

Distribution limited

WHC-97/CONF.204/11  
Paris, 3 September 1997  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-first session  
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

23 - 28 June 1997

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
I.	OPENING SESSION	1
II.	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
III.	REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE	3
IV.	STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	7
V.	INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER	38
VI.	REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE	56
VII.	PROGRESS REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE'S CONSULTATIVE BODY ON THE OVERALL MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION	60
VIII.	EXAMINATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON ITS ACTIVITIES FOR 1996-1997 TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE 29TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO	71
IX.	INFORMATION ON THE PREPARATION OF THE ELEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (October 1997)	72
X.	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FIRST EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (28-29 NOVEMBER 1997)	72
XI.	PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (1-6 DECEMBER 1997)	72
XII.	OTHER BUSINESS	73
XIII.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSING OF THE SESSION	73

## LIST OF ANNEXES

(Statements are reproduced in the original language)

- ANNEX I List of Participants
- ANNEX II Opening Speech by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
- ANNEX III Opening Speech by the Representative of the Director-General
- ANNEX IV Statement by the Representative of Pakistan
- ANNEX V 1. Statement by the Delegate of Germany  
2. Statement by the Observer of Poland
- ANNEX VI Statement by the Delegate of Italy
- ANNEX VII Proposal of Agreement presented by the Consultative Body - Management Review
- ANNEX VIII
- ANNEX VIII.1 Report of the External Auditors
- ANNEX VIII.2 Director-General's comments
- ANNEX VIII.3 Report of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee (1 and 2 April 1997)
- ANNEX VIII.4 Report of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee (20 June 1997)
- ANNEX IX Provisional Agenda of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
- ANNEX X Provisional Agenda of the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee
- ANNEX XI Report on the Nature-Culture Meeting (Paris, HQ)(28 June 1997)

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-first session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 23 to 28 June 1997. The following members of the Bureau attended: Ms. Maria-Teresa Franco (Mexico), Chairperson, Representatives of Australia, Germany, Italy, Japan and Morocco as Vice-Presidents and H.E. Ambassador Lambert Messan (Niger) as Rapporteur.

**I.2** Representatives of the following States Parties attended as observers: Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, India, Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Malta, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Slovak Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela and Zimbabwe. A representative of South Africa also attended the Bureau session.

**I.3** Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.

**I.4** The World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) was represented. The full list of participants is given in Annex I.

**I.5** The Chairperson warmly welcomed the members of the Bureau, representatives of States Parties who were observing the meeting, and the advisory bodies (Annex II). She stressed that the best expertise, organization and management were necessary to strengthen the implementation of the Convention. She emphasized that loyalty to the principles of the Convention and innovative approaches to ensure the protection of cultural and natural World Heritage sites in all regions were both needed. The Chairperson commented that recognition should be given to the Director-General's and UNESCO's contribution to peace and to the expansion of UNESCO's activities. However, she called for a strengthening of World Heritage conservation through a multicultural approach and the recognition of biodiversity to be supported by sufficient financial resources and new, well administered, strategies. The Chairperson then invited the Representative of the Director-General to address the meeting.

**I.6** Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, speaking on behalf of the Director-General, welcomed the members of the Bureau, the observers, and the representatives of the advisory bodies (see Annex III). He noted that 1997 marks the 25th anniversary of the adoption of

the Convention by the UNESCO General Conference on 16 November 1972 and the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the World Heritage Centre by the Director-General on 30 April 1992. He noted that the Convention at present has 149 States Parties and that the World Heritage List includes 506 cultural, natural and mixed World Heritage properties throughout the world. The Centre, since its establishment in 1992, has aimed to promote all aspects of the implementation of the Convention and has given particular focus to work on the interface between nature and culture, developing a rapid reaction capability to address emergencies in the conservation of cultural and natural heritage, training and capacity building and educating young people on the importance of heritage preservation.

**I.7** Mr von Droste conveyed the Director-General's satisfaction that the External Auditor's report on the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for 1996 had been completed. Referring to the report of the External Auditors, he quoted the following conclusion of the External Auditor: "...the transactions of the [World Heritage] Fund that have come to my notice during my audit of the financial statements have, in all significant respects, been in accordance with the Fund's and UNESCO's Financial Regulations and legislative authorities." He assured the Bureau that all necessary follow-up actions to implement the recommendations of the Auditors would be carried out.

**I.8** He informed the Bureau that several proposals to improve the regional representation of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, build national and local capacity, expedite the implementation of the Training Strategies for natural and cultural heritage as adopted by the Committee, launch special projects for young people and strengthen protection of cultural and natural heritage sites would be submitted, in the Draft 29 C/5 (Draft Programme and Budget for 1998-1999), to the UNESCO General Conference to be convened during October-November 1997. He concluded his remarks by wishing, on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, all those present a successful Bureau session.

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

**II.1** The Chairperson suggested that the Bureau consider amending the Draft Agenda so as to enable the consideration of Item 7 (Progress report by the Committee's Consultative Body on the Management and Financial Review of the Administration of the World Heritage Convention) after Agenda Item 3 (Report of the Secretariat on Activities undertaken since the twentieth session of the Committee). The Chairperson explained that she suggested this change to provide the Bureau members with the opportunity to hear the report of the financial audit to be presented by the Auditors attending the Bureau meeting on 23 and 24 June 1997. The Delegate of Germany

pointed out that Working and Information Documents on Agenda Item 7 had been circulated only shortly before the beginning of the Bureau meeting and he required time to read those documents before entering into discussions on this Agenda Item. Hence, the Chairperson decided to request the Auditors to present their report immediately after the conclusion of Agenda Item 3 and answer questions from the floor. The Bureau would then take up discussion on Agenda Item 7 on the morning of 24 June 1997. With this change, the Bureau adopted the revised Timetable for the meeting, (Information Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.2Rev.1).

### **III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**III.1** The Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported in his capacity as Secretary of the World Heritage Committee on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twentieth session, in an audio-visual presentation (see Information Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.4).

**III.2** The Director began by welcoming two new signatories to the World Heritage Convention, namely Papua New Guinea and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, bringing the total number of States Parties to 149. He noted, furthermore, that the Centre has been informed that South Africa has decided to accede to the Convention and is expected to deposit an instrument of accession to UNESCO in the very near future. In referring to the universal importance and application of the Convention, the Director noted the constant increase in States Parties to the Convention and presented information on the accession rate of UNESCO Member States to the World Heritage Convention.

**III.3** The Director stated that only half of the 149 States Parties to the Convention had submitted tentative lists despite the fact that this is a compulsory requirement if nominations of cultural properties are to be considered by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau. The Director reported that a computerised database on tentative lists had been prepared and further analysis of the content of the tentative lists was now required.

**III.4** The Director noted the constant increase in the number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. He presented an analysis of the World Heritage List by region.

**III.5** The Director reported that the current session of the Bureau will review a total of fifty-eight new nominations. A regional analysis of these new nominations indicates that, more than ever, new cultural nominations have been received from States Parties in Europe. The Director noted, with concern, that there is still an absence of new

cultural nominations from Africa and new natural nominations from the Arab States. For the first time, natural property nominations from Cuba, Dominica and Italy, cultural property nominations from Estonia and Myanmar, and a mixed property from Kenya will be reviewed by the Bureau. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reported on several forthcoming initiatives to promote the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List.

**III.6** The Director recalled that the question of monitoring and reporting procedures had been discussed at the tenth General Assembly of States Parties in November 1995 and the nineteenth and twentieth sessions of the Committee in 1995 and 1996 respectively. The question will again be examined by the forthcoming General Assembly of States Parties at its eleventh session in October 1997. A Draft Resolution to be examined by the General Conference in October and November entrusts the definition, periodicity, form, nature and extent of reporting to the World Heritage Committee. Working Document WHC-97/CONF.204/6 presents the Draft Resolution as adopted by the Committee at its twentieth session.

**III.7** In noting that more than fifty state of conservation reports from World Heritage properties in all regions of the world would be presented to this session of the Bureau, the Director presented an overview of some particular issues of concern relating to some of these properties. In the first instance, he reported on the serious situation that exists concerning the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

**III.8** In referring to the Galapagos National Park, Ecuador, he recalled that the Committee had, for the first time in the history of the Convention, delegated its responsibility to the Bureau to decide on whether the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He noted that a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site has been submitted to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.9.

**III.9** The Director then reported briefly on the state of conservation of the following World Heritage properties - Manas National Park, India; Ichkeul National Park, Tunisia; the Elephanta Caves, India; Butrinti, Albania; Teotihuacan, Mexico; the Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin, Germany; and, Tyre, Lebanon. He also mentioned the state of conservation of the Buddhas of the Bamiyan Valley, Afghanistan. The Director reported on a project concerning the decentralised co-operation between local authorities in World Heritage cities in Asia and cities in Europe and the United Kingdom.

**III.10** The Director reported that a number of natural and cultural heritage training seminars approved by the Committee

at its twentieth session have taken place. Furthermore, he noted that, Mr Laenen, the Director-General of ICCROM had recently addressed the Executive Board of UNESCO. Mr Laenen had commended the substantial support provided by the World Heritage Committee, in the form of financial support from the World Heritage Fund for training activities.

**III.11** With the help of UNESCO National Commissions and Associations, the World Heritage Centre has identified and expanded its co-operation with film and publishing companies to ensure that the importance of World Heritage properties and their conservation is communicated to the public at large. The World Heritage Review launched one year ago now has about 5,000 subscribers. The Director called on the help of members of the Bureau to increase subscriptions to the Review. The World Heritage Newsletter and folding World Heritage Map have been recently updated, an improved World Heritage Kit for the press is in preparation, as is the 1998 World Heritage Diary. The World Heritage Internet site is now available in English and French and is receiving more than 10,000 requests per week. The World Heritage Web usage statistics have shown a sharp increase since December, and is the most popular of UNESCO's web sites.

**III.12** A World Heritage Education Kit is being prepared as part of the six-year UNESCO Special Project "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" conducted by the World Heritage Centre and the Education Sector. The Kit will be made available to schools that are part of the Associated Schools Project Network (ASPNet) in early 1998. World Heritage Youth Fora will be held in China in September 1997, and Japan in 1998.

**III.13** The Director noted that the staffing table of the Centre, as had previously been requested by the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, will be distributed as Information Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.10. He noted that of the eleven professional posts foreseen in the Regular Programme eight have been provided, including that of the Director and Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre. However, in the last 12 months three senior professional staff at the level of P5 have left the Centre. A professional administrator at the P3 level is under recruitment. The Director recorded his deep thanks to the Governments of Austria, Denmark, Japan and Sweden for having provided Associate Experts to the Centre. In addition, he gratefully acknowledged the secondment of a press specialist by the Government of France. Furthermore, a Young Professional of Afghan nationality has recently been assigned to the Centre. The Director also noted that a consultant Media Adviser in the Centre backstops media contracts and is paid from servicing income generated from media and publishing contracts. Another consultant is working on World Heritage Education. The Director gratefully acknowledged the financial support of



NORAD, Rhône-Poulenc and the Osaka Junior Chamber of Commerce in Japan for the World Heritage Education Project. Another consultant in the Centre is working on developing a strong World Heritage web site. The Director warmly thanked the Republic of Korea for their generous contribution to the development of the World Heritage presence on the Internet.

