadorian Navy, this is clearly not sufficient. Only 5% of entrance fees to the GNP are directed towards controlling the Reserve.

III.84 *Illegal shark fishing*: Destructive shark fishing, where the shark fin is cut from the live shark and the mutilated animal is dumped back into the sea, continues in the Galapagos Marine Reserve due to the high demand for shark fins for the Asian market. The fishing techniques used also negatively affect other species, including marine birds. During 2001, 22 fishing boats were caught, 5,600 shark fins confiscated and 3,000 pounds of meat seized. According to the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, half the boats caught fishing illegally in the Galapagos were not punished. But progress on this matter has been made: Canela II, a Costa Rican long liner caught fishing out of the port of Puntarenas, was confiscated by the Local Court of Galapagos and the order was upheld by the Court of Appeal. This is a legal precedent, as never before in Ecuadorian legal history has a fishing boat been confiscated for illegal fishing.

III.85 *Sea Lion Poaching*: On the 16 July 2001, fifteen (11 male and 4 female) mutilated sea lion - *Zalophus wollebaeki* - corpses were discovered on La Loberia Beach on San Cristobal Island. This is the first time such action has been reported in the Galapagos Islands. The Charles Darwin Research Station, the Galapagos National Park Service and a veterinarian of the Araucaria Foundation undertook autopsies of nine of the animals. The autopsy report makes the link between the incident and the increasing demand from Asian markets for the male genitals of sea lions and seals for use in traditional medicine, as aphrodisiacs and amulets.

III.86 *Invasive Species Eradication Programme:* In early 2002, the Charles Darwin Research Station and the Galapagos National Park Service will commence a five-year programme to combat invasive species. Funding of US\$18 million is being provided over six years from the United Nations Foundations and GEF, while other sources are estimated to amount to US\$19 million. Biologists and Park staff will use a combination of measures to remove some alien species, make a dent in other populations, and bolster controls to keep other exotics out of the Islands.

III.87 *Tourism:* Progress has also been reported on the *SmartVoyager* certification programme, a joint initiative of the Rainforest Alliance and Conservacion y Desarrollo (C&D) of Ecuador. The programme aims to give a “green seal” of approval to tour boats operating in the Galapagos Archipelago that meet certain environmental and social criteria. Full details of the certification programme can be found at: <http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/programs/sv/objectives.html>

III.88 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee, recognising the continued and increasing threats posed to the marine and terrestrial flora and fauna of the Islands, urges the State Party to make all efforts to finalise the specific regulations under the Special Law and enforce them as soon as possible. The Committee commends the ruling by the State Party's Constitutional Court to uphold the Galapagos Special Law. It also commends the Ecuadorian Government for supporting the “Sea Shepherd” patrols in the Galapagos Marine Reserve, as well as efforts to protect the marine ecosystem in the Reserve. The Committee also commends the *Smart Voyager* initiative, given the nature of tourism visitation to the Galapagos and the impacts of tourism on the fragile environment and in light of the proposed Marine Reserve. It believes that consideration should be given to promoting similar schemes in other World Heritage sites. The Committee furthermore notes that the sea lion incident demonstrates the need to enhance the capacity of the Park to reinforce patrolling and control of the Islands."

Sian Ka'an (Mexico)

III.89 The Bureau was informed that IUCN received a report informing that land on the strip of dunes between the ocean and the coastal lagoon of Sian Ka'an was being advertised for sale by a real estate agent in the town of Akumal. While this is consistent with State Party law and regulations on protected areas that maintain ownership of private lands, including the right to sell those lands, the rapid escalation of tourism development in the area since the mid 1980's is of considerable concern.

III.90 However, in the framework of the UNF “Linking biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism at World Heritage sites” project, it is noted that most of the beachfront is in private hands. This has been the case since the Reserve's conception. The management plan has set a policy that private lots can be sold, but not divided, limiting tourism development within the Reserve. The management plan for the site also sets a moratorium on further construction on the private land until the preparation of the Ecological Land Use Plan has been finalised for the site. Authorities wish to fix tourism regulations in the near future to try to raise the quality of tourism and to control its growth. These initiatives will be complemented by a new one from the Sian Ka'an authorities on a transferable development rights strategy to deal with all the beachfront holdings. The authorities hope to identify receiving areas and remove the density (development potential) from critical portions of the World Heritage site, while compensating property owners in those areas.

III.91 IUCN has received notification from the Municipality of Solidaridad, Playa del Carmen, State of Quintana Roo, Yucatan Peninsula, of a scientific gathering planned for 5-10 November 2001. The event – “*RIVIERA MAYA ECO'01: Safeguarding the Fragile Ecosystems of Solidaridad*” is being convened with the aim of developing integrated programmes that consider protection, conservation, recovery and management of the areas unique biodiversity on a sustainable basis. The Municipality of Solidaridad, which includes part of the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve, expects the construction of approximately 80,000 hotel rooms in the Municipality in the next 10-15 years, associated with a 24% annual population growth. Currently, the area receives 5,500 tourists a day. IUCN believes the transferable property rights strategy holds some promise for reducing development pressures, and if successful, may have the potential to be applied in other World Heritage sites. IUCN therefore acknowledged the innovative attempt by the Park authorities to find a solution to the development problems facing the site, and requested the State Party to provide more information on the strategy.

III.92 The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a report on the impact of increased tourism development on the World Heritage site and strategies to address negative impacts. It also requested a report on progress achieved with the revision of the management plan for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002.

Canaima National Park (Venezuela)

III.93 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Ministry for the Environment had sent a letter to the Centre dated 19 September 2001 that was transmitted to IUCN for review. This letter noted that, following one of the recommendations from the UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site in 1999, a “Participatory Long-Term Action Plan” for the site has been developed. The letter also noted the interest and commitment of the State Party to participate in the UNF-financed project “*Enhancing our Heritage:*

monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage sites". Information was received at IUCN that INPARQUES, in charge of administration for Canaima National Park, is facing serious financial difficulties, that are negatively affecting the protection of the site. Deforestation and rubbish dumping around tourist camps within the Park has also been reported. According to information received, tension between indigenous communities, the Federation of Indigenous People of the Bolivar State (FIEB) and national authorities remains high with regard to the issue of the power line project. IUCN stated that the 1999 mission provides for the framework of action. The assessment of the Action Plan is needed and the capacity of the management agency should be reviewed.

III.94 The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a comprehensive report on the conservation of Canaima National Park, including measures taken to enhance the capacity of INPARQUES to effectively protect and manage this site. The Bureau urged the Venezuelan Government to provide a report on the implementation of all recommendations of the UNESCO/IUCN 1999 mission by 1 February 2002.

Europe and North America

Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)

III.95 The Bureau noted that IUCN reviewed the "*Background to Management Guidelines for Bialowieza Forest*", an outcome of the Technical Working Group (TWG) created within the framework of the *Bialowieza Forest Project*. IUCN noted that the *Guidelines* document is the result of a trial process for establishing a decision-making procedure concerning the future of the Forest, its social functions, and the protection of natural values of primeval forests. The TWG is the only forum assembled to date that has included representatives of a wide range of stakeholders and has involved intensive consultations within the communities affected by management of the Forest. The *Bialowieza Forest Project* is supervised by the Ministry of Environment and supported by Danish Co-operation for the Environment in Eastern Europe (DANCEE). The objective of the Project is to achieve a sustainable approach to the management of the Forest, ensuring the protection of natural values and supporting development of local communities.

III.96 The Bureau commended the efforts of the TWG and the Bialowieza Forest Project to bring all stakeholders together to create a common vision for the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide regular progress reports in relation to the implementation of this project.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)

III.97 The Bureau noted that the Ministry for Environment and Water submitted a report on the conservation status of Pirin National Park, which was

reviewed by IUCN. The report included the following information on the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) developed for the Bansko ski zone within the site: The TDP passed all the Environment Impact Assessment procedures under Bulgarian Law. It was later submitted to the High Expert Ecological Council (HEEC) of the Ministry for Environment and Water that requested changes and protection measures. The final version of the TDP is 818.46 ha, with ski runs and facilities occupying 99.55 ha of this area. The TDP aims to upgrade an existing ski zone, the most significant element of which is a cable car. It is considered to greatly reduce the negative impacts associated with crowding, traffic congestion, and rundown facilities. The development aims to ensure the achievement of one of the major goals of the National Park, namely encouraging ecotourism and generating income for the local people. The Management Plan for the Park is to be developed with financial assistance from the ongoing Bulgarian-Swiss Biodiversity Conservation Programme. This is expected to be completed in 2001. On 12 July 2001, the sitting of the three-member High Administrative Court of Bulgaria ended with a rejection of the BALKANI Wildlife Society appeal against the decision of the Ministry of Environment and Water to grant permission for the TDP.

III.98 Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the State Party invited a UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site. IUCN also received a Brief from the "Save the Pirin Campaign", a coalition of over 30 Bulgarian NGOs opposed to the development. IUCN noted the State Party's belief that "the only solution to the problem of the sustainable development of the Pirin NP is to bind the goals of the Park to the interests of the local people", and that the TDP offers this opportunity. IUCN acknowledged that it is important that local populations benefit, where possible, from World Heritage designation. IUCN noted that any development in the World Heritage site must be carefully planned to minimise environmental impacts. IUCN questioned whether the TDP project in Pirin National Park could be considered to promote ecotourism and whether it is compatible with World Heritage status. It also noted that the total area covered by the TDP is 818.46 ha, whereas the current proposed ski runs and facilities cover less than 100 ha. This is a substantial increase.

III.99 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

"The Committee notes the concerns over the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) which it anticipates will lead to further incremental development within the remaining larger area. It requests the State Party to ensure that tourism development does not take place in the remaining TDP area in the future. The Committee urges that the mission invited by the State Party be carried out as soon as possible."

Gros Morne National Park (Canada)

III.100 The Bureau noted that following its request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning the site,

which was reviewed by IUCN. The report noted that logging in the Main River watershed near Gros Morne National Park has not commenced. Parks Canada is working with the forestry company and provincial government to ensure that the proposed harvesting regime takes into account potential impacts on the World Heritage values and the ecological integrity of the site. The Bureau thanked Parks Canada for the report provided and requested the State Party to inform the Centre as soon as new developments occur.

Nahanni National Park (Canada)

III.101 The Bureau noted that following its request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning potential impacts of increased mining activity in the region surrounding Nahanni National Park World Heritage site. IUCN noted that a study is currently underway to determine preferred boundaries for three adjacent areas which are proposed as additions to the Park; that the Deh Cho First Nations have proposed that the Park Reserve be expanded to include part or all of the South Nahanni River watershed and that the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA) governs land and resource use in the Nahanni area and that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board has authority. The areas potentially affected by this activity are within the watershed of the South Nahanni River. In two cases, the areas potentially affected are in one of the three candidate areas that are identified as proposed additions to the Park Reserve.

III.102 The Bureau noted that Parks Canada is concerned that the number and location of the proposed developments could result in cumulative impacts on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, including changes to water quality, habitat fragmentation, changes to wildlife movement and resulting impacts on biodiversity. Parks Canada is continuing to work in the processes established under the MVRMA and De Cho Process to address its concerns. It is continuing efforts to expand the Park Reserve into the three candidate areas identified and to work with other jurisdictions towards a comprehensive conservation regime for the balance of the watershed.

III.103 The Bureau noted the importance placed by Parks Canada on the issue of cumulative impacts from proposed mining near this World Heritage site and the measures underway to solve or minimise this problem. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a progress report on the implementation of the MVRMA and De Cho Process by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst, (Hungary/Slovakia)

III.104 The Bureau was informed that IUCN reviewed reports concerning the preparation of a new version of the mining law by the Slovak Ministry of Economy. The new law is believed to remove or weaken the present restrictions on mining operations in protected areas. The reports also claimed that mining companies are seeking to

open new limestone mines in the Slovak Karst, and claims the granting of limestone exploitation licenses by the Slovak Government is imminent. SOSNA, a Slovak environmental NGO, has proposed to the Slovak Minister of Environment the re-categorisation of the Slovak Karst from a Protected Landscape Area to a National Park and the development of local sustainable tourism and biological farming.

III.105 The Delegate of Hungary informed the Bureau that the issues raised concern only the Slovak part of this transboundary site.

III.106 The Bureau commended the State Party on the process of changing the status of the Protected Landscape Area of Slovensky Karst to that of a National Park. This will complement the adjacent Aggtelek National Park in Hungary and, in doing so, facilitate more cohesive and equivalent management of the two sections of the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide an update on the proposed revisions to the mining law and specific implications for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Aeolian Islands (Italy)

III.107 The Bureau was informed that IUCN received reports of legal proceedings taken to oppose the implementation of the Landscape Territorial Plan for the Aeolian Islands. The Plan (Piano Paesistico delle Isole Eolie), which was prepared by the Superintendent of Culture and Environment on behalf of the Sicily Region, which is fully responsible for the management of the World Heritage site. It covers the seven Islands in their entirety. The main goals of the Plan are to preserve the natural condition of volcanic bodies, structures and coastal areas and to establish clear rules and criteria to guide human interventions in relation to the landscape of the Islands. The Bureau also noted that it is understood that the Mayors of two of the four townships on the Islands – Lipari and Leni - have opposed the Plan and have requested the Court to deliver a judgement in order to cancel the Plan. A group of non-governmental organisations is supporting the Sicily Region's Plan in Court. If the Plan is not implemented, it is understood that the rules regarding conservation, new constructions and general human activities on the Islands will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the different City Councils. The NGO Italia Nostra, has reported that these Councils have stated their intention to increase by at least 4 times the present level of tourist accommodation. IUCN noted the actions of Italia Nostra in support of the Landscape Territorial Plan, which is particularly important given its significance as the only (potential) plan governing the World Heritage site. IUCN also noted that at the time of nomination, the State Party mentioned its commitment to the preparation of a separate management plan for the World Heritage site, to be placed within the Landscape Territorial Plan.

III.108 The Observer of Italy confirmed that there was a court decision on 4 December 2001 which is not yet public, but that it is hoped to be available soon. Collaboration with the Region is already underway and new information may be provided at the time of the Committee session.

III.109 The Bureau expressed its concern to the State Party on the local government opposition to the Landscape Territorial Plan, noting that the inscription of the site was partly based on the existence of this Plan. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the implications the court action has on the preparation of a Management Plan for the World Heritage site. It also requested that information be provided to update on: progress in development of the Management Plan; the protective and educational/interpretative actions undertaken for the site, and proposed development plans, particularly with respect to tourism on the Islands, how such tourism development may affect the World Heritage site and how it will be dealt with within the Landscape Territorial Plan and Management Plan. The Bureau requested that this information be provided by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

III.110 The Bureau noted that the State Party invited a UNESCO-IUCN mission to this site following the recommendation from the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. The mission took place from 25 August to 3 September 2001. A Representative of IUCN and the Director of UNESCO-Moscow Office, representing the World Heritage Centre, conducted the mission. The Bureau furthermore noted the full report of this mission contained in information document WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.8, and reviewed all information as stated in the working document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It noted in particular the series of of recurrent problems and new potential threats that IUCN believed are seriously threatening the integrity of this site, including:

- inadequate implementation of the Federal Baikal Law,
- the frequent violations of *the Federal Law on the Protection of the Environment* and of the *Federal Law on Environmental Impact Assessments* in relation to logging activities, illegal hunting, over fishing and development/infrastructure,
- that there is still no overall management plan for this site, as requested by the Committee at the time of inscription, and
- the abolishment of the Baikal Commission, an intergovernmental body comprising federal and regional authorities as well as scientific institutions, in 2000;
- an increase in illegal poaching and logging
- decline of the Baikal Seal population
- that the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM) continues to be a serious threat to the integrity of this site
- pressure on the forests of the Lake Baikal region.

III.111 In addition to these recurrent problems, the Bureau expressed concern about a number of new potential threats to the integrity of this site including a project to develop a gas and oil pipeline to China which was confirmed and that the Government of the Republic of Buryatia has granted a license to Buryat Gas Company. A number of Bureau members noted that no indication was received from the State Party concerning the inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As the Russian Federation is now a member of the World Heritage Committee, this question will be raised at the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

III.112 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes that little substantial progress has been achieved towards enhancing the protection of Lake Baikal, and addressing issues repeatedly raised by the Committee, and that there are new emerging threats that pose unprecedented risks to the integrity of this site. The Committee therefore decides to inscribe Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee notes that this should be viewed as a positive measure to attract international support to enhance the capacity of the State Party to deal with the complex issues related to the conservation of this site.