**III.14** Finally, the Director noted the challenges for the year to come - the eleventh session of the General Assembly in October; an agenda item on monitoring and reporting of World Heritage sites to be debated at the twenty-ninth UNESCO General Conference; the World Heritage Bureau at the end of November; another meeting of the Consultative Body; and the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Bureau in Naples, Italy (as decided by the Committee at its last session). The Director concluded his presentation by noting that he would be pleased to reply to any questions on his presentation.

**III.15** The Chairperson thanked the Director and staff of the World Heritage Centre for their work in favour of World Heritage conservation.

**III.16** The Delegate of Germany noted his great surprise that three P5 posts in the Centre were vacant and asked the Director, World Heritage Centre for clarification. The Director noted that one former Centre staff member has been appointed as the Director of the Unit for the Status of Women and Gender Equality. Another former staff member of the Centre has been appointed as the representative of UNESCO in Gabon and the third former staff member of the Centre has been appointed as Secretary of the Dayton Commission. The Delegate of Germany asked whether these three professionals would be replaced by other persons. The Director expressed his hope that the three professional posts would be filled in the future. The Delegate of Germany asked whether the three professional posts in question were still included in the Regular Programme budget of the Centre. The Director of the World Heritage Centre commented that it was not yet certain whether these posts would be filled through recruitment or transfer. He again noted that the staffing situation within the Centre is critical with three P-5 posts vacant whereas a year ago five P-5 posts were occupied.

**III.17** The Delegate of Germany questioned whether the Bureau should make a recommendation to the Director-General of UNESCO drawing this issue to his attention. The Chairperson noted that the forthcoming management review of the World Heritage Centre will reveal the situation.

#### **IV. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**IV.1** The Bureau examined Working Documents WHC-97/CONF.204/2A and WHC-97/CONF.204/2B, Information Documents WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.8 (Potsdam, Germany) and WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.9 (Galapagos Islands, Ecuador), as well as additional information provided by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies during the session.

##### **A. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

###### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.2** The Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of eleven of the thirteen natural properties included in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau noted that in the case of Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria) and Everglades National Park (United States of America) no new information had been received, since the conclusions of the twentieth session of the Committee.

###### **IV.3 Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its twentieth session, had determined that the World Heritage values of Plitvice Lakes National Park had not been adversely impacted by the armed conflict of the early 1990s, and concluded that the natural systems of the site were recovering from pre-war over-development and over-use. The Committee decided to retain Plitvice Lakes National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, because it recognized potential post-war threats due to rising visitor impacts, and the damaged condition of the Park's infrastructure.

The Bureau was informed that the Croatian authorities had revised the boundaries of the Park to increase its total area to include the entire underground basin which supplies water to lakes and streams of Plitvice and had trained Park employees. A road outside the northeast boundary of the Park to re-direct traffic currently passing through the Park is under construction and, a state of conservation report on the Park, including the experience gained from the management of visitors during the summer of 1997, is expected to be submitted to the Centre by 15 September 1997.

The Bureau commended the Croatian authorities for increasing the total area of the Park to include the entire underground basin supplying Plitvice's lakes and streams and constructing a road outside of the Park's northeast boundary in order to redirect truck-traffic currently flowing through the Park. The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the Croatian authorities to obtain a map of the new boundaries of the Park and to find out

whether they intend to enlarge the World Heritage area to conform with the Park's new boundaries. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, after reviewing the state of conservation report due by 15 September 1997, decide whether or not to remove Plitvice Lakes National Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**IV.4 Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)  
Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)**

Since the twentieth session of the Committee, the eastern part Democratic Republic of the Congo has become further destabilized and military action has spread to other parts of the country. Reports received indicate that in both these sites, infrastructure had been destroyed and wildlife populations decimated. The Bureau noted that IUCN and the Centre will continue to maintain contacts with UNHCR and conservation NGOs and provide up-to-date reports on both Virunga and Garamba, at the time of the twenty-first session of the Committee.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to contact relevant authorities of the new Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in order to arrange for a high-level mission to meet with senior officials to remind them of their responsibilities under the World Heritage Convention and to discuss restoration and rehabilitation of the country's five World Heritage sites. This mission should initiate project proposals in consultation with the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Implementation of some of the projects may be financed by emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund. A long-term policy and strategic vision for World Heritage conservation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is the main need at the moment. The Centre should co-ordinate its activities with those of other UN agencies and conservation NGOs active in the country. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to provide detailed reports on both sites, at the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau to be held on 28 and 29 November 1997, in Naples, Italy.

**IV.5 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twentieth session, commended the Park administration's (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre, (INEFAN)) actions and reports, but reiterated its serious concerns about road construction activities, poaching and colonization, and recalled its request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The Bureau noted that INEFAN has submitted a report to the Centre that identifies the Guamote Macas road construction to be the main problem and that colonisation in the Guamboya valley and along the River

Palora, and small-scale mining activities have been stopped. The new management plan is close to finalization and government institutions and NGOs have expressed interest in participating in its implementation.

IUCN informed the Bureau that the implementation of a number of conservation projects at Sangay, including several funded by WWF and the European Union have begun.

The Bureau commended INEFAN for its report and action, but reiterated its calls for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Guamoto Macas road construction project. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.6 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its last session noted the report of the technical mission to the site, (2-9 November 1996), which identified the deterioration of the Walia ibex population, loss of biodiversity, encroachment at the borders of the site and impacts of the construction of a road through the Park, and, as stipulated in Paragraph 79 of the Operational Guidelines, included Simen National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed that the Head of the Bureau of Agriculture of the Bahir Dar Region, where Simen National Park is located, informed the Centre of his Regional Government's disagreement with the Committee's decision to include Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger. He drew the Centre's attention to the fact that although Simen was neglected in the past, currently Simen receives high attention and effective protection. The number of Walia Ibex has increased as a result of proper protection of the Park and the Central and the Regional Governments are implementing a rehabilitation programme to restore the Park's infrastructure to its previous state. Furthermore, he indicated that the Regional Authorities do not accept the statement in the report of the technical mission to Simen, undertaken in November, 1996: i.e. "A majority of participants endorsed the recommendation that Simen Mountain National Park should be listed as World Heritage site in Danger". Following the Committee's decision to include Simen National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Regional Authorities in Bahir Dar have decided not to convene the technical workshop, originally scheduled for 10-18 April, 1997, and for which the Committee approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 at its last session. They have called upon the Central Government of Ethiopia to co-operate with concerned national and regional institutions to organize a discussion forum with UNESCO in order to reverse the decision taken by the Committee.

The Bureau noted that a mission to Simen National Park had been undertaken by the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) from 10 to 25 April 1997 and that a buffer zone development project for the site is under consideration.

The Bureau acknowledged the possibility that the views of the Regional Government in Bahir Dar may not have been accurately reflected when the Committee decided to include Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger. Nevertheless, the Bureau called upon the Ethiopian authorities in Addis Ababa and Bahir Dar to view the Committee's decision in a positive light and to proceed with convening the stakeholders meeting. The Bureau in particular requested the Director of the Centre to meet with the Permanent Delegate of Ethiopia to UNESCO to resolve the problem and to explain the Committee's decision. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN take actions to assist the Ethiopian authorities to convene the stakeholder's meeting and to submit a report to the twenty-first session of the Committee in December 1997 so as to enable the Committee to review Simen National Park's status as a World Heritage site in Danger.

#### **IV.7 Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)**

The Bureau recalled that at its twentieth session, the Committee noted the fact that UNESCO's Legal Affairs Office was considering the proposals made by a working group for setting up an "International Foundation for Mt. Nimba". The Bureau was informed that the Legal Affairs Office of UNESCO has advised the Centre that UNESCO cannot create an International Foundation but that such a Foundation may be established under the national legislation of a suitable State Party. The Swiss Foundation established for the conservation of Banc d'Arguin National Park, a World Heritage site in Mauritania, was considered a good example. Contributions earmarked for Mt. Nimba may also be set aside under a special account of the World Heritage Fund (as per paragraph 118 of the Operational Guidelines), or set up as a separate 'Funds-in-Trust', similar to the World Heritage Fund, within UNESCO.

The Bureau, while recognizing these options for setting up a Foundation or a Special Fund for Mt. Nimba, noted that the mining companies are not yet ready to contribute funds to launch the initiative. Furthermore, the Bureau took note of the fact that the Minister of Environment of Guinea acknowledged the threats to Mount Nimba, reiterated the commitment of his Government to the protection of the site and requested that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit information concerning the options for setting up a Foundation or a Special Fund for Mt. Nimba to the authorities of Guinea and

recommended that the Committee retain Mt. Nimba on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.8 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twentieth session included Rio Platano in the List of World Heritage in Danger and urged the Honduran authorities to implement the eleven-point corrective action plan, endorsed by the Honduran Minister for the Environment, and keep it informed, on a regular basis, of measures taken to safeguard this property.

The Bureau noted that a revised budget breakdown requested from the Honduran authorities for a US\$ 30,000 project, approved by the Bureau at its twentieth session for preparing a management plan for Rio Platano, has not yet been received. The Bureau was informed that major changes in the staff of the Ministry of Environment of Honduras had occurred and that a number of projects have been initiated in cooperation with Nature Conservancy, WWF and KFW (Germany). The Bureau noted that IUCN will provide a report on Rio Platano at the forthcoming session of the Committee.

The Bureau requested that the Centre contact the Honduran authorities to obtain the necessary information for the implementation of the management planning project and recommended that the Committee retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.9 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Bureau noted that the Ministry for Environment and Forests (MOEF) of India, hosted a World Natural Heritage Site Managers' Meeting for South Asia, from 16 to 19 January 1997. The Director of Manas Wildlife Sanctuary presented a report on the state of conservation of Manas at that meeting. A staff member of the World Heritage Centre accompanied the Deputy Inspector General for Wildlife in India on a mission to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary from 20 to 23 January 1997. The mission concluded that:

(i) Militancy of the Bodo people in the early 1990s had damaged the infrastructure for the protection of Manas and demoralized staff, resulting in poachers taking a heavy toll of wildlife populations within Manas Wildlife Sanctuary. (ii) Since 1993, militant activity has diminished and Manas authorities have been able to improve relationships with surrounding villagers and seek their support for conservation. Peace and order in and around Manas have been re-established and an estimated 8,000 tourists visited Manas in 1996. (iii) Damaged ranger and guard units are in urgent need of repair and/or reconstruction. The poaching threat continues to prevail as the mobility and the communications capability of Manas staff remain limited.

The Bureau was informed of a report on Manas Wildlife Sanctuary from the MOEF transmitted via the Permanent Delegation of India, which notes that "Manas deserves to continue to be in the World Heritage in Danger List", as it helps to draw international attention to the site. The MOEF has also submitted an emergency assistance request for a contribution from the Fund for US\$ 235,000 to implement a three-year rehabilitation plan estimated to cost a total sum of US\$ 2,135,000.