The Committee furthermore notes the following as key milestones in assessing future progress:

- (1) Development and enforcement of all related regulations and by-laws required for the *Federal Baikal Law* to become fully operational. These regulations and by-laws should be developed through a participatory and transparent process involving local people and all key stakeholders dealing with the protection and management of this site.
- (2) Development and implementation of an integrated management plan for the whole Baikal region, with emphasis on the protection of the World Heritage site. Priority should be given to develop an adequate ecological zoning of this site to enforce the *Federal Baikal Law*. This plan needs to include a comprehensive monitoring system on the state of Lake Baikal. Adequate human and financial resources are required to ensure its long-term implementation.
- (3) Development and implementation of adequate institutional and co-ordination mechanisms for implementing the *Federal Baikal Law*, its regulations and by-laws. This could take the form of a renewed Baikal Commission or a similar institutional arrangement that would enhance co-ordination between federal and regional authorities while involving also NGOs, scientific institutions and other stakeholders.
- (4) Development and implementation of a comprehensive programme to adequately address the

pollution problems affecting this site, giving particular priority to the case of BPPM, but also including other sources of pollution that are affecting the integrity of this site.

- (5) Detailed consideration of various scenarios for the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill, including total phasing out of the Mill. This requires a long-term strategy and must be associated with the development of alternative livelihoods for local people as the BPPM is the main source of employment in the region.

In addition, the Committee requests that the State Party provides an urgent response by 1 February 2002 in relation to these issues, particularly on the development of a gas and oil pipeline to China, and the potential impacts of this project on the integrity of this site, as well as the proposed oil and gas exploration in the Selenga Delta. The Committee furthermore requests the World Heritage Centre to undertake all possible efforts to encourage the World Bank, GEF, UNF, and other relevant international donors to provide urgent support, in the form of soft loans, grants and projects, to enhance the State Party efforts to address the complex conservation and development issues facing Lake Baikal."

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation)

III.113 The Bureau noted that the situation in and around the Bystrinski Nature Park (BNP) remains uncertain: The Kamchatka Park Service has appointed a new Park Director, however there has been little progress in dealing with threats to the BNP as the Park is receiving no financial support from the Government. Legal uncertainties continue: the boundaries of the BNP are not officially defined, and zoning of the BNP remains incomplete. This situation constrains the Park Director in monitoring hunting, preventing poaching and forest fires, and controlling tour operator activities within the BNP without authorization. Indigenous populations have expressed concern.

III.114 The Bureau noted that gold mining operations have started at Manuch, following an unannounced change to the boundary of the BNP. The mine is 5km from the 'new boundary' of the Park in the south-eastern section, or approximately 12km inside the boundary of the BNP as inscribed by the World Heritage Committee. Neither the Forest Service, the Park authorities, nor leaders of local indigenous communities were informed of the mine development. IUCN also informed the Bureau of a report that a road is planned connecting Esso, in the centre of the BNP, with Palana, the capital of Koriak Autonomous Region. The road will bisect the Park, and no monitoring or control programmes have been outlined. IUCN noted that this road will open up large areas to poaching and hunting and in the light of the extremely limited capacities of Park authorities and the Forest Service, the potential for major impacts on the Park are high.

III.115 The Bureau noted that IUCN has been working with local and indigenous communities in Esso and

Anavgai in the Bystrinski Nature Park within the framework of the CIDA-funded project "*Building partnerships for forest conservation and management in Russia*". The project aims to build partnerships with local communities for the development and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) such as mushrooms, berries, herbal teas and medicinal plants, thereby improving livelihoods and conserving the forest.

III.116 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

"The Committee notes with concern threats to the Bystrinsky Nature Park and notes conflicting reports relating to the gold mine operation and its relationship to the World Heritage boundary. The Committee requests the Centre to work in consultation with the State Party to prepare a mission to the site to review the state of conservation including the issues noted above and to ascertain whether a case exists for inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)

III.117 The Bureau was informed that IUCN reviewed a copy of the State Party periodic report for the Western Caucasus prepared following the June 2001 Bureau meeting. The report mentions that illegal trespassing continues to be significant, largely related to the proximity of tourist centres and hostels to the preserve's boundaries. Furthermore, there has been a weakening of conservation controls over the last 5-10 years, with an absence of such controls in the Lagonaki Plateau and Fisht-Oshtensky Massif, which are popular areas for trekking and mountaineering. In September, IUCN received reports that the Court of Adygea intended to exclude part of the Western Caucasus Zapovednik (the World Heritage site) to allow for tourist development and the construction of a road.

III.118 IUCN noted a number of issues of concern, including the tourism and ski facilities development, as well as illegal hunting. Concerning the proposed road, IUCN noted that in an official letter at the time of the inscription it was stated that: "*The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of the Republic of Adygea informs you that at the present time the authorities of the Republic of Adygea are considering a new route for the Maikop-Black Sea Coast highway, avoiding the Caucasus Natural Reserve and other specially protected territories, including the Caucasus nomination. The above-mentioned activities are being carried out for the purpose of execution of the order by President of the Republic of Adygea Dzharimov. So the insinuations that the Adygean authorities have tried to build the highway right through the Caucasus State Natural Biospheric Reserve have no grounds.*"

III.119 The Bureau furthermore noted that the issue of the road through the Lagonaki Plateau was discussed at the time of inscription of this site and that assurances of the

State Party to abandon this route was key to the site being inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the developments mentioned-above, and specifically the status of the removal of areas from the site and the status of the road by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)

III.120 The Bureau noted that following the UNESCO-UNDP mission to the site information was received in August 2001 from the UNESCO Moscow Office of support for an international consultant to provide expertise to the Republic of Altai with regard to the road project. The Russian authorities, through the Vice Head of the Section of Especially Protected Natural Territories, informed the Centre that the Federal Road Fund agreed to finance the preparation of technical and economical grounds (TEG) for the road project, carried out by the Omsk Academy of Architecture and Construction, which will review the three variants of the proposed highway. At present, this has not been considered by the Government of the Republic of Altai.

III.121 The Bureau noted the need for an international consultant to assist the Government of the Republic of Altai in the issue of the revision of the road project and encouraged the authorities to submit a well-defined international assistance proposal. Such a project should be reviewed and carried out in close consultation between the State Party, IUCN, the Centre and the UNESCO Moscow Office.

Doñana National Park (Spain)

III.122 IUCN informed the Bureau about a number of issues concerning the site: the Expansion of the Port of Seville up the Guadalquivir River and outside the World Heritage site, a project funded by sea shipping subventions of the EU, the National Park Management Plan still under discussion, the decline of the Iberian lynx and the imperial eagle population, the Rocío Pilgrimage, twice a year, involving large numbers of pilgrims walking through the Park to El Rocío village at the northern boundary of the Park, grazing at the site, and the impact of road building outside the Park. Furthermore, there are issues of illegal water extraction and the Restoration Plan for Aznalcollar Mine. Another concern lies with the funding for the required restoration works, as Apirsa has declared bankruptcy, and Boliden Ltd has denied responsibility.

III.123 Concerning the Project Doñana 2005, IUCN noted that progress continues to be slow despite the importance of this project. In May 2001 the Project established its Scientific Board, however there has been little scientific input into the Project's activities. A new co-ordinator for the project has been appointed and it is expected that this will help to speed up project implementation. The report from the State Party notes that some of the recommendations from the October 1999 Seminar are still to be acted upon, for example, in relation to: coordination;

definition of public riverine domain; watershed restoration; promotion of sustainable agriculture; development of pilot projects; and prospective studies.

III.124 The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the results of the 2nd International Meeting on the Hydric Regeneration of Doñana (Huelva, 26 - 28 November 2001). The Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention, representatives of UNESCO, and IUCN participated. Both the representatives of the Ramsar Bureau and the World Heritage Centre also participated in the meeting of the Patronate of the Park chaired by the Minister for the Environment. It noted the Doñana 2005 project is probably the most ambitious wetland environmental regeneration project currently underway in Europe. The participants of the Conference reviewed progress and made a number of specific recommendations for the improvement of the implementation of the project. Furthermore, it was recommended that the Ramsar Convention meeting scheduled to be held in Valencia, Spain in November 2002 should be an occasion for a review of the regeneration of Doñana. The Bureau was furthermore informed of an information note on the situation of Doñana National Park prepared by the Spanish authorities and received by the World Heritage Centre, that reviews a number of issues indicated by IUCN and stating that the site has a management plan since 1984, currently in its 2nd revision, and that grazing remains a concern. At the same time the efforts to alleviate the consequences of the mining accident have to be acknowledged. The information was provided to IUCN for review.

III.125 The Observer of Spain informed the Bureau that both IUCN and the Centre were involved in the Doñana 2005 review and that new information was just provided by the States Party to the Centre. He stated that there was no need for Danger Listing of this site.

III.126 The Bureau commended the State Party on the *Doñana 2005* initiative, which provides an excellent framework for integrated land management. The Bureau noted that a number of concerns have been raised in relation to the integrity of this site. Accordingly, the Bureau requested the State Party to provide a full report on the threats to the site, and on how they will be addressed, by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

St Kilda (United Kingdom)

III.127 The Bureau noted that the report provided by the Scottish Executive was transmitted to IUCN on 18 September 2001 for review. It recalled that the Committee proposed that the boundaries of the site be expanded to include the marine area and the management plan be revised. The authorities informed the Centre that they would be targeting a submission date in time for the twenty-sixth session of the Committee. IUCN commended the State Party on the research and surveys, and for maintaining the moratorium on the issuance of new oil licenses nearer to the site than those already in existence. IUCN requested that details of the risk assessment process

to be put in place be provided along with the draft management plan as soon as possible and noted the collaboration of a number of organisations in the process of delineating the proposed new boundaries of the site. It encouraged the State Party to include in the revised management plan strict prohibition of all oil, gas and other exploration, in both the site and the buffer zone.

III.128 The Bureau commended the State Party for the progress report provided and requested the authorities to submit a report by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to complete the new boundary identification as soon as possible so that work can commence in earnest on the management plan. It requested the State Party to clarify the role and involvement of the site authorities in the decision-making process for issuance of licenses in the site, in the buffer zone and outside the buffer zone. The Bureau also welcomed the outcome of the consultation meetings held as part of the preparation of the management plan. The Bureau reminded the State Party that any revised nomination dossier for cultural values and revised boundaries should be submitted by the deadlines established by the Committee.

Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom)

III.129 The Bureau noted that the Centre received a number of letters, notably from the National Trust, raising concerns with regard to commercial development in the area surrounding the site, and the private sale and redevelopment of a complex for visitor facilities. These letters were transmitted to the State Party for comments and to IUCN for review. IUCN noted that the Department of Environment announced that it would bring forward proposals for the production of a management plan for the entire Causeway Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which includes the World Heritage site, later this year. IUCN noted that major development, including the redevelopment of the visitor centre, should be considered in the context of such an integrated management plan and must be compatible with its status as a World Heritage site.

III.130 The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that concerning the visitor centre and related development proposals, a decision was taken on 4 December 2001 not to sell any land. Furthermore he stated that the management plan for the World Heritage site is under preparation.

III.131 The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a report on the situation of the site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau, to include progress with the production of the management plan for the Causeway. The Bureau expressed its concern with piecemeal development in and around the site, in the absence of such a plan.

Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America)

III.132 The Bureau noted that a report on this site would be presented to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

General debate

III.133 The Delegate of Greece noted that a number of issues come up regularly, such as mining, tourism and infrastructure development, and the authority of different administrative levels. Rather than treating these issues only on a case-by-case basis, general policy frameworks should be developed with regard to these issues. The Chairperson noted that this is a very good suggestion that would enable the revision of problems common to many World Heritage sites in a more systematic manner.

III.134 The Representative of IUCN stated that a general policy framework is a good starting point to review site-specific cases. For a number of themes this process has commenced, as in the case of mining and World Heritage. The World Parks Congress, scheduled in September 2003, would be another occasion and an opportunity to discuss these issues in a broader context.

III.135 The Delegate of Thailand underlined that such a general debate would not prevent the discussion of specific problems of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites.

MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) HERITAGE

Kakadu National Park (Australia)

III.136 The Bureau noted that reports concerning the proposal to develop the Jabiluka uranium mine relevant to the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park have been received since the twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000). Complete details of information presented to the Bureau are contained in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10 (see pages 29 - 32).

III.137 The Bureau noted that new information on the status of the Jabiluka mine site had been received from the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC) on 4 December 2001 following a site inspection on 16 November 2001. The report refers to significant environmental concerns regarding the "Standby, Environmental Management and Planning phase" and calls for prompt and appropriate rehabilitation at Jabiluka. More specifically, the report raises concerns that social, cultural and environmental issues are apparently regarded as secondary to cost considerations in the development of the Jabiluka mine. The GAC consider the current regulation and indefinite use of contaminated water to irrigate the Jabiluka mine site as unacceptable. Other reported concerns include reference to the management of the mineralised stockpile and contamination of groundwater. The GAC report has

been provided to the State Party, IUCN and ICOMOS for review and comment.

III.138 The Bureau was informed that the State Party had written to the Centre on 26 November 2001 advising of continuing progress in reestablishing dialogue between the State Party and the Mirrar Traditional Owners. As a part of that dialogue, the State Party has proposed that the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC) consider a process for cultural mapping at Jabiluka based on the *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter*. The GAC have agreed to give their consideration to this process.

III.139 The Delegate of Thailand referred to the fact that members of the Bureau and the Centre had received reports and information directly from non-governmental organizations in Australia. He suggested that the proper procedure would be, in the first instance, for discussions to take place between the NGOs and the State Party. The representative of the Centre assured the Bureau that all reports on the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park had been transmitted to the State Party to verify the source and content of the reports. In responding to the Delegate of Thailand, the representative of IUCN highlighted the importance of inviting a representative from the conservation NGO community to join the newly established Independent Science Advisory Committee (ISAC).

III.140 The Representative of ICOMOS noted that with the current pause in development of the Jabiluka uranium mine and with the price of uranium dropping worldwide, a reprieve to a previously intractable problem had been found. He noted that a process for cultural mapping of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease was being developed by the State Party in consultation with the GAC. He reported that Australia ICOMOS would be involved in this process and was willing to make contributions in the form of seminars and discussions.

III.141 The Chairperson commented that progress to resolve cultural issues at Kakadu had, to date, not been adequate. He therefore welcomed the possibility of serious discussion and progress in developing a process for cultural mapping with the involvement of ICOMOS. He emphasized the need to consider in this case both intangible and tangible heritage values.

III.142 The Delegate of Greece commented on the reluctance of Traditional Owners to divulge information on secret sites. In response, the representative of ICOMOS outlined the need to devise a culturally appropriate process of cultural mapping. He informed the Bureau that ICOMOS had begun work on the preparation of guidelines for cultural mapping of places of importance to indigenous peoples. The representative of the Centre informed the Bureau that in a report dated 13 November 2001, the GAC had noted that the Mirrar had already provided culturally sensitive information regarding the Jabiluka area on numerous occasions. The Mirrar remain opposed to providing further information as part of the development of the Jabiluka Project. As stated in the GAC

report, "In the interests of advancing dialogue with the Australian Government on the protection of cultural heritage at Kakadu, the Mirrar, however, are willing to examine a process of cultural mapping removed and separate from the management/development of the Jabiluka Project."

III.143 The Observer of Australia noted that the pause in the development of the Jabiluka uranium mine, until at least 2009, had been beneficial in providing the opportunity to improve the dialogue with the Mirrar. According to the mining company, development of the mine would not proceed without the consent of the Traditional Owners. He noted that the protection of the cultural values of Kakadu National Park required good consultation and dialogue with all Traditional Owners in the Park, and that the Mirrar was one of some 25 clan groups. In this regard, discussions were ongoing in the Kakadu National Park Board of Management on the protection of cultural values. He noted that Aboriginal people formed the majority, and chaired the Park Board of Management. He emphasized that the process of cultural mapping at Jabiluka would need to be one in which all parties, including the Mirrar Traditional Owners, would have confidence. In relation to the new information referred to by the Centre, the Observer of Australia, in support of the observation made by the Delegate of Thailand, noted that his authorities would be able to respond more quickly to any issues if they were raised directly with them. Direct contact in this manner would help resolve any issues.

III.144 The Bureau noted that new information is available concerning the reestablishment of dialogue with the Mirrar Traditional Owners and scientific/technical issues relating to water management and rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine site. The Bureau requested the State Party, Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre to consult during the few days prior to the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee to develop a new proposed decision to the Committee. Therefore, the Bureau transmitted the state of conservation report on Kakadu National Park to the Committee for decision.

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

III.145 The Bureau noted that IUCN has provided the Centre with information on two development proposals relevant to the state of conservation of this site.