The Bureau commended the Indian authorities for the report provided and their support for organizing the mission to the site. The Bureau noted that the emergency assistance request in support of the rehabilitation of the site will be discussed under Agenda Item 6 "Requests for international assistance" and recommended that the Committee retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.10 Air-and-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)**

The Bureau recalled that a peace agreement, signed on 20 April 1995, had started a dialogue between the conflicting parties and set in motion the process for a return to a normal management regime and that the Committee at its twentieth session had noted that a detailed site evaluation and the development of an action programme for site recovery may become feasible in the near future. The IUCN/WWF project, with funding from DANIDA, for re-establishing a normal management regime for the site is soon to be resumed.

By letter of 20 March 1997, the Permanent Delegation of Niger has provided the terms of reference for a monitoring mission to the site, expected to be carried out in the autumn of 1997. The Bureau heard a presentation by Mr. André Bourgeot (CNRS/EHESS, France) who had carried out a mission to the site in April 1997 together with local IUCN staff. He indicated that: (a) there were no security problems in the area; (b) the vegetation is less impacted than the wildlife populations, whose decline was noticeable; and (c) an analysis of the Reserve's situation should be undertaken by a team including a competent specialist in ecology. The Bureau noted that the proposal to establish an Air-and-Ténéré Biosphere Reserve covering 24 million hectares was favourably recommended to the MAB Bureau for inscription on the World Network of Biosphere Reserves. The Delegate of Niger informed the Bureau that this Biosphere Reserve would reach as far as the Algerian border and constitute a huge wildlife reserve with the World Heritage site as core area and buffer zone. The Delegate of Niger thanked Mr. Bourgeot for his report and commended IUCN for their efforts to support the conservation of the site. Furthermore, he was of the view that the state of conservation of the site has improved considerably and the site might be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee at its forthcoming session review the status of Air-and-Ténéré, future plans for its continuing recovery and decide whether or not it should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.11 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twentieth session noted that the construction of two dams had limited freshwater flow and devastated the wetland values of Ichkeul National Park, leading to dramatic increases in the salinity of the lake and marshes and sharp reductions in migratory bird populations. Hence, the Committee included Ichkeul in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Tunisian authorities to provide a programme of corrective measures to reverse the degradation of the site, and alerted them to the possibility of the deletion of Ichkeul from the World Heritage List if rehabilitation of the site is not possible.

IUCN informed the Bureau that the report of an official mission to the site by the Ramsar Convention Secretariat had suggested that the Tunisian authorities give a clear indication of the measures they plan to take based on a number of studies already carried out and which have identified conservation actions. Furthermore, an agreement on the release of water from the dams should be reached and a central management authority addressing all management issues in the site, including the long-term management of the Tindja sluice needs to be established. The Ramsar mission recommended the repair of the sluices, the filling of the Joumine Canal to restore the Joumine Marsh, and continuous scientific monitoring of the Park's ecology.

In its discussions on the potential delisting of Ichkeul, the Bureau recalled the Committee's discussions with regard to another wetland, i.e. Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria) and that the Committee had given the Bulgarian authorities a three-year time frame to restore the site.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the recommendations made by the mission of the Ramsar Secretariat to the Tunisian authorities and invite them to provide their views with regard to the implementation of the recommendations, by 15 October 1997. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee set up a three-year time table to review the outcome of efforts to restore Ichkeul National Park and in the meantime retain the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.12 Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twentieth session noted several remedial actions taken by the State Party to minimize potential and ascertained threats to this



site, and commended the President of the country for his efforts to fully remove the potential mining threat to the integrity of the site with a mutually, to-be-agreed upon trade of land, valued at US\$ 65 million. Since then, the Montana State Office of the Bureau of Land Management of the United States Department of the Interior, and the Northern Region Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture have published a summary, and the full Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed Cooke City Area Mineral Withdrawal and have circulated it inviting any person or group to comment on the Draft EIS.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee in consultation with IUCN and the State Party and based on its review of the state of conservation report due from the State Party by 15 September 1997, determine whether actions taken to mitigate potential and ascertained threats to Yellowstone are adequate and whether or not Yellowstone should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.13** The Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of two of the nine cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

##### **IV.14 Angkor (Cambodia)**

The Bureau, while commending the efforts of the Royal Government of Cambodia and UNESCO, expressed deep concern over the looting and illegal excavation of cultural properties from Angkor, notably over the organized trade in antiquities, including the dismantling of monuments. The Bureau invited the Royal Government of Cambodia to submit a report to the twenty-first session of the Committee on administrative mechanisms and regulations put into place for the enforcement of the law on cultural heritage including measures adopted for the prevention of illicit traffic in cultural property. Finally, the Bureau took note with satisfaction of the decision taken by the Royal Government of Cambodia to forbid any hotel construction within the Zones 1 and 2 of the site of Angkor. Furthermore, the Bureau ardently wished that in conformity with the studies carried out for the enforcement of the zoning plans, hotels be built within the hotel zone.

##### **IV.15 Fort Bahla (Oman)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat concerning the situation at Fort Bahla, the Bureau thanked the Omani authorities for their communications of 12 and 24 March 1997 by which they confirmed their intent to carry out the recommendations of the UNESCO experts. However, it expressed its serious concern following the collapse of the Fort's

north-west Tower and requested them to make every effort to consolidate the monument. It approved the dispatch of a new expert mission next October, on a cost-sharing basis, as previously.

**B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES  
INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**NATURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.16** The Bureau examined document WHC-97/CONF.204/2B, and a selected number of state of conservation reports of other natural properties, submitted by the Centre and the representatives of IUCN, and made specific recommendations for the consideration of the Committee.

**IV.17 Australian World Heritage Sites:**

Introducing its written report on the state of conservation of natural World Heritage properties, IUCN supplemented this with a verbal report on more recent developments in Australia. IUCN recalled previous discussions of the Bureau and the Committee on the future of forested public lands adjoining the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and the response at that time by the State Party that World Heritage issues would be taken into account in the negotiation of a Regional Forest Agreement between the Governments of Australia and the State of Tasmania. The IUCN Representative said that a World Heritage Expert Panel had reported in June 1997 to the two Governments to facilitate consideration of World Heritage issues. This report and extensive data bases should ensure that information on World Heritage potential would be available when decisions are made in finalizing the Regional Forest Agreement due to be completed by 30 June 1997.

The Bureau decided to commend the State Party on the comprehensive approach adopted and to invite the State Party to report to the Centre on the outcome relevant to World Heritage by 15 October 1997.

IUCN also commented favourably on the manner in which World Heritage cultural and natural values are being taken into account in the preparation of a new management plan for the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, including a workshop held on 16 June 1997 with the Anangu people (traditional and legal owners of the Park) and Park staff on the implications of World Heritage status on visitor management. Issues raised in the IUCN report on other sites, i.e. Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu National Park and Shark Bay, noted a number of positive decisions taken, particularly those aimed at conserving dugong habitats in the Great Barrier Reef.

The Delegate of Australia commented in detail on all the issues raised in the IUCN report about Australia and suggested that IUCN seek official comment from the Australian government as the next step. She also expressed concern at the lack of time to consider and respond to the report and requested more advanced consultations with the State Party to permit dialogue on the issues raised. Concern at the late tabling of the report was also expressed by the Delegate of Germany. The Delegate of Australia assured the Bureau that the State Party would continue to maintain its commitment to respect the integrity of its World Heritage sites.

The Chairperson ruled that the issues raised in the IUCN report should not be further considered at this meeting, because in many cases the States Parties had not been given the opportunity to examine the issues raised, to verify their accuracy and to respond.

#### **IV.18 Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

The Bureau noted that an alarming situation has recently developed in this Park which required urgent attention. A local organization is campaigning for the reopening of an 18 km road which was closed in 1986 to strengthen protection of the site. In early May, 800 people invaded the Park and set up camp to begin unauthorized work to re-open the road. The responsible conservation authorities have been unable to resist political pressures associated with this development and have not acted to contain the damage.

The Bureau requested the Centre to urgently contact Brazilian authorities to encourage them to re-establish control over the section of the Park to close the road and to rehabilitate the damaged areas within the Park. The Bureau observed the fact that Iguacu (Brazil) and Iguazu (Argentina) National Parks continue to remain as two separate World Heritage sites, despite the prevailing opportunity to link them into a single transborder World Heritage area for purposes of the World Heritage List.

#### **IV.19 Democratic Republic of the Congo**

##### **a) Okapi Faunal Reserve**

The Bureau was deeply concerned to learn that the armed conflict which spread, during early 1997, to the whole of the region has led to the looting of all facilities and killing of several elephants in this site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in Mexico (December, 1996). Most of the expatriate and research staff have fled the Park and those remaining in the site receive only minimum salaries. There are reports of gold mining within the Park and the new Government's policy with regard to respecting the boundaries of the World Heritage area remain unclear.

**b) Kahuzi Biega National Park**

The Bureau noted with grave concern that portions of this Park had been deforested and considerable hunting of wildlife had been reported. Park facilities have been looted and destroyed and most of the Park staff have left the area. The Park may also be serving as a hide-out for militant groups and conflicts between tribal populations in the area have also been reported. Although UNHCR and GTZ (Germany) are considering to provide support for the Park projects cannot be started until the security situation in the area returns to normal.

The Bureau expressed its serious concerns regarding the integrity of Okapi Faunal Reserve and the Kahuzi Biega National Park and recommended that the Committee, at its next session, include these two sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau recalled its recommendation of a high level mission to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, made with regard to the two sites in this State Party already recognized as World Heritage Sites in Danger (i.e. Garamba and Virunga National Parks) and suggested that such a mission include discussions on the state of conservation of Okapi Faunal Reserve and the Kahuzi Biega National Park as well with a view to initiating projects for their rehabilitation.

**IV.20 Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)**

The Bureau thanked IUCN, and the Observer of Ecuador for their reports. It noted that there was a major effort in Ecuador to take steps to conserve the World Heritage values of the islands.

The Bureau recalled that, at its twentieth session in Merida, the World Heritage Committee decided "to include the Galapagos National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger, effective 15 November 1997, unless a substantive written reply by Ecuador is received by 1<sup>st</sup> of May 1997, and the Bureau, at its twenty first session determine that effective actions have been taken".

Having studied both the report of the State Party and the report of IUCN, the Bureau came to the conviction that such effective actions have been taken that the efforts of the Ecuadorean authorities should be honoured. The Bureau therefore decided that it would not be appropriate to include the Galapagos National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger at this time.

In order to enable the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty first session, to have a full picture of the up-to-date situation of the World Heritage Site, the Bureau asked the State Party to deliver a progress report by, 15 November 1997,

on the nine issues outlined in the IUCN report of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 1997, as follows:

- Decree
- Law
- Control of Residency
- Quarantine
- Environmental management of populated areas
- Introduced species
- Marine reserve
- Tourism
- Financing

The Bureau recommended the World Heritage Committee to ask the State Party for an annual progress report on the above mentioned issues from the end of 1998 until the end of 2002.

The Bureau further recommended that if the decrees of the Government of Ecuador are not reflected in law by the time of the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee, scheduled in December 1997, in Naples, Italy, the Committee could once again consider adding the Galapagos to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.21 Kaziranga National Park (India)**

The Bureau noted that a member of the Centre joined the Deputy Inspector General for Wildlife for India, during 24-25 January 1997, on a mission to Kaziranga National Park, in the State of Assam, India. The Bureau learnt with satisfaction Kaziranga's success in conserving the great one-horned rhinoceros, whose population within the Park has grown from 366 in 1966 to about 1,200 at present. However, every year about 26 rhinos are poached and an additional 52 die due to natural causes, most of them drowning in the annual floods of the Brahmaputra River.

The Bureau encouraged the management of Kaziranga to proceed with their plans to add six adjacent patches totalling more than 400 sq.km. to the Park, increase the number of anti-poaching camps along the periphery of the Park, build upland refuges for animals to retreat during the annual flooding of the Brahmaputra River and launch conservation awareness and environmental education programmes for local villagers. Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the Indian authorities have submitted a request for financial assistance to support the implementation of parts of the above-mentioned activities and that the Bureau will consider the request under Agenda Item 6 (Requests for international assistance).

**IV.22 Keoladeo National Park (India)**

The Bureau recalled the fact that the Committee had previously expressed concerns regarding the decrease in the population of wintering Siberian cranes returning to this site and management problems, such as the over-growth of grasses, forming a thick mat in some areas were adversely affecting the breeding habitat of the Siberian cranes. Records maintained by Park management indicated that the wintering population of Siberian cranes, estimated at about 38 in 1985-86 when the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List, had dropped to 5 in 1992-93; no Siberian cranes were seen in Keoladeo during 1993-95. In 1996-97 three Siberian cranes have returned to Keoladeo National Park.

The Bureau noted that the State Party, recognizing that the decrease in the number of Siberian cranes arriving to winter at Keoladeo may be attributable to the intensity of hunting and other threats prevailing along the migratory route of the species, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the eight countries (Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) with whom it shares the range of the central and western Asian populations of the Siberian crane. UNEP, which hosts the Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), International Crane Foundation (ICF) and the Wild Birds Society of Japan are also signatories to the MOU, under which an action plan foresees: (i) the release of captive-bred Siberian cranes to augment wild populations; and (ii) capturing of Siberian cranes and the deployment of satellite transmitters on the cranes for tracking their migratory route from their wintering areas in Keoladeo to spring breeding grounds in other countries. At the site level, the management has introduced a controlled burning and cutting regime for grasses in order to limit their growth from negatively impacting the breeding habitats of the cranes and closed the Park for grazing by cattle belonging to local villagers. The Bureau urged the Centre to cooperate with the CMS Secretariat and support the implementation of the action plan.

**IV.23 Sundarbans National Park (India)**

The Bureau was informed that the Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage Area, comprising 1,330 sq.km., forms the core area of the larger Sundarbans Project Tiger Reserve (2,585 sq.km) and the even larger "Sundarbans Biosphere Reserve" which extends over more than 9,000 sq.km of the inter-tidal area of the Sundarbans delta. Although India has not yet formally nominated the Sundarbans Biosphere Reserve for inclusion in UNESCO's international network of biosphere reserves, the case illustrated an interesting application of the World Heritage and the Biosphere Reserve concepts of UNESCO within the same ecosystem. Several eco-development

activities undertaken in the larger Biosphere Reserve, e.g. fishing, collection of honey, timber harvest etc., have enabled the management to establish a working relationship with the local people and solicit their cooperation for the protection of the "Biosphere Reserve's" core area, i.e. Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage Area. This working relationship between the management and the local people has been particularly useful in minimizing the poaching threat to the world's largest population of the Bengal tiger inhabiting this World Heritage Site. The Bureau noted with interest the harmonious application of UNESCO's World Heritage and Biosphere Reserve concepts in Sundarbans and urged the Secretariat and IUCN to identify similar cases and bring them to the attention of States Parties to the Convention.

#### **IV.24 Nanda Devi National Park (India)**

The Bureau was informed that this Park is located in a very remote area, and due to difficulty of access, remains well protected. There are no major threats to the Park; a certain amount of illegal collection of medicinal plants and herbs has been recorded. No visitors are allowed to the Park; some mountaineering groups have in recent times expressed an interest in organizing expeditions to the area. Allowing a certain amount of visitation may facilitate the presentation of this World Heritage Area to the general public and may generate income for the benefit of local people as well. Hence, the Bureau, while taking note of the high level of protection afforded to Nanda Devi National Park, invited Indian authorities to consider undertaking a feasibility study for specialized (mountaineering) tourism development in the Park.

#### **IV.25 Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

The Bureau recalled the fact that the boat provided to this World Heritage area with financial assistance from the Fund in 1994, was destroyed in an accident during a systematic monitoring mission to the site in July 1995, in which four Indonesian officials lost their lives. With a view to equipping the Park with a boat capable of undertaking open-sea travel, the Committee at its nineteenth session (Berlin, 1995) approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 and requested that the State Party provide the additional US\$ 30,000 needed to purchase a large fiberglass catamaran. Learning the fact that the Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia has made available the US\$ 30,000 as recommended by the Committee, the Bureau requested the Centre to transmit its appreciation of the Indonesian Government's contribution of US\$ 30,000 to match an equal amount provided by the Committee. The Bureau also requested the management of the Komodo National Park to fully insure the boat against accidents and other potential liabilities.

**IV.26 Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania)**

The Bureau was informed that the Centre's attention had been drawn by the International Foundation for Banc d'Arguin (FIBA) and WWF, to a Rally, "Trophée des Gazelles - Rallye des Sables", that had traversed the area of the Park and to potential impacts which the Rally could have had on the fragile ecosystem within the Park. However, the Bureau noted that subsequently the Rally Organizers and FIBA have informed the Centre that the Rally did not traverse the World Heritage site and that there were no threats to the integrity of the site.

**IV.27 Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaino (Mexico)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its twentieth session (Merida, 1996) reviewed a report on a project for industrial salt production at the site and its potential threats to the site's whale population and noted that the project had not yet been authorized and that a Scientific Committee to review the proposed project had been established by the Ministry of Environment.

The Bureau was informed that the seven member Scientific Committee has elaborated, through consultations with the public, rigorous and comprehensive terms of reference for its work and for the environmental impact study of the proposed San Ignacio industrial salt production project. The Scientific Committee is expected to document the actual situation of the World Heritage area prior to the commencement of the industrial salt production project, assess the impact of the project's proposed construction and operational activities on the ecological, biological and protected area management aspects of the World Heritage area and undertake a 26-issues driven socio-economic evaluation of the project. The Bureau was satisfied to note that the Scientific Committee, in its preliminary report, had indicated that the proposed industrial salt production project will only be authorized if the Committee finds that the project will not compromise the conservation of natural resources in the region and does not pose a risk to the protection of the biological heritage of the Mexican people.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit its appreciation for the State Party's efforts to ensure a rigorous evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed industrial salt production project and requested the State Party to provide a progress report on the work and findings of the Scientific Committee for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-first session, in December 1997.



**IV.28 Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

The Bureau noted with satisfaction that this site has a population of more than 400 great one-horned rhinoceros and its success is partly attributable to the cooperation between the Nepalese Army and the staff of the Royal Chitwan National Park in anti-poaching activities.

The Bureau was informed that 80% of the total population (i.e. about 2,000) of the great one-horned rhinoceros, a species restricted in its range to South Asia, are found in the World Heritage sites of Kaziranga (India; 1,200) and Royal Chitwan (Nepal; 400). The Bureau, however, noted that intensive poaching can quickly lead to sharp declines in rhino populations, as observed in the World Heritage area of Manas (India), a site included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau encouraged the Centre to facilitate cooperation between the staff of Royal Chitwan (Nepal) and Kaziranga and Manas (India) World Heritage sites, and the CITES Convention for sharing of intelligence information on trading routes of rhino horns and the activities of commercially motivated poaching gangs in order to sustain the contributions which World Heritage sites have made to rhino conservation in South Asia.

**IV.29 Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal)**

The Bureau was informed that about 3500 people belonging to the Sherpa community live in and around the Park and play a significant role as guides for the visitors to the Park. Tourism however, is placing an ever increasing energy demand on the sparse woody vegetation left remaining in the area and also introduces considerable problems of waste disposal.

The Director of the Park had proposed that staff, army personnel and the Sherpa community resident in the vicinity of the Park shift to using kerosene as a primary source of energy but has been unable to raise the necessary capital, estimated to be about US\$ 50,000, for making this shift. The Director has called for more involvement of scientific expertise in advising the management on resolving practical problems such as energy needs of the staff, army personnel, the Sherpa community and the tourists and the management of waste disposal. The Bureau requested IUCN to utilize expertise available in its Nepal Office in Katmandu to undertake a field visit to Sagarmatha National Park and discuss with the Director of the Park, ways and means by which they can provide advise on alternative energy sources and other management issues. The IUCN Representative pointed out that funding would be required to support IUCN involvement.

#### **IV.30 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its twentieth session (Merida, 1996) expressed its concerns regarding the poaching of thirteen Oryx, the damage to the desert habitat caused by construction of a reverse osmosis plant and delays in the completion of the management planning and boundary definition project. The Bureau was informed that the authorities in Oman have provided the Centre an outline of an interim plan which foresees the following:

(a) a new outer boundary which will be fixed and boundaries of the five management zones which will be provisionally accepted for 5 years to allow the Ministry of Resource Management and the Environment (MRME) to map individual zones more accurately;

(b) construction of an MRME Headquarters at or near Al Ajaiz with management, research and monitoring facilities and a visitor centre, a local service centre and a desalination plant for supplying water to Al Ajaiz and its integrated development and access roads to the desalination plant at Al Khumkham, specifically to Haylat at Kharasheef and the Habbab Road;

(c) pilot projects on environmental tourism, environmental tourism plan for the coastal region from Ras Madrakab to Al Khaluf, establishment of a local coordinating committee, range land and livestock management, archaeological studies, particularly in the northern extension to the Sanctuary, and environmental awareness programmes; and

(d) possible MRME financial and human resources to develop the Sanctuary as Oman's first national park.

The Bureau thanked the Omani authorities for providing an outline of the interim plan and encouraged them to develop the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary as Oman's first national park. The Bureau requested the Omani authorities to provide a map indicating the outer boundary and the boundaries of the five management zones and to report to the Centre on the status of the Arabian Oryx population in the Sanctuary and the impacts of the reverse osmosis plant on the desert ecosystem. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to study the map(s) and the report(s) to be provided by authorities in Oman and assess whether a site visit to the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary is necessary. The Delegate of Germany stated that this case clearly demonstrates the danger connected with the inscription of a site without exact boundaries.

#### **IV.31 Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines)**

The Bureau noted that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved, in 1996, a sum of US\$ 20,000, for the

implementation of a project entitled "Protection and Information and Education Campaign for the Conservation of Tubbataha Reef Marine Park". The Bureau was happy to note that the Project Management Team (PMT) has regular consultations with Government agencies, research institutions and local communities concerned with the project's implementation and that a Presidential Task Force has brought together all groups interested in the conservation of this World Heritage site. In addition the Bureau noted that a symposium had been convened on 31 March 1997 for raising public awareness of the Management Plan for Tubbataha Reef.