III.146 The *Basslink project* to construct an electricity connector between Tasmania and the Australian mainland could change the operating regimes at the current Gordon River Hydro Electric Scheme, including changes in the utilisation of the turbines (both number of turbines and the time of their activation) and associated water release. The Gordon River Hydro Electric scheme is entirely within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA). When this site was inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Committee had expressed concern about the impacts of the Gordon power scheme on the Gordon River. The Committee had imposed a set of conditions including

monitoring of riverbank erosion and the health of the meromictic lakes that are key features of this site. IUCN has expressed concerns that the proposed project may impact the meromictic lakes, inter-tidal zone and riparian vegetation and lead to increased seepage erosion and loss of mid-tidal macro-invertebrates and snag habitat.

III.147 The second project concerns a proposed ecotourism resort at Planters Beach, Cockle Creek East. The resort will comprise a lodge, 60-80 accommodation units, an 800-metre extension of the current road into the Park, a jetty, walking tracks, spas, a tavern, 92 car park spaces and four bus bays. The proposed location of the resort is within the boundaries of the South West National Park, but outside the World Heritage site. It is however within the area covered by the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan of 1999 (TWWHAP). Therefore, for the development project to proceed, the Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment had proposed that the WHA Plan be amended to allow for addition of a new 'Visitor Services Site'. The proposal and proposed amendment to the WHA Plan were publicly announced and submissions called for in April 2001.

III.148 The Centre reported information from the State Party, received on 26 November 2001, which emphasised that assessments of both development proposals were underway. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of the *Basslink project* is under preparation and will be assessed as part of the Combined Assessment and Approvals Process by a Joint Panel comprising representatives of the Commonwealth, Victorian and Tasmanian Governments. The proponent of the project has prepared an Integrated Impact Assessment Statement (IIAS) and invited public comment; the Joint Panel will take into account the revised IIAS in its assessment of the proposed *Basslink project*.

III.149 The Cockle Creek East development proposal has been considered under the Commonwealth's Environment and Biodiversity Conservation Act of 1999. On 5 October 2001, the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the World Heritage values of the Tasmanian Wilderness Heritage Area and therefore does not require approval under the Act. However, the proposal is being assessed under the Tasmanian State Legislation and under the provisions of the *New Proposals and Impact Assessment Process of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 1999*.

III.150 The Australian Observer noted with regret the fact that IUCN reports on the two projects were not transmitted to the concerned authorities in his country for comment prior to their inclusion in the working document WHC-01/CONF.207/3 in accordance with normal procedure. He stressed the need for the Centre to request the State Party for information and verification on all reports on the state of conservation of properties.

III.151 The Bureau noted that processes for the assessment of the environmental impacts of the two projects were currently underway. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit detailed status reports on both projects, including outcomes of any EIAs prepared for these projects, to the Centre before 1 February 2002. These reports would enable the Bureau to undertake a comprehensive review of these two projects in relation to the conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area at its twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

III.152 The Bureau noted the report on the state of conservation of Tongariro National Park concerning the management of the ash build-up at Crater Lake, Mount Ruapehu contained in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10 (page 33).

III.153 IUCN emphasized that eruptions within the Crater Lake are a regular and ongoing natural feature. IUCN considers that proposed engineering works to manage the ash build-up at Crater Lake might establish a precedent within Tongariro and other national parks. IUCN recommends that natural processes be allowed to function and measures be implemented to protect both public safety and infrastructure. ICOMOS recalled that the mountains of Tongariro National Park are sacred to the Maori and that a culturally appropriate solution needs to be found to the management of the ash build-up.

III.154 The Bureau was informed that a representative of the State Party was expected to attend the twenty-fifth session of the Committee. The Bureau therefore decided to transmit the state of conservation report of Tongariro National Park to the Committee noting that new information may be provided.

Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)

III.155 The Bureau noted that preliminary reports on the state of conservation of this site received by IUCN are worrying. The reports note that the limestone cliffs are becoming discoloured and, despite the authorities prohibiting visitors from entering the travertines and the placement of signs explaining the fragility of the site, many visitors continue to enter the travertines. In addition, the collection of pieces of limestone are being taken as souvenirs. Few guards patrol the site, and there is little or no law enforcement.

III.156 The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report on the situation of the limestone cliffs, and on the overall management of the site before 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Europe and North America

Historic District of Québec (Canada)

III.157 As requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session, ICOMOS undertook an evaluation mission to the site (15 to 21 October 2001). Following this mission, ICOMOS made the following recommendations:

- the Point-à-Carcy port project is acceptable so long as it serves as a port-of-call and an arrival port, but not as a homeport;
- There should be strict noise and traffic control during loading and unloading periods;
- The planned second phase of the project should be implemented as soon as possible, so as to make the quay available to the general public;
- Immediate consideration should be given to the conversion of the Champlain Maritime Station into a terminal for departing and arriving cruise ships;
- The boundaries of the World Heritage site should be adjusted so as to include the entire Pointe-à-Carcy esplanade;
- An urban plan for the area must be agreed upon in association with the Municipality;
- The three-member commission should be strengthened by the appointment of a non-Canadian expert;
- The Port Administration of Québec should provide the World Heritage Committee with a synthesis of the project as it stands, following modifications over recent years.

III.158 The Bureau took note of the information provided by ICOMOS and requested that the full report of the ICOMOS expert mission be transmitted to the State Party. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide, by 1 February 2002, a report on the activities undertaken for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)

III.159 The Bureau noted that the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission, for the UNDP-SPPD project for the *Study and Development of a Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia*, identified the following serious problems at the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, the most significant monument of the City of Mtskheta:

- the construction of two large underground storage areas, irreversible and disproportionate to the monument;
- the on-going construction of a new bell tower right over the original gate of the wall enclosing the cathedral grounds;
- the behaviour of the Cathedral in the case of an earthquake will be difficult to predict due to past and current works carried out in the immediate vicinity of the monument;

- the erection of additional constructions in concrete and aluminium, at a short distance from the Cathedral, entirely changing the external appearance of the walls of the courtyard.

III.160 The Bureau invited the Georgian authorities to request an ICOMOS-UNESCO evaluation mission to the site to ascertain the state of conservation and notably the progress of the ongoing and future work. This mission should also identify corrective measures and solutions to establish appropriate protection and management mechanisms for the Cathedral. The Bureau requested the State Party to prepare a report on the state of conservation of the site comprising up-to-date information on all the restoration and construction projects at the site, before 1 February 2002, for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002. This report should be reviewed by the evaluation mission to the site.

Classical Weimar (Germany)

III.161 During its last session, the Bureau had requested the German authorities to prepare a progress report on the road project foreseen in the vicinity of the Tiefurt Castle and its Park at Weimar, presenting the adopted mitigation measures. In response to a question from the Delegate of Thailand, the Observer of Germany indicated that the authorities were still awaiting the report from the Municipality of Weimar.

III.162 The Bureau requested the German authorities to present a progress report, by 1 February 2002, for examination at its twenty-sixth session.

Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany)

III.163 In July 2001, the Secretariat learnt of a construction project in the centre of Lübeck. Following discussions and reservations expressed by ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and the German authorities, concerning the proposed height and architectural style of the buildings, an extensive report was sent to the Secretariat on the construction project by the Mayor of Lübeck on 12 September 2001. According to this report, the current buildings (post office building and townhall) which are located in the area of the construction project, have no national heritage character and are not considered worthy of protection. The height of the two new buildings will be compatible with the other buildings in the street/square and will therefore not have a negative visual impact on the World Heritage site. The modern architecture of the new buildings provides a neutral framework for the town hall. Following examination of this document, ICOMOS had informed the Secretariat that, in their view, the style and the height of the proposed new buildings on the market square are inappropriate to the ensemble of the site and proposed that another solution be found which is more compatible with the existing buildings surrounding the open area and the particular skyline of Marienkirche and the Petrikerche.

III.164 The Observer of Germany remarked that the authorities of the city and notably the conservator, were in favour of this project, which whilst being a contemporary construction and a new element in the architectural landscape, respected the historical structure of the City.

III.165 The Chairperson proposed that a working group comprising the International Committee of Historic Towns and Villages (ICHTC) of ICOMOS, and the local and national authorities be set up and meet in Lübeck to identify appropriate solutions. The Delegate of Hungary, Chairperson of the ICHTC, stated that this was not a unique case and that the results of a working group could serve as a basis for a study on historic city centres that face these situations.

III.166 The Bureau requested that the working group meet as soon as possible in Lübeck to identify appropriate solutions. The Bureau requested that the report of the working group be submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002).

Roman Monuments, Cathedral of St Peter, and Church of Our Lady, Trier (Germany)

III.167 The Bureau, at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session, requested the German authorities to formulate and implement planning regulations that will ensure the long-term preservation of the archaeological remains in this area. At the request of the Minister of Culture of the Land Rhenanie-Palatinat, ICOMOS undertook a mission to the site on 23 – 24 September 2001 to assess the state of conservation of the site. The ICOMOS expert noted that the Roman Amphitheatre is well conserved, however, there is a conservation problem notably connected with the water table, concerning the important Roman remains revealed at the site of the former brewery. In general, the ICOMOS mission noted damage to the Barbara Baths, Porta Nigra and the Imperial Baths caused by bad weather, deficiencies in staffing, a shortage of maintenance personnel to monitor state of conservation of structures, and inadequate on-site interpretation. Furthermore, the ICOMOS expert identified two potential extensions to the existing site which are: the Viehmarkt, where extensive rescue excavations have revealed substantial remains of a large Roman thermal establishment and the Simeonstift, the history and location of which are intimately linked to those of the Porta Nigra. The ICOMOS mission recommended:

- A major project for the study and re-excavation of the Barbarathermen, followed by scientific conservation and the implementation of a management plan, should be initiated without delay;
- A scientific study of the extent and nature of degradation of the stones of the Porta Nigra, followed by the implementation of appropriate conservation measures;
- Serious consideration should be given to the appointment of additional security and maintenance personnel at the archaeological sites;

- Projects should be undertaken to improve the interpretation and signage at the archaeological sites;
- Consideration should be given to the nomination of the Viehmarktthermen and the Simeonstift as extensions to the World Heritage site, subject to the opening to the public of the Viehmarktthermen and appropriate changes so as to improve its presentation.

III.168 The Observer of Germany thanked ICOMOS for its mission and recommendations. However, he indicated that the problems raised by this mission only concerned two or three monuments at the site, which comprised nine in total. He also emphasized that the improvement projects which concerned notably the conservation and the signage at the site had been entrusted to a private company. He also indicated that all the monuments at the site are open to the public, including those that ICOMOS had suggested to be included in the extension. With regard to the question of the extension of the site with other monuments, the Observer of Germany informed the Bureau that as the work foreseen at the Collegiale St Simeon had not commenced, the Ministry deemed it too early to request an extension.

III.169 The Representative of ICOMOS underlined that a management plan existed for some of the monuments but that for others there was no information provided regarding this point. Several delegates emphasized the importance of an integrated management plan encompassing all the monuments at the site. The Chairperson proposed that a management plan for each site be established and that coordination between these plans be ensured.

III.170 The Bureau took note of the ICOMOS mission report and information provided by the State Party. The Bureau requested the German authorities to continue to implement the necessary measures for the establishment of appropriate management plans for each monument and to ensure coordination between these plans. It also requested the State Party to pursue its efforts in the framework of the conservation and presentation of the site, and to provide a detailed report on the implementation of these measures for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)

III.171 The Bureau had requested the German authorities to collaborate with ICOMOS in the assessment of the Havel waterway improvement project and to submit a report for examination by the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. Through the German National Committee of ICOMOS a report was prepared by Stiftung Preussischer Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg which calls attention to the threat the project will cause to the buildings located at the Havel waterfront. Notably, the Heilandskirche in Sacrow and the Maschinenhaus Park Babelsberg could be adversely affected by the project.

III.172 The Bureau took note of the concerns raised by ICOMOS and the Stiftung Preussischer Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg regarding the negative impact

of the Havel waterway improvement on the landscape on each side of the river. The Bureau also noted that the State Party had informed of the delay in the project and that an official decision would not be taken before 2004. In this context, the Bureau requested the German authorities to undertake all necessary measures to ensure that the values of the World Heritage site be taken into consideration in the framework of the official urban planning public process and the ICOMOS be invited to participate actively in this process. The Bureau requested the State Party to prepare, by 1 February 2003, a detailed report comprising updated information on the status of the project for examination by its twenty-seventh session in April 2003.

Acropolis, Athens (Greece)

III.173 After examination of information provided by a group of residents on a 32-metre high building proposal, in the vicinity of the Acropolis, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it considered the project unacceptable due to its proximity to the World Heritage site. This construction would significantly block the view from certain points, and cause adverse visual impact on the site. The Bureau noted that numerous protests had been made complaining about this project, notably by NGOs, the Department of Architecture of the University of Athens and by the Directors of Institutes of Nordic Countries in Athens, whose buildings are located within the perimeter of the building project. The Secretariat was also informed that the 3rd Department of Antiquities of Athens had undertaken archaeological research at the site where the construction is foreseen because of recent discoveries of archaeological remains.

III.174 By letter of 29 November 2001, the Permanent Delegation of Greece, informed the Secretariat that the land area upon which the building would be constructed is outside of the buffer zone of the Acropolis site and also outside the historic centre of the city of Athens. The Delegation had also informed that the building licence granted for the project was provisional mainly because the area falls under the archaeological jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture and that since September, the 3rd Department of Antiquities of the Ministry has been carrying out excavations at the site and that remains have been found. The Delegation added that the building licence was dependent upon the results of the ongoing excavations.

III.175 After examination of this information, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it was satisfactory to have confirmation that the parcel of land was under the archaeological jurisdiction of the Ministry and that the excavations had been undertaken. However, ICOMOS noted that the main objection to this project was the size of the proposed building that was considered as possibly causing negative visual impact on the World Heritage site.

III.176 The Delegate of Greece emphasized that the jurisdiction applied to the site concerned by the project was clear and that this was outside of the buffer zone and the World Heritage site. She furthermore informed that

the responsible Ministry was anxious to protect the site and its visual aspect. She mentioned that, in this framework, the law forbade constructions above a certain height. The Delegate of the State Party furthermore, reaffirmed that no building licence had yet been granted and that this would only be done in accordance with the results of the excavations undertaken.

III.177 ICOMOS remarked that the principal concern remained the height, 32 metres, of the proposed building, and that this would constitute a new emergence in the landscape. The Chairperson remarked that it would be useful to carry out a visual impact study. The Bureau took note of the building construction project adjacent to the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed of the evolution of this project.

Historic Centre of Naples (Italy)

III.178 The Bureau noted that the Italian authorities have taken action to halt the demolition of 27 ancient buildings in the Historic Centre of Naples and congratulated the State Party for protecting the World Heritage values of the site.

The Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russian Federation)

III.179 At the request of the State Party, an ICOMOS/UNESCO (UNESCO Moscow Office) mission assessed the impact on the site of a proposed oil extraction operation. The ICOMOS expert visited the Lithuanian part, while the UNESCO Moscow Office representative (ecology specialist) had discussions with the Russian side (including the Lithuanian Consulate and World Ocean Museum in Kaliningrad, Russian Federation). Both experts obtained similar information. The UNESCO Moscow Office received documentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the project. The D-6 Krakovskaya oil deposit is located at a depth of 27 – 30m in the Baltic Sea shelf, 22km off the coast of the Curonian Spit. In 1985 the USSR established that the environmental aspects of the project were not safe and that the existing technology could not ensure a safe oil exploitation. In August 2000 the company Lukoil announced that work would commence. The Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs repeatedly requested official information on the project from the Russian Federation. However no reply was received. During a boat visit of the area, the mission noted that construction work is being carried out on the platform and that the construction will be completed by 2002. While the platform has no visual impact on the World Heritage site, ICOMOS considers the potential impact of an oil spill as immense. In case of accident, the wind and sea currents would drive the oil spill in the direction of the Baltic shores of Lithuania, the Spit and as far as Latvia. The recommendations of the ICOMOS mission are:

- An environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be carried out, by either a joint Russian-Lithuanian team of experts or by an independent international consultancy;

- The Russian company should allow Lithuanian experts access to the technical data relating to safety provisions;
- The two countries should collaborate in the preparation of a risk-preparedness programme.

III.180 The Bureau took note of a fax received on 7 December during its session from the UNESCO National Commission of the Russian Federation informing that neither the State Committee for Ecology or its successor, the State Committee for Natural Resources had agreed to any mining exploration projects. ICOMOS emphasized that the mining exploration was located at no great distance from one of the most fragile cultural landscapes inscribed on the List and that the risk of an oil spill was high. If this happened, the impact on the site would be great.