The Bureau encouraged the PMT to provide the Centre with a copy of the Management Plan for Tubbataha Reef and submit periodical reports on the progress made by the Project and the status of conservation of Tubbataha Reef Marine Park. The Bureau also commended the Marine Parks Centre and the Environment Agency of Japan for financing several projects in support of the conservation of this World Heritage site.

#### **IV.32 Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)**

The Bureau was informed that the Sri Lankan authorities have increased the total area of the Sinharaja National Heritage Wilderness Area from 8,860 ha to 11,187 ha to incorporate some habitat fragments northeast of the World Heritage Area. Since the current size of the Sinharaja World Heritage area is 8,860 ha, the Bureau requested IUCN and the Centre to contact Sri Lankan authorities to obtain information on areas included in the extension in order to determine whether or not the State Party should be invited to consider increasing the total area of the World Heritage Site.

#### **IV.33 Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

The Bureau noted with concern that this site faced considerable threats from a proposal of the national electricity company (EDELCA) to erect a series of power transmission lines, expected to extend 160 km across the Park, to supply power from the Guri dam to Brazil and to a mining site north of the Park. The traditional Pemon community who inhabit a portion of the Park are concerned that the power generation project will lead to increased mining and logging and hence are opposing the scheme. During recent years large scale mining operations have been started in areas outside of the Park and is resulting in significant loss of forests and pollution of rivers. INPARQUES, the national agency responsible for Canaima National Park have limited resources and have not yet intervened against the project proposed by EDELCA. An adequate environmental impact study had not been carried out and construction is expected to begin soon. It is not known whether funds for the completion of the power lines project have been guaranteed by either the Venezuelan Government or international donors.

The Bureau noted that the Committee, at the time of inscription of this World Heritage Site in 1994, had made several recommendations, including the finalization of the boundaries of the World Heritage area, which have not yet been implemented. Hence, the Bureau suggested the Centre to transmit its concerns regarding the integrity of Canaima National Park to the Venezuelan authorities and discuss with them the feasibility of fielding a high level mission to Venezuela in order to gather information and discuss and resolve problems facing the conservation of Canaima National Park.

#### **IV.34 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its nineteenth and the twentieth sessions expressed concerns over the impacts which a proposed port development project could have on this site and plans of the Vietnam Government to issue a license for the establishment of a large floating hotel in the vicinity of the World Heritage site. The Bureau noted that a member of the Centre staff participated in the management planning training seminar organized by the Vietnamese authorities in Ha Long City, during 10-23 June 1997, with financial support (US\$ 24,250) approved by the Committee at its last session in Merida and was informed of the following:

(i) As recommended by the Committee at the time of inscription of Ha Long Bay in the World Heritage List in 1994, a Ha Long Management Department had been set up and currently has a total staff of 102. The Department is legally authorized by the Provincial Government of Quang Ninh to protect the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area and regulate development activities along the entire coast of the Bay.

(ii) The Vietnamese authorities have submitted a request for US\$ 20,000 to the consideration of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for the purchase of selected equipment for the Management Department of Ha Long Bay.

(iii) While the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area is protected adequately, enforcement of environmental regulation along the coastal zone of the Quang Ninh Province needed considerable improvement.

(iv) Plans to issue a license for the establishment of a floating hotel near Ha Long Bay World Heritage area had been withdrawn.

(v) JICA (Japanese International Cooperation Agency) will conduct an environmental study of the Ha Long Bay area.

(vi) When phase 1 of the construction of the port (i.e. Cailan port) is completed in the year 2000 about 2-4 large ships

could pass through the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area each day.

The Bureau commended the Vietnamese authorities for establishing and strengthening the Ha Long Management Department and welcomed JICA's environmental study of the Ha Long Bay area. The Bureau requested the Vietnamese authorities to strictly enforce environmental regulations in the development of the coastal zone throughout the Quang Ninh Province with a view to minimizing the pollution impacts on the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area. The Bureau encouraged the Vietnamese and the Japanese authorities to cooperate in carrying out the JICA's environmental study of the coastal and marine environment of Ha Long Bay mentioned above. The Bureau encouraged the Vietnamese authorities to search for ways and means to direct large ships that are expected to pass through the World Heritage area along alternative routes.

#### **IV.35 Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro))**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its last session had been concerned about the unplanned and uncontrolled expansion of the village of Zabljak and its environs and requested clarification regarding the boundary adjustments under consideration. Furthermore the Committee had considered an engineering evaluation of the earthen containment structures built within the earthquake prone flood plains of the Tara River.

The Bureau was informed that the Management of the Durmitor National Park have informed the Centre that their proposal to excise the 40 ha area around the village of Zabljak from the Park area had been approved by the Government of the Republic of Montenegro and that the Management wished to know whether the World Heritage Committee would agree with the proposed modification of the Park boundary. The Park Management, while ensuring high protection of the Tara River Canyon, and supporting spelaological, hydrological, biological and archeological studies there, had not reacted to the Committee's suggestion for an engineering evaluation of the earthen containment structures built in the earthquake prone flood plains of the River. Finally the Management has brought to the attention of the Centre its concerns regarding the revival of plans for exploiting the hydropower potential of the River to resolve the problem of the negative balance of power faced by the Republic of Montenegro.

The Bureau requested the Park Management to submit to the Centre, before 15 September 1997, a map showing the proposed modification of the Park's boundaries to excise the 40 ha area around the village of Zabljak and recommended that the Committee at its next session in December 1997 decide whether or not the proposed boundary modification is acceptable.

Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Centre to request clarification from the Durmitor authorities whether they feel that an engineering evaluation of the earthen containment structures in the flood plains of the River is necessary. Finally, the Bureau requested the Centre to transmit its concerns to the relevant authorities regarding their plans for tapping the hydropower potential of the Tara River and obtain more information on this subject for submission to the Committee session in December 1997.

## **MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) HERITAGE**

### **IV.36 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**

The Bureau thanked the Government of Peru for the report on Machu Picchu prepared by the National Institute for Culture. It expressed its concern, however, about the apparent lack of integral management mechanisms for the property and the implementation and/or consideration of several projects that might have a negative impact either on its natural or cultural values. The Bureau, therefore, requested IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake a joint mission to Machu Picchu in order to examine the management and conservation of the site and to draw up recommendations for future actions. The Bureau requested IUCN and ICOMOS to submit a report on the mission to the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau suggested that the mission also examines the measures taken for the protection and conservation of the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, on which the Committee at its twentieth session requested the Government of Peru to submit a full state of conservation report by 15 September 1997.

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **IV.37 Butrinti (Albania)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau of press reports according to which the site of Butrinti and its museum were looted during the civil disturbances in Albania. This information was confirmed by the Butrint Foundation and in a meeting with the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Albania to UNESCO on 16 April 1997 at which it was agreed that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Butrint Foundation mission would be undertaken to the site. Due to the security situation in the country, this mission could not be undertaken before this session of the Bureau.

The Bureau expressed its great concern about the damages caused to the World Heritage site of Butrinti and the actual conditions of the site in terms of protection, management and conservation. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to undertake a mission to the site as soon as the security situation in Albania permits

and to submit a report to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session. This report should include an assessment of the damages to the site and the actual state of conservation, a recommendation whether the Committee should consider the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as proposals for future actions in the framework of the World Heritage Convention and the resolution adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO at its hundred and fifty-first session which "urges the Director-General, in close co-operation with the competent authorities of the Republic of Albania and in close co-ordination with the other international organizations concerned, to draw up a plan of action for the rehabilitation of educational, cultural and scientific institutions and the restoration of the cultural and architectural heritage in Albania".

**IV.38          Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid fields  
from Giza to Dahshur; Nubian Monuments from Abu  
Simbel to Philae; Ancient Thebes with its  
Necropolis (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat regarding the studies carried out in several tombs at Saqqara in the Necropolis of Thebes and at Abu Simbel, by INERIS, the Supreme Council of Antiquities and the University of Cairo, the Bureau thanked the Egyptian authorities for their cooperation and invited them to implement the recommendations of the experts concerning the ventilation of these monuments, which would ensure the long-term conservation of their mural paintings.

**IV.39          Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

**a)      Al-Azhar Mosque**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat concerning the ongoing works at the Al-Azhar Mosque at the site of Islamic Cairo, the Bureau requested the Egyptian authorities to ensure that the authenticity of the monument is respected, which unfortunately was not the case for the three Fatimid Mosques, and recalled that the World Heritage Centre is available to provide expert advice to this end.

**b)      Al-Sinnari House**

After having taken note of the Secretariat's report concerning the ongoing work at the Al-Sinnari House in Islamic Cairo, the Bureau thanked the Egyptian authorities for their efforts in the restoration of this exceptional monument and requested them to ensure that highly qualified artisans be made available for this project.

**IV.40 Roman Monuments, Cathedral and Liebfrauen Church  
in Trier (Germany)**

The Bureau took note of a report submitted by the Minister for Culture, Youth, Family and Women of the Land Rheinland-Pfalz regarding the Roman amphitheatre in Trier.

The Bureau noted the results of the urban competition for the zone north of the Roman amphitheatre and the selection of a project which would permit the reopening of the northern access to the arena, which had until now, been blocked by brewery constructions. The Bureau requested the City of Trier to adopt this project and to establish a legal planning instrument for its implementation.

With regard to archaeological excavations of which the report makes no mention, the Bureau learned that they were important for a better knowledge of the site which includes, other than the amphitheatre, barracks, depots and a cemetery. The Bureau requested the local and Land authorities to do their utmost to allow the archaeologists to continue their work and to provide them with the means and the time necessary to accomplish their task.

As to the height of the urban villas east of the Bergstrasse, the Bureau regretted that the advice of the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission of May 1996 to reduce the height of the buildings closest to the amphitheatre had not been followed up. It considered that this will have a negative impact on the historical aspect of the amphitheatre. In this context, the Bureau noted the need for clearly established and adequately managed buffer zones. It requested the Secretariat to transmit these considerations to the German authorities with the request for a full report on the protection and management mechanisms for the monuments and their surroundings for examination by the next session of the Committee.

In conclusion, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to send another expert mission to Trier to assess the actual impact caused to the World heritage site, as well as the possible impact of the proposed urbanization of the Petrisberg east of the amphitheatre. It requested ICOMOS to report its findings to the next Committee session.

**IV.41 Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town of  
Quedlinburg (Germany)**

In response to a request for information made by the Observer of Lebanon, the Bureau requested the German authorities to present, by 15 September 1997, a report on the state of conservation and development plans for the City of Quedlinburg. The Bureau also requested ICOMOS to undertake a mission to Quedlinburg to assess the situation, and to report to the extraordinary session of the Bureau.



#### IV.42 Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)

The Bureau commended the Minister for Science, Research and Culture of the Land Brandenburg for the detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and the actions that have been taken to preserve the Potsdam cultural landscape.