III.181 The Bureau took note of the information provided by the ICOMOS expert and the report on the mission of August 2001. It thanked the Lithuanian authorities for their efforts to ensure the protection of the Curonian Spit. In view of the urgent situation, the Bureau requested the State Party of the Russian Federation to submit a report before 1 February 2002, on the project concerning the Russian part of this transboundary site and on technical data relating to safety provisions, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002. Furthermore, the Bureau requested that the environmental impact assessment be carried out, without delay, jointly by a Lithuanian-Russian team of experts and that the outcome of this study be communicated to the Bureau, at its next session.

City of Luxembourg: its Old Quarters and Fortifications (Luxembourg)

III.182 Following a meeting between the Delegation of Luxembourg, the Chairperson, the Secretariat and the Representative of ICOMOS, the Bureau was informed that awaiting the opinion of the Secretary General of ICOMOS, the examination of this site would be referred to the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta)

III.183 The Bureau, at its twenty-fifth session, requested the State Party to inform the Committee on progress of actions undertaken following damage caused by vandalism that occurred in April 2001. A report on the restoration project of the Megalithic Temples was sent by the Permanent Delegation of Malta to the Secretariat on 18 October 2001. This report informed that a strategic restoration plan had been prepared by the Department of Museums and implemented during May to July 2001. It also informed that security measures had immediately been undertaken following the acts of vandalism, as well as a general reinforcement of security at the site. The report also contained information concerning ongoing and long-term protection and conservation projects for the Megalithic Monuments.

III.184 The Bureau took note of the information contained in the report and expressed its satisfaction as to the speed with which the remedial actions had been undertaken and for the conservation and protection measures established to protect all the Megalithic Temples of Malta. The Delegate of Greece noted that, in these cases, appropriate measures should be undertaken to combat vandalism.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)

III.185 The Bureau noted that a site visit to Auschwitz under the leadership of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Peter King, took place on 1 and 2 July 2001, to assess the issues relating to the management of the site and the establishment of a buffer zone. The full mission report was presented to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.6. The Bureau was also informed that it was sent to the Polish authorities for review and comments.

III.186 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the mission covered the management of the World Heritage site, its buffer zone (including the 300 to 1000 m silence zones), related sites, government responsibilities and local communities, as well as management planning and financial issues. The report contains very specific recommendations for each of these issues, including those for the International Group of Experts.

III.187 The Bureau noted that as a result of the site visit, discussions with the Polish authorities and concerned parties were held in a constructive atmosphere to achieve progress with regard to the protection of the site and confidence for the overall future management in consultation with all stakeholders. The mission in particular acknowledged the commitment by the Polish Government to the preservation of the World Heritage site. However, the need for a policy for the conservation and overall management of the surroundings incorporating a coherent silence and protection zone, an appropriately zoned buffer area and satisfactory long-term protection or integration of the area between the two camps was emphasized. The excellent quality of management at the World Heritage site and the commitment and dedication of the staff of the museum was noted. However, a number of issues were identified: social and commercial development, private property rights in neighbouring areas, longer term suitable investment, appropriate tourism and education programmes, inventory of related sites, co-ordination between the different levels and a dialogue between the city of Oswiezim and the village of Brezinka. The mission also recommended that the terms of reference and structure for the work of the International Group of Experts and the formation of two sub-committees, one on museology and conservation and the other one on urbanism and planning be determined as soon as possible. This will enable the International Group of Experts to proceed with the work on an on-going basis.

III.188 The Bureau was informed of a letter received from the Deputy Secretary of State of the Ministry of

Internal Affairs and Administration of the Republic of Poland dated 5 December 2001, informing the Centre that he had taken over the responsibility for the implementation of the Auschwitz Government Strategic Programme. This Programme will be continued for the period 2002-2006. The authorities furthermore invited UNESCO to undertake a further visit in the second half of 2002. Concerning the discotheque, the regional governor has now reversed the decision and refused to grant permission to operate the facility.

III.189 The Observer of Israel commended the Secretariat for the excellent support and underlined that the mission obtained very positive views concerning the management of the site. He informed the Bureau, however, that a number of issues remain to be solved, including the discotheque, the supermarket and the work and structure of the International Group of Experts. He requested that this be followed very closely, as steps need to be taken to ensure the work, structure and timetable of the International Group of Experts. As no technical assistance request was received from the Polish authorities, his Government would provide an amount of up to US\$20,000 for the actions required.

III.190 The Observer of Poland reconfirmed the appreciation of his Government for the mission and its findings. He stated that his Government was pursuing juridical procedures with regard to the discotheque and the Carmel Convent. Concerning the technical assistance request, he informed the Bureau that this is now under consideration and that the function, structure, competence and terms of reference of the International Group of Experts required clarification. He confirmed the conclusions of the report and informed the Bureau that the complexity of different Government levels should be acknowledged. He assured the Bureau of a close follow-up of all matters with UNESCO.

III.191 The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the World Heritage Committee for action:

“The Committee takes note of the report of the site visit to Auschwitz Concentration Camp and its surroundings and thanks the Chairperson, Mr Peter King, for his great commitment concerning this site. The Committee urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission as soon as possible and requests the authorities to provide a report by 1 February 2002 with details on the status of the implementation of the recommendations and a timeframe.”

Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania)

III.192 The Bureau noted the information contained in the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It also noted the information provided by the State Party that underlined that the special programme including the "Dracula ParK" project, as well as the creation of an Interministerial Committee for its monitoring, had been approved by the Government in July 2001, launched in November 2001

and for which the implementation is foreseen for May 2002. The Bureau also took note that the first phase of this project comprised a feasibility study, that the complex envisaged is located 6 Km from the town centre and will be constructed on a vast area and a rehabilitation and revitalisation of the town of Sighisoara was foreseen thanks to the income from the "Dracula Park".

III.193 The Bureau took note of the view of ICOMOS who considered that although such a project would permit an increase in tourism in the region where the economy is weak, its impact could have a negative effect on the values for which Sighisoara was inscribed on the World Heritage List. This would include the alteration to the visual integrity of the historic town itself, even if the project is located at a distance of 6 Km, and the effects of mass tourism on the World Heritage site and its immediate surroundings.

III.194 The Observer of Germany emphasized that the area covered by the project was foreseen to be sixty hectares and that there was a risk that the town would become the focal point of an amusement park on the lines of a "Disneyland". He thought that the authenticity of the town would be greatly threatened by a project of this kind. He also recalled paragraph 56 of the Guidelines that invited States Parties to inform the Committee of all construction projects that could modify the value of the property.

III.195 The Delegate of Hungary indicated that this was a serious problem which concerned a project involving mass tourism and which would be very different from that generated by the town itself. He emphasized that there was no question of preventing tourism but that one must be prudent. He also noted that the proximity of the ParK to the town was very dangerous. He suggested that another location be found for the construction of the Park.

III.196 The Representative of ICOMOS indicated that the distance separating the Parc project from the town was 1.5 Km as the crow flies, that the impact on it would be vast and that a large number of elements of the Park would be visible from the town. He also indicated that a cablecar project existed to link the Park to the town. He finally mentioned that ICOMOS was not against a project that could generate income for the region, but he strongly recommended that another location for the project be found as far away from the town of Sighisorara as possible.

III.197 After this debate, the Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee notes with concern the building project for an amusement park in the vicinity of the site, and which could have a negative impact on the integrity and the ensemble of the site. The Committee notes with disquiet the information provided by the State Party and notably the fact that the Romanian authorities had already approved the project as well as

the implementation of the special programme foreseen for May 2002. The Committee urgently requests the State Party to undertake the projected environmental impact study as soon as possible; it informs the State Party that assistance could be granted for this purpose. Furthermore, the Committee strongly encourages the State party to explore all other possible solutions for an alternative location for the construction of this amusement park. The Committee requests that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission be undertaken to the site as soon as possible and that a report on the mission be presented at its twenty-sixth session (June 2002)."

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)

III.198 The Bureau took note of the information contained in the World Document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It also took note that a request for emergency assistance from the State Party to hold an international workshop at the site had been received by the Centre and was approved on 14 October 2001 for a total amount of US\$29,540. This workshop would also include the elaboration of a workplan for the safeguarding of the site.

III.199 The Delegate of Finland underlined that the site has been facing permanent and continual problems since its inscription, notably with regard to the conservation work, management and security measures. He proposed that given an increasing number of wooden churches are being inscribed on the World Heritage List, or were being proposed for inscription, a network of experts and responsible persons at the different sites could be created to respond to different problems. He also recommended that in the future, direct assistance from the Committee to the responsible person at the site be proposed.

III.200 Recalling the structural problems encountered at the site, the Representative of ICCROM indicated that a multidisciplinary conservation plan had been adopted for the site in 1995 but that it had never been implemented. He supported the proposal of the Delegate of Finland and informed that ICCROM would provide assistance, recommending, however, that this approach be global and that all questions affecting the site be treated.

III.201 The Representative of ICOMOS commended the Delegate of Finland for this proposal. He indicated that the services of the International Committee for Wood and Vernacular Architecture of ICOMOS were at the disposal of the Committee for the study suggested by the Delegate of Finland.

III.202 After this debate, the Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee takes note of the information provided by ICCROM and thanks the authorities of the Russian Federation for having initiated the process to ensure the protection of the site. In view of the alarming state of conservation of the site, the Committee requests the Secretariat to work in close collaboration with the

authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies with regard to the international workshop on conservation measures for Kizhi Pogost. Furthermore, the Committee requests the State Party to provide a detailed update of the situation, by 1 February 2002, and requests the Centre to provide a full report on the results of the workshop, in collaboration with the authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies, for its twenty-sixth session in June 2002."

Spišský Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia)

III.203 In June 2001, ICOMOS received information that a travertine quarry below Drevenik, on the south-western edge of the inscribed site, was operational and that quarrying was going ahead. The permit is of limited duration and is scheduled to end in 2002. ICOMOS considers that the main threat to the site comes from the blasting operations, and to a lesser extent, from the large quantity of dust produced by extraction and transportation.

III.204 The Bureau took note of the report provided by ICOMOS and requested the Slovakian authorities to provide a report on the situation by 1 February 2002, for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

III.205 The Bureau took note of the reservations made by ICOMOS concerning the dam project that represents a threat for a part of the Route of Santiago de Compostela. It expressed its concern with regard to the impact of the dam which risks flooding a part of the Route of Santiago de Compostela and requested the Spanish authorities to study all alternative solutions to avoid any negative impact on the values and integrity of the World Heritage site.

III.206 The Observer of Spain informed the Bureau of progress achieved with ICOMOS on this question following the recommendation formulated by the Bureau during its twenty-fourth session. He indicated that after the meetings to be held between representatives of the national and regional governments and ICOMOS-Spain representatives, information would be updated and sent to the Centre. He also indicated that research would be carried out to establish the true trail of the Route to its source. He informed the Bureau that the national and local Governments would do nothing to endanger the historical integrity of the Route.

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites (United Kingdom)

III.207 The Bureau noted the information received from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport of the United Kingdom emphasizing that in order to improve the site's setting, the Government proposes to remove two roads from the immediate vicinity of the monument. In this regard, it is proposed that the A303 road run through a 2km tunnel near the stone circle, whilst the other road (A344) should be closed and converted to grass. It is also

proposed that the present rather poor visitor facilities and car park should be removed and that a new visitor centre (with car parking and interpretative facilities) should be built a short distance away, outside the site. However, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport underlined in its letter that all these proposals will be subject to examination under normal planning procedures and that full consideration will be given to the overall archaeological and environmental implications. ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it was in full agreement with the proposals and that the cut-and-cover tunnel is a feasible project that will not cause any damage to the archaeology and the environment on the site.

III.208 Concerning Silbury Hill, part of the World Heritage site, the Secretariat has been informed by numerous letters that the site was threatened by collapse. The State Party informed the Centre that the present problem has been caused by the collapse of the filling of a vertical shaft. In May 2000, a squared-shaped hole about 1.8m wide opened up to a depth of just over 10m. This was covered immediately with a scaffolding cover. However, before any plan could be implemented further collapse occurred. Under these circumstances, English Heritage decided to commission a seismic survey, but this was delayed due to the fact that the Hill was situated within an area infected by Foot and Mouth Disease. The State Party informed the Secretariat that appropriate action is being taken to repair Silbury Hill and safeguard it from further damage. Furthermore, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that the existence of the pit at the top of the Hill had been known for many years and it was not considered a threat to stability until it began to widen under the impact of the unusually heavy rainfall earlier this year. ICOMOS is of the opinion that both the technical and archaeological problems are being addressed as matters of urgency and that the long-term future of the monument is not threatened.

III.209 The British Ministry of Culture has informed the Secretariat that the seismic survey commissioned for Silbury had been carried out, and that its results which are presently being analysed, will be transmitted to the Centre together with proposals for the restoration of the monument, as soon as possible.

III.210 The Bureau noted the information transmitted by the State Party concerning the planning and the protection of the site of Stonehenge. The Bureau also noted the views of the State Party and ICOMOS on Silbury Hill which is part of the World Heritage site. It requested the State Party to work in close consultation with the Centre and ICOMOS regarding the planning and protection of the site and to present a progress report to the Bureau at its next session in April 2002.

Arab States

M'Zab Valley (Algeria)

III.211 The Secretariat informed the Bureau on the findings of the mission sent to the M'Zab Valley in September 2001. The expert reported on the adverse impact on the built and natural environment of the site of the significant socio-economic changes, which occurred in the Valley over the past decades. As adequate protective legislation is lacking, the report stressed the need to urgently provide assistance to the Algerian authorities in establishing appropriate protective mechanisms for the various *ksour*. In this respect, the Secretariat also informed the Bureau of the requests for International Assistance submitted by the State Party of Algeria, currently under review, for the organization of training activities and for technical co-operation, aimed at improving the management of the site.

III.212 The Bureau invited the State Party to co-operate with the Centre in the elaboration of a Development and Safeguarding Plan for the M'Zab Valley. The implementation of International Assistance, based on international experience and respecting the local artisan traditions, for on-the-job training on conservation techniques should also be initiated.

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)

III.213 The Secretariat confirmed to the Bureau that, according to recent information received orally from the Director of the Algerian Heritage Department, the site has not been particularly affected by the torrential rains of November 2001. The Bureau was also informed on the findings of the expert mission sent to the Kasbah of Algiers in September 2001.

III.214 The expert reported on the worrying deterioration process and lack of maintenance affecting the site, due to the progressive replacement of the original population with inhabitants of poorer condition from the countryside, combined with the absence of a protective legislation. Further to the abrogation of the old law by the new 1998 legislation, the development of a new Safeguarding Plan was entrusted to local urban planning firms by the authorities. This Plan, however, has not yet been completed. Further to the expert mission, the State Party submitted two requests for International Assistance, currently under review, for the organization of training activities, aimed at improving the management of the site.

III.215 The Bureau invited the State Party to co-operate with the Centre in the elaboration of a Development and Safeguarding Plan for the Kasbah of Algiers, and in the implementation of the International Assistance for training activities on conservation techniques and management of the built heritage.

Archaeological Site of Tipasa (Algeria)

III.216 The Secretariat reported on the findings of a visit to the site, carried out last September by an international expert, in preparation for the Emergency Assistance approved by the Bureau at its last session of June 2001. During this visit, the problems raised in the Periodic Report submitted by the State Party were reviewed and detailed terms of reference for the team of international experts identified.

III.217 A major concern is the Safeguarding and Presentation Plan for the site, prepared in 1992 with support from the Committee, which apparently is not implemented. As a result, new buildings have been constructed within the buffer zone, while the threats deriving from erosion and salt winds are not yet under control. Another issue is the impact on the site of over 140,000 visitors per year, mainly schools from the nearby city of Algiers, which is causing damage to the fragile archaeological structures.

III.218 The Bureau recommended to the Algerian authorities to implement without delay the 1992 Safeguarding and Presentation Plan, to reduce pressure on the site. Furthermore, the Algerian authorities were invited to keep the World Heritage Centre fully informed of any project or development concerning the site of Tipasa, and submit all studies for approval before their implementation.

Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)

III.219 The Secretariat informed the Bureau on the findings of the ICOMOS mission to Cairo in August 2001, to evaluate the current restoration projects, and reported on the mission headed by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in September 2001.

III.220 On the major restoration campaign presently being implemented in Cairo, with a total of 150 interventions foreseen within a period of eight years and 48 monuments currently under restoration, the ICOMOS report emphasized a number of issues of concern. The main remarks concerned the need to strengthen co-ordination among the various institutions involved in the rehabilitation of the site; the importance of adopting a comprehensive Master Plan with clear land-use and building regulations; the necessity to ensure a compatible use and proper management mechanisms for restored monuments; and the overall issue of the varying quality of the projects and work being executed, with a tendency towards 'complete restoration', as opposed to conservation of signs of age and patina that has resulted from wear and tear.

III.221 In addition, the report stressed the need for a larger public awareness of the objectives of the restoration campaign, and for specific training on conservation for the professional staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, mostly composed of archaeologists, architects and

engineers, taking into account the unprecedented scale and number of restoration projects.

III.222 The Secretariat then informed the Bureau of a series of specific actions, to be partially funded through the Egyptian Funds-in-Trust at UNESCO, that the WHC and the Egyptian authorities agreed to implement together, in order to address the above issues. These actions include:

- An International Seminar on the conservation of Historic Cairo, with multi-disciplinary planning workshops focused on specific projects, to be organized in early 2002. Periodic reviewing seminars of the current projects will also be held;
- The establishment within the premises of a restored monument, of a permanent Information Centre on Historic Cairo World Heritage site and current conservation efforts;
- The preparation of a Conservation Manual, with technical specifications and detailed descriptions of the types of work most commonly required for the conservation and maintenance of historic buildings within the city of Cairo.

III.223 The Delegate of Egypt thanked the Secretariat and ICOMOS for their co-operation, but strongly protested about the leakage of the ICOMOS mission report to the Egyptian press that occurred before its official transmission to the Egyptian authorities, and the letter written by the ICOMOS President to the First Lady of Egypt, Madam Suzanne Mubarak, which he claimed, referred in an exaggerated manner, to the poor state of conservation of Historic Cairo. On this latter point, he requested an official apology from ICOMOS. The Egyptian Delegate also expressed some reservations on the content of the ICOMOS report, and stated that the Egyptian authorities were not provided the opportunity to review it thoroughly with the Centre and ICOMOS. Recalling that Historic Cairo has over 600 listed monuments, he questioned the completeness of the evaluation made by ICOMOS and the conclusions contained in the report. He then reiterated the Egyptian authorities' readiness to continue co-operating with UNESCO and the WHC, in addition to the initiatives mentioned above, to ensure the appropriate monitoring of the site. Finally, the Delegate of Egypt expressed the wish that the future denomination of the site be, from now on, "Historic Cairo", to better represent its composite, multicultural heritage.

III.224 The Bureau commended the State Party for its great efforts towards the rehabilitation of Historic Cairo, for co-operating with the Centre in monitoring the state of conservation of the site, and particularly for supporting the three above-mentioned actions in collaboration with the WHC. The Bureau also encouraged the State Party:

- to improve co-ordination among concerned institutions within Historic Cairo and to elaborate a comprehensive institutional framework which would ensure a better management of the site;

- to institutionalise the trend, recently emerged, whereby appropriate and compatible functions for non-religious buildings and future management mechanisms are determined, before starting any restoration works on a monument;
- to ensure consistency in the quality of all restoration works, in compliance with recognized international standards;
- to invest, as a matter of urgency, adequate resources towards the capacity-building in the area of architectural conservation for the staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, to enable a more effective management of the restoration campaign;
- to continue the periodic monitoring of the restoration works, in close consultation with the WHC.

Abu Mena (Egypt)

III.225 The Secretariat reported on the findings of a visit to the site, headed last September by the Director of the World Heritage Centre. A land-reclamation programme for the agricultural development of the region, funded by the World Bank, has caused in the past ten years a dramatic rise in the water table. The local soil, which is exclusively clay, is hard and capable of supporting buildings when in a dry state, but becomes semi-liquid with excess water. The destruction of numerous cisterns, disseminated around the city, has entailed the collapse of several overlying structures. Huge underground cavities have opened in the north-western region of the town. The risk of collapse is so high that the authorities were forced to fill with sand the bases of some of the most endangered buildings, including the crypt of Abu Mena with the tomb of the Saint, and close them to the public. A large banked road, moreover, was built to enable movement within the site. The Supreme Council of Antiquities is trying to counteract this phenomenon by digging trenches, and has enlarged the listed area in the hope of lowering the pressure of the irrigation. These measures, however, have proved to be insufficient, taking into account the scale of the problem and the limited resources available.

III.226 The Delegate of Egypt explained that, while the constant need for arable land in the country (only 6% of its territory) totally justifies this irrigation scheme, an appropriate drainage mechanism had not been provided at the time of the project, thus causing the rise in the ground water level. He then recalled that a large Monastery, visited by thousands of people every week, lies east of the site, adding to the problem. Conscious of the gravity of the situation, the Delegate of Egypt thanked the Centre for its support and expressed his agreement on the proposed inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Chairperson commended the positive attitude of Egypt for this important step which, he recalled, is aimed exclusively at assisting the State Party in identifying and implementing the necessary corrective measures for the safeguarding of the values of the site.

III.227 The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee decides to inscribe Abu Mena on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the Egyptian authorities to co-ordinate with all the competent national institutions and the Centre, in view to rapidly identify the necessary corrective measures to ensure the safeguarding of the site.”

Tyre (Lebanon)

III.228 The Bureau was informed of the recent decisions taken by the Lebanese authorities, specified in an official letter from the Director-General of the Antiquities Department to the Centre on 5 October 2001, on the proposed Tourism Marina project and Urban Master Plan.

III.229 A Feasibility Study on the Tourist Marina project was to evaluate three possible options: 1) the rehabilitation and up-grading of the existing Tyre Port; 2) the extension of the existing Tyre Port; and 3) the construction of a new port in Mheilib, three kms north of Tyre. The Lebanese authorities have confirmed that the first option (rehabilitation and up-grading of existing port structures) will be retained, in line with the recommendations of the Centre. The latter, however, conditioned its approval to the accomplishment by the Lebanese authorities of the following:

- Full underwater survey inside the harbour;
- Limiting to the maximum of 30 the number of boats docking in the tourist marina;
- Using the marina project as an opportunity to upgrade the fishing port with the creation of amenities for fishermen and locations for the interpretation and presentation of the underwater heritage of Tyre.

III.230 As concerns the Master Plan, the Department of Antiquities confirmed the listing and protection, within the territory of Tyre, of vast areas around the main archaeological sites. These areas will be mostly surrounded by agricultural land, with building coefficients limited to 5%. The definition of the land-use for all other areas belonging to the State will be frozen until completion of the archaeological survey.

III.231 The Secretariat also informed the Bureau of a recent mission to Lebanon carried out by the World Heritage Centre, to review the scope of a proposed large World Bank Cultural Heritage and Tourism Development project, with a significant component for the site of Tyre (as well as for the World Heritage sites of Baalbek and Byblos). As the relevant documents are still under preparation, the Secretariat will inform the Bureau on the potential implications of this project for the site of Tyre and other Lebanese World Heritage sites at its next session, in April 2002.

III.232 The Bureau commended the Lebanese authorities on the important decisions taken for the safeguarding of the World Heritage site of Tyre, and recommended that, prior to any building activity within the ancient port, in

line with the provisions of the *Operational Guidelines*, reports and detailed projects be transmitted to the Centre for submission to the Committee. In relation to the proposed World Bank project, the Bureau invited the Lebanese authorities to continue co-ordinating with the Centre in its finalization and future implementation.

Ksar Ait ben Haddou (Morocco)

III.233 The Secretariat recalled that a mission report dated August 2000 expressed strong concerns for the state of conservation of the site, and had formulated a number of urgent recommendations for its safeguarding. These recommendations included:

- Status of the site at the national level: finalising the listing process of the site, including private properties;
- Strengthening the capacities of the Centre for the Conservation and Rehabilitation of the Southern Kasbahs (CERKAS), responsible for the site;
- Creating a management commission for the site;
- Creating a working group to elaborate a Management Plan;
- Completing the Management Plan by the end of 2001.

III.234 The report also recommended the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

III.235 The Bureau was also reminded that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session, in Cairns, the Chairperson of the Committee made it clear that, should the proposed actions not be achieved by the end of 2001, the Moroccan authorities would submit a request for inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A report on the progress of the activities was also due for submission to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Centre has so far not received such a report. During a private visit to Ksar Ait Ben Haddou carried out in August 2001, the same expert, author of the first report, found that the above-mentioned actions had not been completed and that a Management Plan for the site had not been prepared.

III.236 The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee, for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee, pending consultation with the State Party concerned, decides to inscribe Ksar Ait Ben Haddou on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and encourages the Moroccan authorities to submit a request of International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund, aimed to finalize a conservation and management plan for the site. The Committee, furthermore, requests the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2002, a report on the progress on the recommendations made in the report of August 2000”.

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)

III.237 The Secretariat reported on the very worrying state of conservation of the site, which, despite the positive achievements of the 1986 International Safeguarding

Campaign for the Old City of Sana'a, is presently affected by an uncontrolled urban development, in the absence of an adequate protective mechanism.

III.238 The historical market area (*Souk*), which serves now a much larger community than it used to only ten years ago, is spreading outside its traditional borders towards the adjacent residential areas, with a significant impact on the lower levels' structure of these ancient buildings. Numerous new constructions are also being built within the walls of the Old City, using modern structures and materials. These constructions include several high-rise constructions, the height of which is in excess by several storeys, of the level of other parts of the Old City. On the other hand, most traditional houses are not properly maintained by the present inhabitants, mainly tenants who recently moved into the city from the villages, due to lack of financial means.

III.239 The Bureau encouraged the Yemeni authorities to submit a request for International Assistance to the Committee, to enable the preparation of a comprehensive Safeguarding Plan for the Old City of Sana'a, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau, furthermore, invites the Yemeni authorities to consider the opportunity to take urgent measures in order to halt new constructions, modern additions or alterations within the traditional urban fabric of the Old City, until such a Safeguarding Plan has been prepared and adopted.

Africa

No state of conservation reports. The state of the World Heritage in Africa, 2001, will be presented to the Committee.

Asia and the Pacific

The Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple Monastery, Lhasa (China)

III.240 The Bureau recalled that the state of conservation of the Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple of Lhasa had been examined by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session and again at the twenty-fifth session by the Bureau. The Bureau took note of the urban development, expansion of tourism related facilities, deterioration of architectural structures and mural painting conservation issues which continue to affect the world heritage values of the property.

III.241 The Bureau was informed that a fact-finding UNESCO Mission was undertaken by a Centre staff with the Chinese authorities in November 2001. This mission noted with appreciation that the restoration of the southeastern wall of the Potala Palace, which collapsed partially in August 2001 due to rainfall, was underway. Concerning the 35 meter high tower commemorating the “Peaceful Liberation of Tibet”, the UNESCO Mission verified that the new construction was located outside the World Heritage protective zones, at the south end of the new Potala Square.

III.242 The Observer of China expressed her Government's appreciation to the World Heritage Committee, its Bureau, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre for their continued concern and support for the conservation of Tibetan cultural heritage. In relation to the Bureau's request at its twenty-fifth session for information concerning policies for international co-operation for conservation programmes benefiting the World Heritage protected areas in Lhasa, the Observer of China assured the Bureau that the authorities wholeheartedly welcomed international co-operation, a policy consistent with the national "open door" policy. However, she informed the Bureau that Tibet is an autonomous region where all international co-operation activities must be undertaken with the request and support from the local authorities, involving local experts to the extent possible.

III.243 The Bureau expressed its appreciation to the Chinese authorities for facilitating the UNESCO mission to the Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple in Lhasa in November 2001. Recalling its recommendation to the authorities to consider the organization of a mural painting conservation workshop, the Bureau noted with appreciation that the Central Government of China had decided to allocate approximately US\$25 million for the second phase of the Potala Palace Rehabilitation Project. This funding, expected to be utilized in 2002, would be allocated for the consolidation of the Norbulingka Gardens, the Saja Temple, as well as for the conservation of the mural paintings within the Potala Palace and Norbulingka Temple.

III.244 The Bureau, assured by the Observer of China that her Government continues to support the work of the Lhasa Cultural Relics Bureau for the inventorying and mapping of the "construction restriction zones", nevertheless encouraged the Chinese authorities to consider requesting international technical assistance for supporting this important activity. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the progress made in the restoration of the collapsed wall for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session.

Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (China)

III.245 The Bureau recalled that the Committee had examined at its twenty-third session, the findings of the ICOMOS-ICCROM Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian in 1999, organized upon request for international assistance submitted by the Chinese authorities to improve the on-site museum. The Bureau noted that the 1999 mission noted the need to establish a regular monitoring system and to enhance overall conservation and management of the site to mitigate ascertained or potential negative impact caused by uncontrolled tourism activities, uncontrolled mining and quarrying activities, and industrial pollution. The Bureau was informed that the Centre had not received further information concerning the measures taken to address the 1999 mission recommendations endorsed by the

Committee concerning the elaboration of a comprehensive conservation and management plan.

III.246 The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Bureau that during a recent mission, ICOMOS noted that the situation on-site had improved since 1999. The Representative of ICOMOS expressed his surprise to have been informed that UNESCO was organizing an *International Training Course on the Preservation, Conservation and Management of Zhoukoudian and Sangiran Prehistoric World Heritage Sites*, taking into consideration the dissimilarity of the two sites.

III.247 The Observer of China informed the Bureau that the root cause for insufficient management and conservation at the Zhoukoudian property was the fact that the scientific agency designated at present was the Chinese Academy of Sciences, which does not have the administrative authority for comprehensively managing the site. She stated that her Government was currently considering taking necessary actions to transfer the administrative and managerial responsibility to the most appropriate government authority to ensure that the concerns of the Committee are addressed.

III.248 The Bureau, noting with appreciation the new information presented by the Observer of China, requested the State Party to inform the Committee on the actions taken since the 1999 ICOMOS-ICCROM Joint Mission for examination at its twenty-sixth session, especially with regard to the establishment of a systematic low-cost monitoring system for the entire site. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to elaborate, in co-operation with the Centre, an international assistance request for the development of a comprehensive conservation and management plan for the site. Finally, the Bureau requested the Centre to assist the State Party in submitting a state of conservation report for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

Ajanta Caves (India)

Ellora Caves (India)

III.249 The Bureau recalled that both Ajanta and Ellora Caves face long-term progressive structural deterioration due to the nature of the caves carved within overbearing cliffs. The Bureau was informed that the Indian authorities have been taking conservation and preventive measures to control the micro-climate within the caves, to increase the quality of visitor experience and simultaneously to decrease negative impact caused by tourists and pilgrimage activities. The Bureau also took note of the needs identified by the national authorities to establish appropriate codes for the restoration and conservation of sculptures and wall paintings within the Caves.

III.250 The Centre informed the Bureau that a Reactive Monitoring Mission by an international wall painting expert was taking place between 1-9 December 2001 following a request by the authorities to examine the state of conservation of the mural paintings. The main objective of this expert mission is to enable the national

conservation experts to consider various conservation measures following international standards for long-term protection and presentation of the paintings.

III.251 Finally, the Bureau was informed that the Centre was assisting the authorities in the organization of a conservation and management workshop to be undertaken in 2002 for the Ajanta and Ellora Caves, that would bring together all the concerned stakeholders to exchange views on conservation and management of these unique properties. The objective of the workshop would be to review and integrate the various tourism and site-enhancement development plans into a comprehensive conservation and development plan.

III.252 The Bureau congratulated the Indian authorities for their efforts for the conservation, management and development of the Ajanta and Ellora Caves. The Bureau, noting the World Heritage Centre's continued assistance to the authorities in enhancing co-operation between the numerous national and international conservation and development activities, decided to examine further information at its twenty-sixth session.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

III.253 The Bureau recalled that the Committee had:

- examined the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley in twenty-one sessions of the Committee and its Bureau since 1992;
- debated on the inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at each session upon examining the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Mission, the 1998 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Nepal Mission, and the reports submitted by the State Party on progress made in the implementation of the 16-point recommendation adopted by the Committee in 1993 and the 55 Recommendations for Enhanced Management and Time-Bound Action Plan for Corrective Measures adopted by the State Party in 1998;
- dispatched a High Level Mission in September 2000 headed by the former Chairperson of the Committee, and comprising the current Chairperson, the Director of the World Heritage Centre among others, for consultations with His Majesty's Government of Nepal at the highest level on the merits of the in-danger listing as a tool for conservation;
- noted the conclusion of the High Level Mission which stated that whilst the major monuments were in good state of conservation, should no new measures be undertaken, the deterioration of the historic urban fabric will persist, irreversibly damaging the traditional architecture surrounding the public monuments, and consequently undermine the world heritage values of this unique and universally significant site;
- expressed its disappointment at the twenty-fourth session, that the State Party was not convinced of the constructive objectives of the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a mechanism for strengthening further political commitment and mobilizing international

technical co-operation and greater awareness at both national and international levels, and underlined the need to ensure the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, its Committee and the World Heritage List, while effectively implementing the mechanisms provided under the Convention in safeguarding the World Heritage properties, especially when the threats are ascertained and the process in the loss of the world heritage values have already occurred; but,

- decided to defer inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until 2002 in view of the State Party's strong desire to avoid inscription on this List.