The Bureau particularly welcomed the openness of the German authorities for dialogue and their commitment to seek compromise solutions. In particular, the Bureau took note of the commitments of the German authorities to:

- proceed with the extension of the World Heritage site as recommended by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session;
- initiate the preparation of a comprehensive 'Urban Development Master Plan for the Development of the Potsdam Cultural Landscape';
- launch three architectural/urban competitions for the *Quartier am Bahnhof*, *Alter Markt/Lustgarten* and *the Alter Markt/Palais Barberini*.
- cancel previous plans for the hotel in the *Quartier am Bahnhof* building area number 2, so as to include this area in the architectural/urban competition;
- not to implement the results of the earlier competition for building areas 9-12 for any construction above the zero ground level until the competition for the entire *Quartier am Bahnhof* will be completed and thus to allow for the competitors to develop their proposals for the entire site and for the German authorities to review the plans for building areas 9-12 in the light of their compatibility with the results of the competition and the feasibility of the project.

Furthermore, the Bureau noted with satisfaction that the 'German Unity Transport Project No 17' will not have any negative impact on the World Heritage site and that no dredging along the river sides of the castle park of Babelsberg, Neuen Garten and castle parks of Glienicke and Sacrow will be undertaken and that the Glienicke Bridge will not be changed.

Having examined in detail the report provided by the Minister for Science, Research and Culture of Land Brandenburg, the Bureau requested the German authorities to provide by 15 October 1997 a report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session which should address in particular:

- the progress made in the preparation of the proposal for the extension of the World Heritage site;
- the progress made in the preparation of a comprehensive 'Urban Development Master Plan for the Development of the Potsdam Cultural Landscape';
- the results of the architectural/urban competitions for the *Quartier am Bahnhof, Alter Markt/Lustgarten and the Alter Markt/Palais Barberini*;
- an assessment of the impact of individual building projects, as mentioned in the report submitted by the German authorities as well as other projects, on the values of the Potsdam cultural landscape;
- the results of the impact assessment of the 'German Unity Transport Project No 17'.

The Bureau recommended that, on the basis of this new report, the Committee during its twenty-first session, examines if the threats to the World Heritage site still persist and if it still considers it necessary to inscribe the World Heritage site of Potsdam on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.43 Ajanta, Ellora and Elephanta Caves (India)**

In view of the information provided by the Secretariat regarding the state of conservation of the Ajanta, Elephanta and Ellora Caves, and taking note with appreciation of the additional information provided by the Observer of India concerning the national and local efforts being made to safeguard these sites, the Bureau expressed its serious concern over the state of conservation of these sites, especially that of the advanced deterioration of the wall paintings and insufficient visitor control at the site of Ajanta. In addressing the problem of water seepage, the Bureau recommended that a study be made on the means of vegetation control and selection of species to be planted to prevent soil erosion. While the Bureau commended the plan for establishing a visitors' museum displaying replicas of the wall paintings to decrease the number of visitors entering the Ajanta Caves, it requested the concerned authorities to keep the Committee informed of the developments of the OECF *Ajanta-Ellora Development Plan* and conservation plans at Elephanta and Ajanta, especially in relation to the conservation of the fragile wall paintings in Ajanta.

#### **IV.44 Petra (Jordan)**

After having noted the report of the Secretariat on Petra and the report of the Director of the Department of Antiquities dated December 1996, the Bureau thanked the Jordanian authorities for their efforts to protect the site, but again insisted that preservation measures be urgently undertaken and

that the coordination of on-site activities be reinforced with the support of UNESCO. Amongst these measures, it would be appropriate to provide the Petra Regional Council and the Coordination Group of the Ministry of Antiquities and Tourism with the means to function; to urgently regulate and limit the construction of hotels too near to the site, buildings and the extensions to houses in the vicinity of the site and on the Taybeh road; to closely study the negative impacts of measures encouraging uncontrolled influx of tourists, such as the widening of roads; and to preserve the natural environment through the conservation of all green and wooded areas (Hishe oak forest, the pine forest and agricultural terraces close to the entrance of the site). They also requested the authorities to refrain from undertaking restoration work within the site until the condition of the monuments has been carefully recorded.

#### **IV.45 Quseir Amra (Jordan)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on the site of Quseir Amra, the Bureau thanked the Jordanian authorities for their efforts, jointly with UNESCO and the Cultural Service of the French Embassy, to protect the site from flooding and to restore the manège and the cistern of the Omayyades Baths. The Bureau recommended that the Jordanian authorities improve visitor control mechanisms to ensure a better protection of the wall paintings.

#### **IV.46 Tyre (Lebanon)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on the site of Tyr and the remarks of the Observer of Lebanon, the Bureau decided to defer the examination of the state of conservation of the site until its twenty-first extraordinary session in November, so as to take into consideration the mission reports of the experts sent to the site by UNESCO in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign and the observations of the Lebanese authorities.

#### **IV.47 Historic City of Vilnius (Lithuania)**

After having taken note of the report made by World Heritage Centre consultant, the Bureau commended the State Party and the cooperating governments, institutions and agencies for their joint effort to conserve and rehabilitate the Vilnius Historic Centre, and requested to be kept informed on the progress made. The Bureau also recommended to the State Party to accelerate the operationalization of the Agency for the Revitalization of Old Vilnius (OTRA) as a key element for the revitalization of the Historic Centre. It called upon international and bilateral donors to further discussions with the Lithuanian authorities with a view to initiating cooperative agreements along the lines endorsed at the donors' meeting which was held in February 1997 in Vilnius.

**IV.48 Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico)**

The Bureau took note of the results of an expert mission to the Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan and commended the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH) for the exemplary management and conservation of the site. The Bureau requested the national authorities to examine the consultant's report with great attention and to transmit its views on, and follow-up actions foreseen in response to the conclusions and recommendations contained in it to the Secretariat by 15 September 1997 for examination by the Bureau at its next session.

**IV.49 Medina of Fez (Morocco)**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Moroccan authorities according to which the road construction projects through the Medina had been abandoned and congratulated them for the measures undertaken to preserve the site.

**IV.50 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report provided by His Majesty's Government of Nepal and expressed its appreciation for the progress made towards fulfilling the sixteen-point recommendation of the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission of 1993. In expressing its regret over the further delay in the integration of the Development Control Unit (DCU) as a permanent unit of the Department of Archaeology (DOA), the Bureau recalled that international assistance under the World Heritage Fund for the establishment of the DCU was not to provide salary support but for the training of the DCU staff. It therefore reiterated its hope that His Majesty's Government will honour its commitment to make available the necessary resources to enable the DOA to maintain the DCU in function.

While having noted improvements in the enforcement of building regulations in the Monument Zones of Bhaktapur, and Patan, the Bureau expressed deep concern over the continued demolition of historic buildings located along the circular street surrounding the Bauddha Stupa and the construction of new structures, including the new Buddhist temple, which do not conform to the building codes. In view of the alarming situation in the Monument Zone of Bauddhanath, and the persisting problems in the Monument Zone of Kathmandu, the Bureau wished to consider at its twenty-first extraordinary session to be held in November 1997, the placement of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage Site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. To enable it to make a sound recommendation to the Committee in this regard, the Bureau requested His Majesty's Government of Nepal to provide a full report on the progress made in each of the sixteen points of the 1993 UNESCO-ICOMOS recommendation.

**IV.51 City of Cusco (Peru)**

The Bureau took note of the report presented by the Peruvian National Institute for Culture on Cusco and reiterated the need for appropriate planning mechanisms for the historical City of Cusco. The Bureau welcomed the proposal to establish a Master Plan but emphasized that in the process of its preparation and application arrangements should be made for the adequate coordination and collaboration between all institutions and authorities involved, particularly the National Institute for Culture and the municipality of the City.

**IV.52 Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

The Bureau commended the Polish authorities for the adoption of the 'Strategic Government Programme (Oswiecim Program)' which foresees activities for the years 1997-2001 aiming at a long-term and comprehensive development and management of the site while fully recognizing the need to protect and preserve the physical integrity and dignity of the site and abstaining from any commercial development which could compromise the site's symbolic values. The Bureau fully supported the 'Declaration Concerning Principles for Implementation of Program Oswiecimski' and commended the signatories of the Declaration (the Government of Poland, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, the International Council of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau and the City of Oswiecim) for their will to fully cooperate in the preparation and implementation of the 'Urban Master Plan for the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau'. The Bureau requested the Polish authorities to inform the Committee on a regular basis on the progress made in this matter.

The Observer of Poland underlined the importance of the Declaration and informed the Bureau that the Government of Poland has asked ICOMOS-Poland to coordinate its implementation. The Representative of ICOMOS-Poland assured the Bureau that the Committee will be kept informed about the progress made in this respect.

**IV.53 Churches of Moldavia (Romania)**

The Bureau took note of the initiation of the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust project 'International Support for the Restoration and Preservation of the Probota Monastery' which is the first large-scale UNESCO cultural heritage project funded by the Japanese authorities outside Asia. It commended the authorities of Romania and Japan as well as UNESCO for their joint collaboration in this respect.

**IV.54 Alhambra, Generalife and Albayzin, Grenada  
(Spain)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat regarding the situation of the Albayzin and the construction of a festivities hall at the Place del Rey Chico, the Bureau:

1) expressed satisfaction that the global revitalization programme of the Albayzin quarter was being elaborated in association with all sectors concerned;

2) strongly requested the competent authorities to undertake all efforts to ensure that the revitalization of the Albayzin quarter is implemented in accordance with the World Heritage Convention and other international conventions and recommendations in force;

3) insisted strongly that the competent authorities undertake all efforts to avoid the degradation of the site through construction works which should be interrupted until the results of impact studies are known, and requested them to provide the Secretariat with a report relating the measures undertaken to remedy this situation so that the World Heritage Committee may be informed at its twenty-first session in December 1997;

4) requested that the application of the Convention should be strengthened in this World Heritage sites and a management plan for the entire site be prepared within the framework of a joint Spain-UNESCO Committee to be set up urgently to follow-up the implementation of the above measures.

**IV.55 Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain)**

Having taken note of the information provided by the Secretariat on the state of conservation of the site and inappropriate management of traffic in its vicinity, the Bureau requested the national authorities to provide a report on the measures taken and the plans adopted for the protection of the Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct. The Bureau requested ICOMOS to examine the state of conservation of the World Heritage Site of Segovia and to present a report to the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**IV.56 Old City of Berne (Switzerland)**

The Bureau expressed its concerns regarding the damages caused by a fire to five of the historic buildings in the Old City of Berne. It commended the Swiss authorities for the immediate actions taken for their safeguarding and restoration.

#### **IV.57 Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)**

##### **a) Mosque of the Omayyades**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on the Mosque of the Omayyades in the Ancient City of Damascus, the Bureau thanked the Syrian authorities for having halted the work which was threatening the authenticity of the monument and renewed the invitation which had been made by the Committee at its twentieth session to provide all possible advice of national and international experts to decide upon future action to be undertaken

##### **b) Tekiya Souleymaniah**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on the situation at the Tekiya Souleymaniah in the Ancient City of Damascus, and the letter dated 21 June from the Direction of Antiquities and Museums, the Bureau thanked the authorities of the Arab Republic of Syria to have halted the calls for tender for foundation work at the monument and asked them to keep the Committee informed of the results of the additional scientific and technical studies.

#### **IV.58 Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on the Ancient City of Bosra, the Bureau thanked the Syrian authorities for their efforts in the conservation of the restoration of the southern Baths, and invited them to continue collaboration with the French Mission to continue the restoration of these monuments with all necessary precautions and with the most competent enterprises.

#### **IV.59 Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat on Palmyra, the Bureau warmly encouraged the Syrian authorities to proceed with the deviation of the busy road which crossed the World Heritage site and to initiate, without delay, the study on a global plan for its conservation. It recalled that the Centre was always available to provide expert assistance for such projects.

#### **IV.60 Hadrian's Wall (United Kingdom)**

At the time of inscription the site was not defined by mapped boundaries. In response to increasing threats through tourism, development etc., English Heritage together with the authorities and landowners devised a management plan for the site.

The Representative of ICOMOS underlined the exemplary nature of the management plan which ensures cooperation between all partners, a strategy for tourism management and provides a clear

definition of the boundaries of the site. An extensive buffer zone has been identified along Hadrian's Wall and its associated sites. The plan further foresees the establishment of a database and periodic monitoring.

The Bureau commended the authorities of the United Kingdom for the preparation of the management plan for Hadrian's Wall and for the clear delimitation of the site.

**IV.61** In connection with discussions on the state of conservation of several World Heritage sites, the Bureau emphasized the need for the recognition of the World Heritage values in the integral planning at World Heritage sites, as well as the need for the establishment of adequate buffer zones. It also concluded that communications between all levels of government and the World Heritage Committee and its Secretariat should be improved so as to avoid that the World Heritage Committee be alerted too late in the process about inappropriate interventions and constructions in or close to World Heritage sites. The Representative of IUCN also commended the importance given in the Hadrian's Wall Management Plan to the site's World Heritage status and drew the Bureau's attention to the excellent emphasis on World Heritage in the planning ordinances for the City of Bath.

**IV.62** In this context it was recalled that paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines invites the States Parties to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in the area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property, and that notice should be given as soon as possible and before making any decision that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the world heritage value of the site is fully preserved. In discussing the management plan for Hadrian's Wall, the Representative of ICOMOS noted that the matters of the boundaries, buffer zones and management mechanisms should receive particular attention in the context of the monitoring and reporting procedures that might be introduced following the decision-making at the General Assembly of States Parties later in the year.

**IV.63** Following discussions of the looting of the site museum at Butrinti, Albania, the Secretariat recalled that illicit traffic was a severe problem at a number of World Heritage sites (Angkor, Baalbek, Petra, Kathmandu Valley, Saqqara, etc.) and that support could be provided by UNESCO in training, contact with other international networks such as INTERPOL and ICOM, and recovery (UNESCO press releases and Notices of Stolen Cultural Property). It also could support states to implement the UNESCO Convention on Illicit Traffic (1970) and the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Property (1995). There are 150 States



Parties to the World Heritage Convention but only 86 to the 1970 Convention. Further information about participation of States in these conventions was requested and a table with information was circulated.

**IV.64** The need for an integrated application of UNESCO's three Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage was stressed by several of the Bureau members. The Representative of ICOMOS emphasized the need for better collaboration by all actors for protection of heritage and described new working arrangements of ICOMOS, ICOM, ICA and IFLA in the International Committee of the Blue Shield. He also stressed the importance of the 1954 and 1970 Conventions to complete protection of heritage.

**IV.65** The Bureau concluded that the item of prevention of illicit traffic at World Heritage sites should be included in the agenda of the next Committee session and that the Committee should consider recommending to all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to also adopt the other two Conventions.

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

**V.1** The Secretariat informed the Bureau that all the cultural properties proposed for inscription are listed on the tentative lists of the respective States Parties. Furthermore, the Bureau noted that of 149 States Parties, 75 had submitted, by June 1997, tentative lists in accordance with criteria specified in the Guidelines. The complete list of States Parties having submitted tentative lists and having presented nominations for inscription by 1 July 1996, as well as the individual lists of each State, have been communicated to members of the Bureau (WHC-97/CONF.204/3ARev.).

**V.2** The Bureau decided not to examine tentative list of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). It was remarked that this tentative list should not have been processed and presented to this session of the Bureau.

**V.3** The Delegate of Germany, supported by the Delegate of Mexico and the Observers of Thailand and Lebanon, noted that this year's nominations increase the imbalance between cultural and natural properties as well as between regions. He made a particular reference to paragraph 6 (viii) of the Operational Guidelines in which it is stated that the Convention provides for the protection of a select list of the most outstanding cultural and natural properties and in which the Committee invites States Parties to consider whether their cultural heritage is already well represented on the List and

if so to slow down voluntarily their rate of submission of further nominations.

**V.4** The Bureau concluded that this matter should be examined in great depth in the context of the global strategy for a representative World Heritage List. The Observer of Canada referred to the report of the 1994 global strategy meeting in which this matter is analysed and suggested that this report be made available, as a working document, to the forthcoming Committee session.

**V.5** 55 nominations for inscription were examined by the Bureau (13 concerning natural properties, 41 cultural and one mixed).

#### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

**V.6** The Bureau examined 13 new natural nominations and one mixed site received for review by IUCN. IUCN informed the Bureau that, due to climatic conditions, two field missions could not be carried out in time for the June meeting of the Bureau and are scheduled for August (Central Karakorum National Park) and October (Natural Reserve "Le Triunfo", Mexico) 1997, respectively. The Bureau also examined two previously deferred nominations. The Centre furthermore informed the Bureau that two sites were withdrawn by States Parties: Fossil Forest of Dunarobba (Italy) and Vodlozero National Park (Russian Federation).

**V.7** The Bureau decided not to examine the nomination of Biogradska Gora National Park (No. 838) submitted by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

**V.8** Concerning the nomination of Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802) submitted by Pakistan, the Observer of India made the following statement: "The proposed site in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir is located in an area which is under illegal control of Pakistan. Therefore, the question of territorial jurisdiction cannot be overlooked in this case. I request the Bureau to take note of the Indian position on this issue and not to proceed further with the consideration of the matter".

**V.9** The Bureau recalled that the World Heritage Convention fully respects sovereignty of its States Parties (Articles 4 and 6) and decided to defer the examination of the Central Karakorum National Park. Hence, the Bureau requested IUCN not to proceed with the evaluation of the nomination.

**V.10** Several members of the Bureau expressed the wish that the Rapporteur contact the Representative of Pakistan to UNESCO and obtain a statement regarding Pakistan's position on the Central Karakorum National Park nomination for inclusion

in the Rapporteur's report. After consultation with the Permanent Delegate of Pakistan to UNESCO, the Rapporteur was provided with a statement (see Annex IV).

**A. Property which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List**

Name of Property	Identification number	State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention	Criteria
------------------	-----------------------	---	----------

<b>Heard and McDonald Islands</b>	577Rev.	Australia	N(i)(ii)
-----------------------------------	---------	-----------	----------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property under criteria (i) and (ii). It noted that this site is the only volcanically active sub-Antarctic island and illustrates ongoing geomorphic processes and glacial dynamics in the coastal and submarine environment and sub-Antarctic flora and fauna, with no record of alien species.

<b>Cocos Island National Park</b>	820	Costa Rica	N(ii)(iv)
-----------------------------------	-----	------------	-----------

The Bureau noted that the name of the site, originally nominated as "Cocos Island Marine and Terrestrial Conservation Area", had been changed to "Cocos Island National Park". The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe Cocos Island National Park under natural criteria (ii) and (iv) because of the critical habitats the site provides for marine wildlife including large pelagic species, especially sharks. The Bureau commended the Government of Costa Rica for its initiative to incorporate the marine environment into the Park and encouraged it to extend the limit of this protection from 8km to 15 km around the island.

<b>Morne Trois Pitons National Park</b>	814	Dominica	N(i)(iv)
---	-----	----------	----------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Morne Trois Pitons National Park on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iv) for its diverse flora with endemic species of vascular plants, rich fauna including a large number of bird species, its volcanoes, rivers and waterfalls, illustrating ongoing geomorphological processes with high scenic value.

The Bureau asked the Centre to write a letter to the authorities of Dominica requesting them to provide a time frame for the revision of the management plan and encouraging them to submit a technical assistance request for this revision. In addition, the Bureau requested the Dominica authorities to control further hydroelectric power development in the Park and act to eliminate private holdings in the Park. The Bureau urged the authorities of Dominica to provide, by 15 September 1997, their response to the above suggestions in order for it to be considered by the Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session on 28 and 29 November 1997.

**Pyrénées - 773 France/Spain N(i)(iii)  
Mount Perdu**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site under natural criteria (i) and (iii). The calcareous massif of the Mount Perdu displays in a classic way a number of geological landforms including deep canyons and spectacular cirque walls. It is also an outstanding scenic landscape with meadows, lakes, caves and forests on mountain slopes. In addition, the area is of high interest to science and conservation.

The Bureau took note of the change of the name of the site, from "Mont "Perdu/Tres Seroles" to "Pyrénées - Mount Perdu", as proposed by the two States Parties, and was informed that the site was originally submitted in 1995 under natural criteria. In April 1997 the authorities of France and Spain informed the Centre that they wish also to nominate the area as a cultural landscape under cultural criteria. The Bureau noted that this site is not included in the tentative lists of France or Spain. If the States Parties take action to include the site in their respective tentative lists by 1 September 1997, ICOMOS would be able to carry out an evaluation mission for the cultural landscape aspects in time to report back to the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau.

The Bureau also noted that "cultural landscape" is a relatively new concept, adopted by the Committee in 1992, and that the Expert Meeting on "Evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites" held at the Parc national de la Vanoise, France, in March 1996, had addressed the links between cultural and natural heritage.

**B. Property which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription**

**The Valley of Viñales Pinar del Río**                      **840**                      **Cuba**

The Bureau noted that the site does not meet the natural criteria, lacked clearly defined boundaries and does not have sufficient legal protection. Hence the Bureau did not recommend inscription of this site on the List.

The Bureau noted that the Cuban authorities may wish to consider nominating the area as a cultural landscape.

**C. Properties for which the nominations were referred back to the State Party**

**Macquarie Island**                      **629 Rev.**                      **Australia**                      **N(i)(iv)**

The Bureau noted that the nomination was submitted for its geological features resulting from its location at the edge of two tectonic plates.

The Bureau noted that IUCN has received further information from the Australian authorities and external reviewers of the nomination dossier. These concern both the significance of Macquarie's geological and biological values and further comparative data on islands of the southern ocean.

The Bureau referred this nomination back to Australia in order that this new material can be assessed in light of additional natural heritage criteria. If this information is received by 15 September 1997, IUCN is asked to provide its evaluation to the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1997.

**The Sunderbans**                      **798**                      **Bangladesh**                      **N(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau decided to refer the property back to the State Party, as it does not meet the conditions of integrity on its own. The Bureau suggested that the authorities of Bangladesh consider enlarging the nomination to include the Sundarbans East and South Wildlife Sanctuaries.

The Bureau furthermore encouraged the authorities of Bangladesh and of India to discuss the possibility for creating a transfrontier site with the adjoining Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage site (India).

**National Reserve of  
Maasai Mara**

799

Kenya

The Bureau noted that the site, on its own, does not meet natural criteria. However, the Bureau noted that this site is an integral component of the Serengeti ecosystem and hence could be considered as an extension to the World Heritage site of Serengeti National Park in Tanzania.