III.254 The Bureau examined new information concerning:

- the demolition of the Saraswati Nani Temple within the World Heritage protected area of Patan Darban Square Monument Zone by the Guthi Samthan, the local guardians and owners of this public building; total reconstruction of the Temple reportedly using inappropriate new building material; removal and disappearance of the unique and exquisitely carved struts originally adorning this Temple. This Temple was included in the Kathmandu Valley Protective Inventory and figure in the 1979 nomination dossier submitted by HMG of Nepal;
- demolition of several historic buildings or illegal additions within the Seven Monuments Zones of Kathmandu Valley. A photo of an example of a typical illegal addition of a new floor with cantilevers to a historic building was shown.

III.255 The Centre informed the Bureau that a progress report prepared by the Government of Nepal requested by the Committee was received on 8 December 2001. Neither the Centre nor the Bureau had sufficient time to examine the content of the report.

III.256 The Observer of Nepal, headed by the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Civil Aviation, reiterated her Government's strong commitment to ensure the implementation of the 16 Recommendations of the 1993 Joint Mission, and the 55 Recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan resulting from the 1998 Joint Mission. She expressed her appreciation for the favourable response to requests for technical and financial assistance which the Committee and UNESCO had been providing for Kathmandu Valley since the 1970s. With regard to the demolition of Saraswati Nani Temple, the Observer stated that the poor condition of the building necessitated demolition and reconstruction and assured the Bureau that traditional building material and techniques were being used.

III.257 During the ensuing debate, the Delegate of Thailand sought clarifications on:

- whether the Heritage Conservation Unit for controlling development and preventing illegal alterations and demolitions of historic buildings as well as new constructions had been established;
- actions taken to implement the long-standing recommendation from 1993, repeated in 1998, to

control illegal demolition or alterations within the World Heritage protected areas; and

- the application of existing legal provisions, rules and regulations which would prevent illegal development within Kathmandu Valley.

III.258 The Chairperson underscored the complexity of the site, and emphasized that the principal cause of concern is the difficulty in conserving the historic urban fabric, as the public monuments are in generally good condition. He noted with appreciation, the efforts made by the Government authorities in raising awareness of the local communities, which was essential in reversing the deterioration process of the vernacular architecture surrounding the public monuments.

III.259 The Deputy Director of the Centre informed the Bureau that since 1993, the main focus of UNESCO's support had been to build national capacities which started from support in strengthening protective legislation followed by over three years of on-the-job training in the establishment and enforcement of regulations concerning demolition and building permits, heritage resource mapping and inventory, as well as pilot conservation projects to demonstrate good practice, all financed from the World Heritage Fund and other extrabudgetary resources mobilized by the Centre. The Bureau was reminded of the information provided to the Committee in 1999 that the services of the trained development control officers had been terminated in 1999 by the then Director-General of Archaeology.

III.260 The Delegate of South Africa, recognizing the continued difficulties encountered in Kathmandu Valley by the authorities, which was part of the realities of developing States, stressed the need for international solidarity. She suggested that the Centre support the Nepali authorities in addressing the challenges in urban heritage protection through establishing city-to-city co-operation with local authorities of developing countries.

III.261 The Deputy Director recalled, for the benefit of the new members of the Bureau, that Kathmandu Valley had been the subject of a UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign since 1979, and had benefited from over US\$350,000 provided from the World Heritage Fund and other sources mobilized by the Centre in institutional capacity building to enhance management for conservation. Regarding the city-to-city co-operation, the Bureau was informed that the Centre had brokered decentralized co-operation between UK local authorities (Chester and Bath) and several municipal authorities of the Kathmandu Valley and exchanges were initiated in 1999-2000. The Bureau was also informed that the European Union approved earlier this year under its EU-Asia Urbs Programme, a co-financing of Euro 500,000 for a project involving Chester and Patan. Another request is under preparation involving Bath (UK), Tours (France) and three small local authorities of Kathmandu Valley. Such activities aim at increasing the capacity of the authorities concerned in integrating conservation and management

measures within the integrated urban and tourism development planning process.

III.262 The Deputy Director drew the attention of the Bureau to the need to enhance development control and monitoring capacities at both the national and local levels, and the strong political commitment required to enforce the protective legislation to protect and conserve the privately-owned historic buildings located within the seven monumental zones of this site. She indicated that the multiplication of small-scale illegal operations which individually may not seem grave, has led to the transformation of the historic urban fabric even within the relatively small area of the protected zones surrounding the monuments. If allowed to continue, as tangibly demonstrated in the Baudhanath Monuments Zone, where 90 traditional buildings had been reduced to 15 by 1998, the World Heritage site of Kathmandu Valley will be reduced to a collection of public historic monuments decontextualized from its surrounding historic urban fabric.

III.263 The Director of the World Heritage Centre drew the attention of the Bureau to the Committee decision at its twenty-fourth session:

- to allow two more years for the Nepalese authorities to further implement the corrective measures against urban encroachment and alteration of the historic fabric in the seven Monument Zones to safeguard its integrity and authenticity; and
- to review the state of conservation and decide on future actions to be taken by the Committee within the context of the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Reporting exercise in 2002.

III.264 The Bureau recommended that another High Level Mission be undertaken prior to the finalization of the Periodic Report for the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley. The Bureau recommended that the Committee examine the state of conservation of this property at its twenty-fifth session.

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)

III.265 The Bureau recalled that it had regularly examined since 1999, the state of conservation of the Maya Devi Temple within Lumbini, a centre of pilgrimage for the international Buddhist community with a fragile archaeological site of historical significance. The Bureau noted that the property was the subject of four Reactive Monitoring Missions in 2000 and 2001, organized by the Centre at the request of the Bureau or the State Party. It was also recalled that an International Technical Meeting for the Conservation, Presentation and Development of the Maya Devi Temple took place in April 2001 with financial and technical support from the World Heritage Fund and UNESCO.

III.266 The Bureau's attention was drawn to the findings of the two missions undertaken in July and September 2001 by a UNESCO international brick conservation

expert. This expert witnessed the inundation of the Maya Devi Temple archaeological remains during the heavy monsoon period. It was found that the fluctuation of the water table was clearly eroding the archaeological remains of the Maya Devi Temple. The Centre informed the Bureau that since August 2001, an activity financed from the World Heritage Fund was being conducted by the national authorities and the University of Bradford (U.K.) to compile basic information to assess pilgrimage activities, environmental factors and to identify high or low-importance archaeological areas through non-destructive geophysical surveys.

III.267 The Centre informed the Bureau that the situation called for serious remedial measures based upon careful assessment and analysis of the heritage assets and usage of the pilgrimage property, prior to the implementation of drainage and construction activities. The Bureau was informed that it was essential to plan intervention only after the completion of the non-destructive geophysical survey, environmental and visitation analyses were complete.

III.268 The Delegates of Greece and Hungary, having reviewed the state of conservation of the property and noting the erosion of the archaeological remains, incoherent landscaping of the sacred garden, and serious drainage problems of the site, expressed their alarm for this endangered property which clearly required urgent conservation. The Delegate of Greece, drawing the attention of the Bureau to Article 6.1 of the World Heritage Convention, underscored the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate to protect this common heritage and called for consideration in the future for possible inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegate of Thailand, sharing concern over the condition of the property, noted with appreciation the willingness of the Government of Nepal to collaborate closely with UNESCO, international experts and the World Heritage Committee in improving the state of conservation of the property. He therefore recommended continued consultation with the State Party rather than immediately considering the inscription of Lumbini on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

III.269 The Representative of ICOMOS, the Delegate of South Africa, and the Observer of the United Kingdom underlined the importance for the authorities, international experts, and UNESCO to examine the results of the survey and base-line information analysis prior to the finalization of the plans for the drainage system, the designing of the "Golden Pavilion" shelter recommended by the April 2001 International Technical Meeting, the conservation of the Maya Devi Temple and planning of the pilgrimage circuit within the core zone of the property.

III.270 The Observer of Nepal expressed her Government's deep appreciation for the continued technical and financial support extended by the World Heritage Committee, international experts and the World Heritage Centre. She assured the Bureau that her Government was taking the appropriate steps in

compliance with international conservation norms to ensure that all conservation and presentation interventions were planned after careful consideration of the long term impact such measures would have on the site. She appealed to the Bureau to take note of the political commitment of her Government to the appropriate management of this politically sensitive, religious archaeological site visited by thousands of pilgrims from the international Buddhist community.

III.271 The Bureau, taking note of the information presented by the Secretariat and the national authorities, expressed appreciation to the Government of Nepal, the international experts, and UNESCO for closely co-operating to determine the most appropriate conservation method for the Maya Devi Temple and Lumbini World Heritage property. The Bureau commended the national authorities for the efforts made with UNESCO to compile and analyse information concerning the heritage assets and utilization of this property, necessary to elaborate the guiding principles for the conservation of this fragile but important pilgrimage site. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party and the Centre to report to the Committee at its twenty-sixth session on the state of conservation of the site and the final plans for addressing the drainage problem, shelter options, and long-term presentation and conservation of the Maya Devi Temple.

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)

III.272 The Bureau, recalling previous discussion concerning the state of conservation of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, examined new information contained in WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.5, the report of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission organized in September 2001 in close co-operation with the national authorities. The Centre informed the Bureau that the Philippine authorities had nominated the property for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested international assistance to address the conservation issues facing the site.

III.273 The Observer of the Philippines informed the Bureau that his Government welcomes and considers the inscription of the Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger, not as a dishonour but on the contrary, as an essential tool for mobilizing effective, decisive and rapid intervention for addressing the threats facing an endangered World Heritage property. Referring to the letter dated 26 November 2001 from the Minister of Tourism and Culture and the Chairperson of the Banaue Rice Terrace Task Force addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Observer confirmed his Government's desire for the inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

III.274 The Bureau was informed of the concurrence of the Government of the Philippines with the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission. In order to address the

recommendations of this Mission, the Government of the Philippines was now taking steps to:

- Develop sustainable tourism;
- Establish a permanent and effective body to coordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the property;
- Involve all stakeholders including national government agencies, congressmen, provincial governors, representatives of municipalities, and private individuals in the re-evaluation and updating of the existing management plan for the protection of the site.

III.275 The Observer of the Philippines underscored that the Rice Terraces was a living monument built 1,000 years ago by the genius of the indigenous Ifugao people. Drawing the attention of the Bureau to the recently adopted *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* which encompasses the promotion and protection of indigenous cultures, the Observer of the Philippines expressed his Government's hope that the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and its Bureau would favourably endorse the request for international assistance for addressing the conservation and management issues of this traditionally owned and utilized property. Underlining the need to take all necessary measures to reverse the rapidly deteriorating rice terraces, the Observer of the Philippines called upon the Bureau to support the international assistance as a matter of the greatest urgency.

III.276 The Representative of ICOMOS, noting that this property was the first organic cultural landscape to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, drew the attention of the Bureau to the vulnerability of properties such as the Rice Terraces, where the relationship between human land-use and the environment is continuously evolving. He underlined the importance of learning from the experience of the authorities in their efforts to overcome the difficulties faced in sustainably-managing the fragile cultural resources of this property.

III.277 The Bureau recommended the following decision for adoption by the Committee:

“The Committee expresses its appreciation to the Philippine authorities for facilitating the September 2001 IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the World Heritage site of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, as requested by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in December 2000. The Committee examines the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS mission and notes with deep concern that:

- The Banaue Rice Terraces Task Force (BRTTF) and the Ifugao Terraces Commission (ITC) have tried to safeguard the property. However, the BRTTF lacks full Government support and needs more resources, greater independence and an assurance of permanence.

- About 25-30% of the terraces are now abandoned, which has led to damage to some of the walls. This has arisen because parts of the irrigation system have been neglected, which in turn is due to people leaving the area. The situation is also aggravated by the effects of pest species of worms and snails.
- Despite good planning, irregular development is taking place, which threatens to erode the heritage landscape.
- International assistance has so far not been mobilized to help the area.
- The World Heritage values may be lost unless current trends are reversed within 10 years (maximum).
- Little progress has been made in addressing the needs of tourism. For example, access from Manila and within the property remains poor.

The Committee therefore endorses the following recommendations made by the IUCN/ICOMOS mission:

- Establish a permanent and effective body to coordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the Ifugao Rice Terraces.
- Develop a short and long-term strategy for support funding for the Rice Terraces, drawn from national and international sources and from tourism.
- Identify and implement a programme initiative to remedy past neglect of the rice terraces and ensure optimum prospects for future.
- Develop a sustainable tourism industry that supports the future conservation of the rice terraces, placing priority on improving access to and within the site.
- Review existing management plans for further improvement.
- Establish an exchange programme with other World Heritage sites which share similar conservation challenges.

The Committee commends the positive reaction of the Philippines authorities towards the IUCN/ICOMOS mission recommendations and requests that they examine ways and means of implementing these recommendations.

Taking into due consideration the conservation challenges and threats facing the property, the Committee decides to inscribe the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee commends the Philippine authorities for nominating this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, demonstrating positive use of this important mechanism within the World Heritage Convention to mobilise international and national support to address the conservation challenges facing this site.

Finally, the Committee requests the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Bangkok Office to continue assisting the authorities in the elaboration of a long-term comprehensive management plan for the site. The Committee requests that a progress report on measures taken to elaborate the management plan and to enhance the conservation and development of the property be submitted for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.”

Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)

III.278 The Bureau recalled that it had requested the Government of Sri Lanka to reconsider the proposed expansion of the Sigiriya airport which would impact negatively on the fragile structure of the monument, wall paintings as well as the flora and fauna of the natural reserves surrounding the property. The Centre presented updated information received from the Sri Lankan authorities by letter of 7 December 2001 to the Bureau. Accordingly, the Government of Sri Lanka had decided to accept the recommendations of the UNESCO Reactive Monitoring Mission, organized at the request of the Government authorities:

- Not to shift the operations from the Katunayake Airport to Sigiriya Airport;
- To continue using the present airstrip at Kimbissa only for light aircraft and not for military aircraft;
- To construct a military airport at a distance from the Sigiriya World Heritage property, in Habarana, where there are no archaeological sites nearby.

III.279 The Bureau expressed its appreciation to the Government of Sri Lanka for its decision not to expand the military airport within 2 kilometers of the Sigiriya, which would have negatively impacted upon the World Heritage property. In particular, the Bureau took note with appreciation of the commitment expressed by the Government of Sri Lanka to the World Heritage Convention. The Bureau welcomed with deep satisfaction, this decision taken by the authorities, despite the national security concerns, which demonstrates the importance attached to the safeguarding of this irreplaceable World Heritage site.

Latin American and the Caribbean

Brasilia (Brazil)

III.280 The Bureau was informed that, following its request at the twenty-fourth extraordinary session in December 2000, and in the light of the report submitted by the State Party, a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission took place from 5 to 9 November 2001. Twenty specific recommendations were formulated regarding legal framework, local and territorial Master Plans, specific issues related to the conservation and boundaries of the site.

III.281 The Observer of Brazil noted with satisfaction the report on the state of conservation of the site of Brasilia.

The Bureau noted the report of the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission. It supported the view of the mission that, although changes have occurred to the original concept of the core of the city, the *Plano Piloto*, the city maintains to date, the values on the basis of which the *Plano Piloto* was inscribed on the World Heritage List and meets the test of authenticity and integrity.

III.282 The Bureau endorsed the conclusion of the mission that the city is in a critical phase of change and that this process of change needs to be guided with sensibility and vision and a profound understanding and recognition of the characteristics and values of the exceptional urban and architectural creation of Costa and Niemeyer.

III.283 To this effect, it will be necessary to involve all relevant levels of authority, professional organizations and individuals as well as different sectors of society in a process that should lead to the preparation and adoption of a Master Plan for the protected area that fully recognises and ensures the preservation of the values of the city. The protective documents of 1987 (Federal District) and 1990/1992 (IPHAN) as well as the work accomplished by various inter-institutional working groups (*Grupo de Trabalho Brasilia*, 1980-1987; *Grupo de Trabalho Conjunto*, 1992-1995) should form the basis for the work that should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

III.284 The Bureau requested the Government of Brazil to consider the report of the mission and its conclusions and recommendations and to submit a report on the response it plans to give to each of them by 1 February 2002. The state of conservation of Brasilia will be examined again at the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

Colonial City of Santo-Domingo (Dominican Republic)

III.285 The Bureau was informed that World Heritage Centre had received information from the Cultural Heritage Office of the Dominican Republic about building activities in Santo Domingo. The State Party requested an ICOMOS advisory mission to discuss the building project. The mission was fielded in August 2001. During the mission, ICOMOS found that a private international hotel chain, acting under a concession given by the previous government of the State Party, was in the process of extending a pre-existing hotel use from three to five buildings, all of which have remnants that date from the 16th century, the earliest settlement period. Original construction of the buildings is attributed to Nicolas de Ovando, founder of Santo Domingo.

III.286 Conceptually, ICOMOS stated, that it was clear that the functional requirements of the proposed new use were incompatible with the existing layout of the buildings. The project's feasibility determinations require far more room than is available in the site. Space for the new functions was being created by incorporating and expanding two structures to the south, and by a massive three-storey deep excavation meant to accommodate partially underground construction (overlooking the river,

and abutting the palisade, which is the natural edge of the city), as well as above-ground construction. The programmatic demands for new construction might overwhelm and distort the existing historic fabric in the southern portion of the site. In conclusion, ICOMOS found that damage had already been caused to the historic fabric as well as to the historic urban cultural landscape:

- a) Walls dating from the 16th to 18th century were demolished in the two buildings being integrated in the hotel;
- b) Unrecorded archaeological material from the 16th to the 20th century was lost in the process of deep excavation;
- c) The massive excavation in the patio of the buildings had destroyed the last remaining natural part of the cliff facing the river.

III.287 More damage could be caused by the infra-structural difficulties to be anticipated due to the location of the hotel. A further point raised by ICOMOS was the lack of a reliable legal framework for interventions in the historic district that protect the State Party's heritage effectively. In addition, the Bureau was informed that the Centre had received oral information from the Oficina de Patrimonio Cultural of the State Party that the hotel project has been temporarily halted and that the Oficina had expressed its will to give adequate follow-up to the advisory mission report.

III.288 The Bureau commended the State Party on its initiative to request ICOMOS' advice. At the same time, however, it expressed its grave concerns about the damage already caused to the site through the building activities. It encouraged the State Party to take all possible measures to mitigate the impact of the project on the World Heritage values of the site. Furthermore, the Bureau advised the State Party to improve its heritage protection legislation to avoid comparable situations in the future. The Bureau requested the State party to furnish a report on the state of conservation of the property by 1 February 2002.

Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)

III.289 The Bureau was informed that, following a request by the State Party, an ICOMOS monitoring mission was carried out from 9 to 12 June 2001. The object of the mission was the proposed construction of a shopping centre in the historic town of Antigua. In fact, the project has been cancelled. However, the mission reported on cases of malfunction in the legislation, which are currently threatening the integrity of the city. The National authorities, very much aware of these problems, have announced that they plan to create a buffer zone, and to submit a request for international assistance for the preparation of a new legislation for Antigua. An emergency request following the earthquake damage is still pending.

III.290 The Bureau commended the State Party for the measures taken to safeguard the World Heritage values of Antigua Guatemala by preventing the construction of a

commercial centre within the boundaries of the site. It encouraged the national authorities to implement the recommendations made by the ICOMOS mission in June 2001, in particular the updating of the protective legislation and its Master Plan, which should include the definition of a buffer zone. Awareness-raising programmes are also to be encouraged. The Bureau furthermore encouraged the national authorities to work closely together with the World Heritage Centre concerning the points outlined above.

Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama)

III.291 The Bureau was informed that, following its request at the twenty-fifth session, a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 3 to 11 November 2001, to report on the recurrent physical and management conditions of the site.

III.292 The Bureau commended the State Party for the work already done in order to safeguard and protect the sites. It encouraged the national authorities to implement the recommendations made by the joint ICOMOS-UNESCO mission in November 2001. The Bureau highlighted the significance of the finalisation and implementation of management plans containing clear structuring of tasks and responsibilities and their explicit distribution amongst the various stakeholders of both sites. It noted that the importance of community involvement at all stages of the process has to be stressed. Special attention should furthermore be given to the following issues:

- Definition of values (statement of significance);
- Definition of sites' borders and buffer zones;
- Clarification of land tenure within and around the sites;
- Harmonisation of planned projects in and around the sites;
- Systematic assessment of the sites' conditions;
- Preparation of the sites for rising number of tourists.

III.293 The Bureau recognized the difficult financial and staffing situation of the National Institute of Culture (INAC) but encouraged INAC to valorise its leading role in the protection and promotion of the State Party's World Heritage sites. The Bureau requested the State Party to furnish a report on the state of implementation of the recommendations and the actions taken by 1 February 2002.

Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru)

III.294 The Bureau was informed of the progress achieved in the maintenance and conservation work carried out at the site. The Observer of Peru also informed the Bureau that the Peruvian authorities would present to the Bureau, in April 2002, a detailed report on progress made in the Master Plan and that a request for international assistance had just been submitted to identify priority activities to be undertaken for the stabilisation and preservation of the site.

III.295 The Bureau wished to acknowledge the great effort the State Party has made to submit a report on this site. However, it urged the State Party to deliver the reports in a timely fashion and in sufficient detail. The Bureau encouraged the national authorities to finalise and implement the Master Plan at the earliest possible date and furthermore encouraged the State Party to work closely together with the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau requested a detailed progress report on the actions taken at the site as well as on the progress in the elaboration and implementation of the Management Plan, to be submitted by 1 February 2002 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session.

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru)

III.296 The Bureau was informed of activities carried out since the earthquake. The State Party sent a report entitled "Evaluation of Damages in the Historical Centre of Arequipa following the 23 June 2001 earthquake and Draft Reconstruction Plan.

III.297 The emergency assistance approved by the Bureau as its twenty-fifth session is fully implemented, with the removal of rubble, the construction of a temporary roof for the Cathedral to protect it from rain damage, and the temporary stabilisation of the beams of the building. The first mission of an expert in rehabilitation and restoration was undertaken in July 2001 to assist the Municipality of Arequipa to revise the Master Plan in the light of the new situation, setting priority projects, defining a mechanism for the implementation of reconstruction and rehabilitation in the Historical Centre, and assisting the authorities in the formulation of a first project profile to be submitted to the IBD. A second mission, in August 2001, had as goal, the examination of the draft law for the creation of "The Reconstruction Fund for the Historical Centre and Monumental Area of Arequipa" and to "advise on the formulation of the emergency and urban reconstruction programme of Arequipa". Furthermore, the Bureau was informed that, following the earthquake, the management plan of the City has to be completely revised, that the creation of a management unit was still outstanding and that the Centre should carry out a mission at the beginning of 2002.

III.298 The Bureau was also informed of the mission carried out by ICCROM who immediately sent two Chilean experts in June 2001 to assist the Municipality of Arequipa's conservation laboratory for the safeguarding of the movable objects from the damaged monuments. Assistance was also provided to the Municipality of Arequipa by the Italian Government, the Spanish International Co-operation Agency and the City of Paris.

III.299 During the debate, the Observer of Peru, thanked the Bureau for the rapid response to the request for emergency assistance following the earthquake, and informed the Bureau of the content of the technical report that the Municipality of Arequipa had recently provided concerning the emergency work carried out for the consolidation of the Cathedral. He also informed that a

reconstruction plan was under preparation in line with the Master Plan.

III.300 The Bureau noted that the Observer of Peru would inform his national authorities of their recommendation to submit a request for emergency assistance for the preparation of a new Master Plan. It also noted the suggestions made by the Chairperson that the Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS contact the Embassy of Finland in Lima to ensure the implementation of the recommendations as well as the proposal made by the Delegate of Mexico to share experience gained by his country in the domain of risk preparedness.

III.301 The Bureau wished to take note of the quick response given by the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM. It also noted that following the earthquake a new management plan will have to be developed taking into account the different social, economic, political and religious sectors. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to request technical assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the preparation of this new plan and recommended that the Centre and ICCROM work jointly with national and regional professionals on risk preparedness activities. The State Party is requested to submit a report to the Bureau in 2003.

PART II Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for noting

NATURAL HERITAGE

Australian Fossil Mammal Sites (Riversleigh and Naracoorte) (Australia)

III.302 The Bureau was informed that IUCN had received several reports with regard to management problems of the Riversleigh section of this serial site. They pertain to the lack of infrastructure, such as on-site security and surveillance mechanisms, to deter vandalism or control tourism. Vandalism and theft are reported to have impacted one of the most important deposits - 'Burnt Offering Site'. The reports had also expressed concerns regarding the lack of interpretation, absence of a ranger station and visitor centre, and inadequate research funding to support increased interpretation and better conservation and management of the site. IUCN had noted that the management of Naracoorte and Riversleigh differ significantly, having different physical attributes and being the responsibility of different states; however, there is a Scientific and Management Advisory Committee that brings the two management authorities together.

III.303 The Bureau noted that IUCN recognises that currently efforts are underway to address the different challenges in managing this serial site. IUCN has been in contact with the State Party and has received detailed information responding to the issues raised. The Bureau also noted that these issues will be addressed by the State

Party in the context of the Asia Pacific regional reporting in 2003.

Greater Blue Mountain Area (Australia)

III.304 In response to the Bureau's request for further information on the proposed Clarence Colliery mine extension before 15 September 2001, the State Party, by letter dated 14 September 2001, submitted up-to-date information to the Centre. The Australian Government has examined the referral from the company regarding the possible extension of the Clarence Colliery mining lease and determined that additional information is required on water emissions from the mine. Current mine de-watering emissions have been determined by the New South Wales Environment Protection Agency (EPA) to exceed statutory water quality standards and have been causing pollution problems in the Wollangambe River, which flows through the World Heritage Area. The company and the EPA have agreed to a plan for a trial water transfer system that if successful, would result in the cessation of mine de-watering emissions to the Wollangambe River. A decision by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage on the referral on the proposed extension of the Clarence Colliery mining lease has been deferred until after the establishment of the trial water transfer system. It is anticipated that a decision will be made on the referral by mid-2002.

III.305 The Bureau noted with satisfaction the actions taken and the information provided by the State Party and noted that a comprehensive review of this property in the context of the Asia Pacific regional reporting due in 2003 would be provided by the State Party.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal)

III.306 The Bureau noted that the State Party has been requested to submit a detailed state of conservation report before the end of December 2001 and that it will be presented to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

Global Training Strategy for World Cultural and Natural Heritage

The Global Training Strategy for World Cultural and Natural Heritage, based on working document WHC-01/CONF.208/14, was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 25th session in Helsinki, Finland, 11-16 December 2001.

A. Background

Following presentation of various elements of the Global Training Strategy by ICCROM (for cultural heritage) and by the Secretariat (for both cultural and natural heritage) during the 24th Session of the World Heritage Committee held in Cairns, Australia, in December 2000, the Committee asked the Secretariat and ICCROM to produce an integrated synthesis document in collaboration with the other Advisory Bodies for consideration by the Bureau at its 25th session in Paris, in June 2001.

During preparatory meetings in Rome and Paris, in March and April of 2001, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre initiated efforts to produce a single Global Training Strategy integrating concern for cultural and natural heritage. On the advice of the Chair, the initial request by the Committee to produce a synthesis strategy was also extended to include an action plan supporting this strategy. The action plan to be developed was to address in particular:

1. *Criteria for reviewing of requests of training activities*
2. *Preliminary list of training resources*
3. *Preliminary list of training modules to be developed*

Consideration of the revised document was deferred until the 25th Session of the Committee to be held in Helsinki, Finland in December 2001.

This working document has been prepared as a result of the ensuing collaboration among Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

The working document includes three further sections:

- a) A statement of purpose for the WH Global Training Strategy.
- b) A set of supporting principles, and an exploration of related operational implications, including suggested appropriate follow up actions aimed at strengthening the administrative and operational framework for training, to be undertaken by the Committee, the Secretariat, and the Advisory Bodies. These actions include the need to review and update the criteria for review of requests for training assistance and preparation of a training resources data-base, mentioned above, as well as other measures.

- c) A Priority Action Plan which outlines particular training initiatives (including suggestions for particular training modules and programmes) in three broad areas (implementation of the Convention, site management and technical and scientific support. Suggestions focus on both thematic and regional priorities.

B. Purpose

The purpose of the WH Global Training Strategy is to strengthen conservation of cultural and natural heritage worldwide by increasing the capacity of those responsible for, and involved with, the management and conservation of World Heritage sites.

C. Principles and Operational Framework for Training

1. **Training is a highly cost-effective means to achieve Committee objectives**

Training activities should be recognized as providing important benefits and returns on investment to the various stakeholders, decision-makers, and managers involved with World Heritage. The operational implications of adhering to this principle are the following:

- The World Heritage Committee should give priority to use of training as a means to strengthen implementation of the Convention.

Required action

- The Committee should ensure that training issues have a prominent place on Bureau and Committee agendas, and ensure budget allocations commensurate with its importance. **(Action by the Committee)**
- Training initiatives should be designed to attract necessary funding from other public and private sources on the basis of benefits provided. Potential benefits/returns to target audiences should be analysed and taken into account in the design of training activities and programmes.

Required action

- The Committee should promote benefits/returns coming from training activities to potential partners and supporters, and ensure catalytic use

of the World Heritage Fund to attract spending by others. **(Action by the Committee)**

2. Training should be integrated into the World Heritage planning framework

Training should be mainstreamed within the overall World Heritage analysis and decision-making framework, so that training activities can efficiently and effectively respond to inputs from all current planning streams, including the Global Strategy and Periodic Reporting process (at both the international and regional levels). The operational implications of adherence to this approach are the following:

- The World Heritage Committee would benefit from working within a single, strategic planning process, integrating all relevant training inputs and assuring training outputs reflect a synthesis of concerns raised throughout the system. Until such time as the Committee implements a fully unified strategic planning process, training needs should still be identified within all planning streams (such as the Global Strategy and the Periodic Reporting process), and results analyzed together so that appropriate measures can be designed.

Required actions

- Training needs should be collected from relevant planning streams (Global Strategy, Periodic Reports etc.) and analyzed for presentation to the Committee and development of appropriate responsive actions **(Action by the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies)**
 - Training review should be placed within a cycle of regular reporting to the Bureau and Committee. **(Action by the Committee)**
 - The Committee should adopt an integrated strategic planning process with training as an important element. **(Action by the Committee)**
- Preference should be given to proactive approaches, which result in training modules and long term strategic programmes designed to respond to priority needs.

Required actions

- Regular planning of proactive training modules and programmes, internationally and by specific regions, on the basis of training information collected from planning streams, evaluation of reports of specific training exercises, and periodic review of the global training strategy **(Action by the Secretariat, Advisory Bodies, and others)**
 - A periodical synthesis meeting on training needs and issues resulting in specific training programme proposals to be presented to the Committee. **(Action by the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies)**
- Responses to individual training proposals from States Parties should be assessed relative to the criteria

developed by Advisory Bodies for review of requests for training assistance, adjusted to reflect periodically updated assessments of priority needs. Where possible, these requests should be placed within the framework of existing and planned training initiatives.

Required actions

- The criteria and check list developed by ICCROM in Nov. 1998 to assist the Committee to review requests for cultural heritage training assistance should be reviewed to integrate concern for natural heritage, and updated to reflect current circumstances and priorities. **(Action by ICCROM, the Centre and Advisory Bodies)**.
- Criteria used by the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies to review training requests should be adopted by the Committee and annexed to the Operational Guidelines. **(Action by the Committee)**

3. Commitment to high impact, professionally organised training activities

World Heritage training programmes and activities should be planned to make best use of existing resources and acquired experiences in order to achieve desired objectives. The operational implications of adherence to this principle are the following:

- A commitment should be made to the use of professionally developed training methodologies, targeted to clearly defined learning objectives. Methodologies should integrate use of “best practice” case studies, and results of evaluations of past training experiences, with a view to short term and long term improvements in efficiency, sustainability, and quality.

Required actions

- Preparation of a “Guidelines for organising effective World Heritage training activities” document. Use of such guidelines would be a prerequisite for the preparation of integrated World Heritage training programmes and in the preparation of requests for training assistance by States Parties. **(Action by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat)**
 - Required evaluations for each World Heritage training activity should be systematically collected by the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies for use in planning of training activities. **(Action by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies)**
 - Systematic collection of case study data should be undertaken for easy reference and use in training situations. **(Action by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies)**
- Experienced trainers and training institutions (operational at the national, regional, and/or international levels), where available, should be used for training activities. These trainers and institutions

would both support and benefit from the World Heritage training activities.

Required actions

- Establishment of a World Heritage training database. This database would include information on criteria used in assessment of training requests, reports of past training activities, updated regional training strategy overviews, reports prepared by Advisory Bodies and others, a directory of training centres and trainers qualified to support World Heritage training initiatives, and possible funding sources. **(Action by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. Note: this database could be linked to the already existing ICCROM training directory, and other ICCROM and World Heritage Centre's data-bases. This World Heritage training data-base, still to be fully refined, would respond to the Committee's interest in a list of training resources for World Heritage.)**
- A global network of institutions involved with World Heritage training should be built, maintained, and linked to the Advisory Bodies and to the Secretariat. **(Action by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies.)**
- Consideration should be given to establishing a fellowship programme that would, as in the previous Hungarian proposals on the subject, provide ongoing forums for sharing of experiences among those in developed and developing countries, and result over time in a network of experienced professionals and managers for World Heritage. **(Action by the Centre, and States Parties).**
- Where practical, training components should be included in all conservation activities planned for World Heritage sites.

Required actions

- ICOMOS and IUCN evaluation missions should include training components where possible. **(Action by ICOMOS and IUCN, in agreement with States Parties)**
- States Parties should be encouraged to include training components within their requests for technical assistance for site-based work. Inclusion of a training component could become one criterion for assessment of the request. **(Action by States Parties, Advisory Bodies, and the Secretariat.)**

D. Priority Action Plan

In the Global Training Strategy document prepared by ICCROM for the World Heritage Committee, and presented in Cairns (Dec. 2000), the strategic emphasis was placed on proactive, programmatic solutions to training needs. The strategy called for development of both off-the-shelf training modules and programmes at both the international and regional levels. Initiatives at the

international level were proposed to address global themes or issues of concern for the better implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Regional components were to be designed to meet the specific needs and cultural contexts of a given region and its heritage. One example of this approach, at the regional level, is the AFRICA 2009 Programme, which is now moving from its pilot phase to a consolidation phase.

The Secretariat in a presentation to the 25th session of the Bureau in June 2001 on future orientations for international assistance, reinforced the importance of a programmatic approach, and suggested the importance of developing thematic programmes, addressed to priority themes, with selective implementation on a sub-regional basis. An example of this approach, endorsed by the Committee in 1996, is ICCROM's ITUC (Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation) programme, focussed on a particular conservation approach, supported by seminars and research carried out at the international level, and tests of applied methodologies at regional levels.

An overall training strategy for World Heritage would include both training modules available off-the-shelf, and long term training programmes both targeting priority regions within which important themes are addressed, and priority themes and their application in selected regions, (the choice of particular instruments depending on context and circumstances).

Priority areas for the development of training modules and programmes have been identified below, based on analysis carried out during the Global Training Strategy exercise. (Note that priorities will change with time, and should be reviewed periodically.)

Efforts should be made to promote use and integration of existing initiatives within long term training programmes, such as the Best Practice Guidelines Series of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, the currently available volumes of the UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS Management Guidelines series, and curricular materials emerging from ICCROM's ITUC programme for integrated management of historic cities and landscapes, among others developed and successfully tested by renowned institutions worldwide.

It is expected that the priorities identified below will provide a basis from which training proposals prepared periodically by the Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be drawn and updated. The next step in the implementation of the Global Training Strategy would be the development of a 5 to 10 year framework programme outlining specific recommended modules and programmes to be developed thematically, and by regions.

Area 1: *Improvement of implementation of the World Heritage Convention*

The emphasis in the following actions should be on providing clear, easy to understand materials for those involved in the implementation of the Convention.

Specific requirements of the Convention should be demystified, and where possible put into specific cultural contexts.

Proposed actions

- Development of an illustrated guide to the Operational Guidelines, which would include well developed case studies and other descriptive materials.
- Production and dissemination of off-the-shelf World Heritage training modules on selected themes such as the nomination process, the periodic reporting process, development of tentative lists, reactive monitoring, the global strategy, a general introduction to World Heritage, etc. These training modules should be designed to be adaptable to specific regional and national situations.

Area 2: Improvement of on-site management of World Heritage properties.

The emphasis here should be on promoting integrated, sustainable, and participatory approaches to conservation and management of heritage properties based on retention of their significant heritage values.

Current priorities for development would include:

- Tourism management
- Cultural landscape management
- Integrated approaches to historic city management
- Risk preparedness
- Citizen involvement in management

Proposed actions

- Continued development of the UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS Management Guidelines series, including translation of existing volumes into key languages, the development of volumes in new subject areas, and accompaniment of various Management Guidelines by related technical notes. These should be seen as offering useful guidance in their own right, but also as comprising core materials within training modules.
- Production of compendia of standards, charters, conventions, and recommendations as previously published by UNESCO, and the Advisory Bodies.
- Development of off-the-shelf training modules (possibly to be included in long term programmes), in the particular areas of risk preparedness, the management of cultural landscapes, the integrated conservation and management of historic cities, the development of monitoring strategies within site management, tourism management, and participatory management planning.

Area 3: Strengthening of technical, scientific, and traditional skills for conservation of cultural and natural heritage.

Emphasis here should be initiatives, which focus on technical, scientific, and traditional conservation processes. For cultural heritage, this could include

techniques and practices relevant for conservation of materials such as stone, wood, earth, thatch, and decorated surfaces. For natural heritage, this should include an emphasis on measures for measuring and promoting ecological integrity of particular sites. Training in Area 3 should also address specific technical skills useful in identifying, understanding and managing properties of heritage value.

Priority areas for development at present would include:

- Conservation of masonry
- Conservation of decorated plaster surfaces (mural paintings)
- Development of inventories and evaluation systems
- Use of GIS and other mapping tools
- Development of indicators for use in monitoring management effectiveness
- Integrating parks into the surrounding landscape
- Fundraising
- Negotiation and conflict management

Proposed actions

- Development of off-the-shelf training modules in core areas (possibly to be integrated in later programmes), for the general priority areas mentioned above.

**Speeches of the Young People's Presentation
"World Heritage in Young Hands"**

Mr. Richard Dawson from Peru

Je suis content de participer à la réunion ici à Helsinki pour présenter quelques résultats du Premier Forum des Jeunes sur le Patrimoine mondial et concernant le tourisme et le développement durable qui s'est tenu à Lima en mars dernier.

Nous les *Patrimonitos* venant de 18 pays de l'Amérique latine et des Caraïbes, nous avons affirmé :

1. Que l'éducation en faveur du patrimoine pour les jeunes est importante pour le développement durable.
2. La connaissance et l'application de la Convention concernant la protection du Patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel est nécessaire pour faire face aux défis du 21^{ème} siècle.
3. Il faut d'abord connaître le passé afin de comprendre le présent et construire un meilleur avenir.
4. Donner à tous les jeunes une éducation relative au Patrimoine mondial.

Deuxièmement,

En août 2001 un atelier national important a été organisé au Belize sur le Patrimoine mondial et maritime pour des élèves des écoles associées de l'UNESCO et des jeunes défavorisés.

Je souhaite présenter au Président du Comité du Patrimoine mondial le rapport de notre Forum au Pérou et les Recommandations de Belize.

Mr. Per Kristian Krohn from Norway and Ms. Tiina Helin from Finland

In 2001 two important World Heritage Education events were held in the Nordic countries:

1. Third European Course in Restoration for Youth Røros, Norway and
2. The 10th International Youth Forum in the World Heritage education project was held in Karlskrona Sweden in September 2001.

Teachers and students from 29 countries gathered at the Swedish World Heritage site of the Naval Port of Karlskrona on the Swedish West Coast.

For the Youth Forum a theme was chosen:

The theme was:

Both sides of the coin – how can the dark and the light sides of my World Heritage help me understand the past, the present and the future?

Before the Forum, schools were twinned and worked on topics such as:

- How will environmental degradation affect our World Heritage site and what can we do to help?
- How can tourism affect our World Heritage site? Will the larger amount of jobs counterbalance the increase in traffic, pollution etc?

All participants worked on the Karlskrona recommendations, which concern the future of the World Heritage Education Project and we would like to quote two of them:

1. The World Heritage Committee should consider requesting States Parties to report periodically on the national implementation of Article 27 of the Convention, with particular regard to heritage education and the implementation of the World Heritage Education project in their respective countries.
2. We recommend that increased attention should be given to the valuable contribution of the oral narrative and other forms of oral narrative of intangible cultural traditions as an integral part of conservation and interpretations of World Heritage sites.

We now have the pleasure to present the Karlskrona recommendations to the president of the World Heritage Committee as well as a copy of the Finnish version of the UNESCO World Heritage Education Kit, which was just released last night.

Ms. Djimbou N'Diaye from Senegal

Pour le 30^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention pour la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel, et à l'occasion de l'Année internationale pour le patrimoine culturel en 2002 nous *Patrimonitos*, nous proposons aux pays :

1. d'élaborer des plans nationaux d'action pour l'éducation relative au Patrimoine mondial.
2. de lancer à travers le monde entier, des journées portes ouvertes sur les sites du Patrimoine mondial pour les jeunes, du 10 au 17 novembre 2002
3. d'organiser la célébration de journées spéciales du Patrimoine mondial.
4. Nous demandons aux écoles de produire et de présenter un travail artistique ayant trait aux sites du Patrimoine mondial et l'UNESCO sélectionnera les meilleurs pour les inclure dans une exposition itinérante.

Nous proposons que l'UNESCO nous aide à organiser :

- une série de marathons (à vélo, à pieds et à la chaise roulante) pour des élèves a côté ou autour des sites du Patrimoine mondial pendant toute l'année 2002.
- des olympiades culturelles
- des caravanes pour les jeunes pour découvrir le Patrimoine mondial par bus, train ou bateau

Je voudrais saisir l'occasion qui m'est offerte pour exprimer au nom des *Patrimonitos* de notre Atelier international, toute notre gratitude au Président de la République de Finlande son excellence Madame Tarja Halonen pour avoir reconnu et soutenu le Projet UNESCO "Patrimoine mondial entre les mains des jeunes".

Nos remerciements vont aussi au Président et aux membres du Comité du Patrimoine mondial pour nous avoir permis de partager avec vous nos idées et nos propositions sur l'éducation relative au Patrimoine mondial.

Nous remercions aussi la Commission nationale finlandaise pour l'UNESCO, le ministère de l'éducation nationale et la coordination des écoles associées de nous avoir permis de nous réunir cette semaine à Helsinki en même temps que le Comité pour le Patrimoine mondial. Nous remercions l'UNESCO, le Directeur du Centre du Patrimoine mondial et l'Agence norvégienne pour le développement et la coopération pour toute leur assistance.

Nous avons certes des idées, de la volonté et de l'engagement mais, nous avons besoin de votre soutien tant au niveau local, national qu'international pour réaliser nos objectifs. Ensemble, nous les jeunes avec vous les spécialistes du Patrimoine mondial, nous pouvons agir pour protéger et sauvegarder notre précieux Patrimoine mondial pour les générations présentes et futures.

Je vous remercie.

World Heritage**25 COM**

Distribution limited

WHC-01/CONF.208/21 Rev
Helsinki, 15 December 2001
Original: English/French**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION****CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE****WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE****Twenty-fifth session****Helsinki, Finland
11-16 December 2001****Item 18 of the Agenda: Provisional Agenda and Timetable of the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO Headquarters, 8-13 April 2002)****INTRODUCTION**

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable

PROGRESS REPORTS ON REFORMS AND STRATEGIC REFLECTION

3. Policy/legal issues concerning inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the potential deletion of properties from the World Heritage List
4. Oral report on the progress for the revision of the *Operational Guidelines*
5. World Heritage visual identity and legal protection of the Emblem
6. Progress report on the analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage
7. Discussion on the relationship between the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO
8. Progress report on the preparation of the proposed Strategic Orientations of the World Heritage Committee and revised structure of the budget of the World Heritage Fund
9. Progress report on the preparation of the Budapest Declaration on World Heritage

10. Progress report on the organisation of events to celebrate the 30th Anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* in 2002

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

11. Reports on state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
12. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
13. Requests for international assistance

CLOSING

14. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (Budapest, Hungary, 24-29 June 2002)
15. Other business
16. Adoption of the report of the session
17. Closure of the session

PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE

26th session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 8-13 April 2002

TIME	MONDAY, 8 APRIL Agenda Item	TUESDAY, 9 APRIL Agenda Item	WEDNESDAY, 10 APRIL Agenda Item	THURSDAY, 11 APRIL Agenda Item	FRIDAY, 12 APRIL Agenda Item	SATURDAY, 13 APRIL Agenda Item
A.M.	1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative	4. Oral report on the progress for the revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	8. Progress report on the preparation of the proposed Strategic Orientations of the World Heritage Committee and revised structure of the budget of the World Heritage Fund	11. Reports on state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger	13. Requests for international assistance	REPORT PREPARATION BY THE SECRETARIAT
	2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable	5. World Heritage visual identity and legal protection of the Emblem			14. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (24-29 June 2002)	
	3. Policy/legal issues concerning inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the potential deletion of properties from the World Heritage List				15. Other business	
P.M.	3. (continued) Policy/legal issues concerning inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the potential deletion of properties from the World Heritage List	6. Progress report on the analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage	9. Progress report on the preparation of the Budapest Declaration on World Heritage	12. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	REPORT PREPARATION BY THE SECRETARIAT	16. Adoption of the report of the session 17. Closure of the session
		7. Discussion on the relationship between the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO	10. Progress report on the organisation of events to celebrate the 30th Anniversary of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> in 2002			

World Heritage**25 COM**

Distribution limited

WHC-01/CONF.208/22 Rev
 Helsinki, 15 December 2001
 Original: English/French

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
 AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-fifth session

Helsinki, Finland
 11-16 December 2001

Item 19 of the Agenda: Date, place, provisional Agenda and Timetable of the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (Budapest, Hungary, 24-29 June 2002)

CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

1. Welcome by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Reports on 30 years of the *World Heritage Convention*

OPENING OF THE SESSION

3. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
4. Report of the Rapporteur on the twenty-sixth ordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
5. Report of the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the 25th session of the Committee

PROGRESS REPORTS ON REFORMS AND STRATEGIC REFLECTION

6. Ways and means to reinforce the implementation of the World Heritage Convention
7. Policy/legal issues concerning inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the potential deletion of properties from the World Heritage List
8. Progress made in assisting Afghanistan in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention

9. Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*
10. World Heritage visual identity and legal protection of the Emblem
11. Progress report on the analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage
12. Discussion on the relationship between the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO
13. Progress report on the preparation of the proposed Strategic Orientations of the World Heritage Committee and revised structure of the budget of the World Heritage Fund

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

14. Periodic Reporting: Report on the state of the World Heritage in Africa, 2001
15. State of conservation of properties inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List
16. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
17. Adjustments to the World Heritage Fund Budget for 2002-2003
18. International assistance
19. Revision of the *Rules of Procedures* of the World Heritage Committee

CLOSING

20. The Budapest Declaration on World Heritage
21. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (April 2003)
22. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-seventh session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2003)
23. Other business
24. Adoption of the report of the session
25. Closure of the session

PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE

26th session of the World Heritage Committee, Budapest, Hungary, 24-29 June 2002

TIME	MONDAY, 24 JUNE	TUESDAY, 25 JUNE	WEDNESDAY, 26 JUNE	THURSDAY, 27 JUNE	FRIDAY, 28 JUNE	SATURDAY, 29 JUNE		
A.M.	1. Welcome by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative	6. Ways and means to reinforce the implementation of World Heritage Convention	11. Progress report on the analyses of the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists and the identification of underrepresented categories of natural and cultural heritage	14. Periodic Reporting: Report on the state of the World Heritage in Africa, 2001	17. Adjustments to the World Heritage Fund Budget for 2002-2003	REPORT PREPARATION BY THE SECRETARIAT		
	2. Reports on 30 years of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i>	7. Policy/legal issues concerning inscription of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the potential deletion of properties from the World Heritage List			18. International Assistance			
		8. Progress made in assisting Afghanistan in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention			12. Discussion on the relationship between the World Heritage Committee and the other UNESCO bodies		15. State of conservation of properties inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List	19. The Budapest Declaration on World Heritage
							20. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (April 2003)	
21. Provisional agenda and timetable of the twenty-seventh session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2003)								
					22. Other business			
P.M.	3. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable	9. Revision of the <i>Operational Guidelines</i>	13. Progress report on the preparation of the proposed Strategic Orientations of the World Heritage Committee and revised structure of the budget of the World Heritage Fund	16. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	REPORT PREPARATION BY THE SECRETARIAT	23. Adoption of the report of the session		
	4. Report of the Rapporteur on the twenty-sixth ordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee	10. World Heritage visual identity and legal protection of the World Heritage Emblem						
	5. Report of the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the 25 th session of the Committee						24. Closure of the session	