The Bureau encouraged the Kenyan authorities to work together with the Government of Tanzania for a transfrontier agreement to extend the Serengeti World Heritage site to include the National Reserve of Masai Mara. The Bureau expressed concerns over the integrity of the National Reserve of Maasai Mara and asked the Centre to transmit these comments to the authorities of both Tanzania and Kenya and to request their replies by 15 September 1997.

**Mount Kenya National  
Park/Natural Forest**

800

Kenya

N(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property under natural criteria (ii) and (iii) as one of the most impressive landscapes of Eastern Africa with its rugged glacier-clad summits and forested slopes illustrating outstanding ecological processes.

The Bureau noted that Mt. Kenya is also a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve and will be the subject of a periodic review to strengthen its Biosphere Reserve functions. Under the statutory framework for Biosphere Reserves, such periodic reviews are required every ten years. The Bureau however expressed concern about illegal deforestation and encroachment on the slopes of Mt. Kenya and recommended that the Kenyan authorities reduce the size of the nominated area by excluding heavily impacted forests. The Bureau asked the Centre to contact the Kenyan authorities and request them to provide details of actions they intend to take to improve management of the forested zone, and a detailed map of the revised boundaries of the property before 15 September 1997.

**D. Deferred property**

**Natural Reserve  
of the Terrestrial  
Molluscs, genus Polymita**

839

Cuba

The Bureau noted that the present nomination did not meet the natural criteria. It decided to defer this property to allow the Cuban authorities to consider preparing a revised nomination to include one or more national parks in eastern

Cuba, which would also incorporate Polymita species as well as other natural features.

**E. Properties recommended for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

**Okapi Faunal Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo)  
Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)**

The Bureau discussed the state of conservation of these two sites under Agenda Item 4 (see Chapter IV) and serious threats to their integrity. The Bureau recommended that a high-level mission be undertaken to the Democratic Republic of the Congo to remind authorities of their obligations under the World Heritage Convention and initiate actions to plan rehabilitation of the two sites. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to report back on the steps taken in this regard to the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1997.

**MIXED PROPERTY**

**Property which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List**

<b>Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks</b>	<b>801</b>	<b>Kenya</b>	<b>N(i)(iv)</b>
--	------------	--------------	-----------------

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this property on the basis of natural criteria (i) and (iv) for the discoveries of mammal fossil remains in the site which led to the scientific reconstruction of the palaeo-environment of the entire Turkana lake basin of the Quarternary period. The Lake Turkana ecosystem with its diverse bird life and desert environment offers an exceptional laboratory for studies of plant and animal communities. The Bureau expressed its concern and drew the attention of the Kenyan authorities to grazing by large herds of domestic livestock in the Parks.

Concerning cultural criteria the Bureau noted ICOMOS' request for further information on the Koobi Fora portion of the site and that a comparative study of fossil hominid sites is expected to be completed in late summer 1997; the results of that study will be presented to the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1997.

**CULTURAL HERITAGE****A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List**

<b>Name of Property</b>	<b>Identi- fication number</b>	<b>State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>Hallstatt-Dachstein/ Salzkammergut Cultural Landscape</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>Austria</b>	<b>C(iii)(iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). The Hallstatt-Dachstein/Salzkammergut alpine region is an outstanding example of a cultural landscape of great scientific interest because it contains evidence of a fundamental human economic activity.

<b>The Historic Centre of Sao Luis</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>Brazil</b>	<b>C(iii)iv)(v)</b>
--	------------	---------------	---------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v). The Historic Centre of Sao Luis do Maranhao is an outstanding example of a Portuguese colonial town that adapted successfully to the climatic conditions in equatorial South America and which has preserved its urban fabric, harmoniously integrated with its natural setting, to an exceptional degree.

<b>The Ancient City of Ping Yao</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>China</b>	<b>C(ii)(iii)(iv)</b>
---	------------	--------------	-----------------------

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Ancient City of Ping Yao is an outstanding example of a Han Chinese city of the Ming and Qing Dynasties (14th-20th centuries) that has retained all its features to an exceptional degree and in doing so provides a remarkably complete picture of cultural, social, economic and religious development during one of the most seminal periods of Chinese history.



**The Classical Gardens of Suzhou**      813      **China**      **(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v). The four classical gardens of Suzhou are masterpieces of Chinese landscape garden design in which art, nature, and ideas are integrated perfectly to create ensembles of great beauty and peaceful harmony, and the four gardens are integral to the entire historic urban plan. The Bureau, however, requested the Secretariat to inform the State Party of its recommendation to submit a nomination to extend the World Heritage protection to the entire historic town of Suzhou whose cultural value, marked by the linkage between its canal system and hundreds of gardens, extends beyond the four nominated gardens. The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to inform the State Party of its concern over the proposed construction of the ring road inside the historic town, which would entail irreversible damage to the historic urban morphology of this once fortified town.

**The Episcopal Complex of the Euphrasian Basilica in the Historic Centre of Porec**      809      **Croatia**      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Episcopal Complex of the Euphrasian Basilica in the Historic Centre of Porec is an outstanding example of an early Christian Episcopal complex which is exceptional by virtue of its completeness and its unique Basilica Cathedral.

**The Historic City of Trogir**      810      **Croatia**      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). Trogir is an exceptional example of a medieval town built on and conforming with the layout of a Hellenistic and Roman city that has conserved its urban fabric to an exceptional degree and with a minimum of modern interventions in which the trajectory of social and cultural development is clearly visible in every aspect of the townscape.

**The Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn**      822      **Estonia**      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). Tallinn is an outstanding and exceptionally complete and

well preserved example of a medieval northern European trading city that retains the salient features of this unique form of economic and social community to a remarkable degree.

**The Historic Fortified City of Carcassonne**                      **345rev**                      **France**                      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). The historic town of Carcassonne is an excellent example of a medieval fortified town whose massive defences were constructed on walls dating from Latin Antiquity. It is also of exceptional importance by virtue of the restoration work carried out in the second half of the 19th century by Viollet-le-Duc, which had a profound influence on subsequent developments in conservation principles and practices.

**The 18th Century Royal Palace at Caserta, with the Park, the Aqueduct of Vanvitelli, and the San Leucio Complex**                      **549Rev**                      **Italy**                      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The monumental complex at Caserta, whilst cast in the same mould as other 18th century royal establishments, is exceptional for the broad sweep of its design, incorporating not only an imposing palace and park, but also much of the surrounding natural landscape and an ambitious new town laid out according to the urban planning precepts of its time. The industrial complex of the Belvedere, designed to produce silk, is also of outstanding interest because of the idealistic principles that underlay its original conception and management.

**Residences of the Royal House of Savoy**                      **823**                      **Italy**                      **C(i)(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (v). The Residences of the Royal House of Savoy in and around Turin represent a comprehensive overview of European monumental architecture in the 17th and 18th centuries, using style, dimensions, and space to illustrate in an exceptional way the prevailing doctrine of absolute monarchy in material terms.

**The Botanical Garden            824            Italy            C(ii)(iii)**  
**(Orto Botanico), Padua**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (ii) and (iii). The Botanical Garden of Padua is the original of all botanical gardens throughout the world, and represents the birth of science, of scientific exchanges, and understanding of the relationship between nature and culture. It has made a profound contribution to the development of many modern scientific disciplines, notably botany, medicine, chemistry, ecology, and pharmacy.

The Bureau requested the State Party to provide complementary information on financing and management of the site.

**The Cathedral, Torre            827            Italy            C(i)ii)(iii)(iv)**  
**Civica and Piazza Grande,**  
**Modena**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The joint creation of Lanfranco and Wiligelmo is a masterpiece of human creative genius in which a new dialectical relationship between architecture and sculpture was created in Romanesque art. The Modena complex bears exceptional witness to the cultural traditions of the 12th century and is one of the best examples of an architectural complex where religious and civic values are combined in a medieval Christian town.

**The Archaeological            829            Italy            C(iii)(iv)(v)**  
**Areas of Pompei,**  
**Herculaneum and**  
**Torre Annunziate**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (iii), (iv) and (v). The impressive remains of the towns of Pompei and Herculaneum and their associated villas, buried by the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79, provide a complete and vivid picture of society and daily life at a specific moment in the past that is without parallel anywhere in the world.

**Villa Romana                    832            Italy            C(i)(ii)(iii)**  
**del Casale**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iii). The Villa del Casale at Piazza Armerina is the supreme example of a luxury Roman villa, which graphically

illustrates the predominant social and economic structure of its age. The mosaics that decorate it are exceptional for their artistic quality and invention as well as their extent. The Bureau urged the State Party to address concerns expressed in the evaluation of ICOMOS regarding the drainage of the site and the climatic conditions within the cover buildings.

**Su Nuraxi di Barumini**                      **833**                      **Italy**                      **C(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (iv). The *nuraghe* of Sardinia, of which Su Nuraxi is the pre-eminent example, represent an exceptional response to political and social conditions, making an imaginative and innovative use of the materials and techniques available to a prehistoric island community.

**The Ch'angdokkung Palace Complex**                      **816**                      **Korea (Republic of)**                      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), and (iv). The Ch'angdokkung Palace Compound is an outstanding example of Far Eastern palace architecture and garden design, exceptional for the way in which the buildings are integrated into and harmonized with the natural setting, adapting to the topography and retaining indigenous tree cover.

**Hwasong Fortress**                      **817**                      **Korea (Republic of)**                      **C(ii)(iii)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). The Hwasong Fortress is an outstanding example of early modern military architecture, incorporating the most highly developed features of that science from both east and west.

**The Historic Centre of Riga**                      **852**                      **Latvia**                      **C(i)(ii)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i) and (ii). The Historic Centre of Riga, while retaining its medieval and later urban fabric relatively intact, is of outstanding universal value by virtue of the quality and the quantity of its *Art Nouveau/Jugendstil* architecture, which is unparalleled anywhere in the world, and its 19th Century architecture in wood.

**The Archaeological Site of Volubilis**                      **836**                      **Morocco**                      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**

After having taken note of the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Archaeological site of Volubilis on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi), considering that this site constituted an exceptionally well preserved example of a large Roman colonial town on the very fringes of the Empire.

The Delegate of Morocco informed the Bureau of his country's intention, to propose an extension to the site to include the City of Moulay Idriss. This proposal would be made once effective measures for the long-term protection of the city's cultural and architectural values had been taken, in view of its rapid growth.

**The Medina of Tétouan (formerly known as Titawin)**                      **837**                      **Morocco**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

After having taken note of the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Medina of Tétouan (formerly Titawin) on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v), considering that it is an exceptionally well preserved and complete example of this type of historic town, displaying all the features of the high Andalusian culture.

**Hospicio Cabanas, Guadalajara**                      **815**                      **Mexico**                      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Hospicio Cabanas is a unique architectural complex, designed to respond to social and economic requirements for housing the sick, the aged, the young, and the needy, which provides an outstanding solution of great subtlety and humanity. It also houses one of the acknowledged masterpieces of mural art.

**Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha**                      **666Rev.**                      **Nepal**                      **C(iii)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi). As the birthplace of the Lord Buddha, the sacred area of Lumbini is one of the holiest places of one of the world's great religions, and its remains contain important evidence about the nature of Buddhist pilgrimage centres from a very early period.

**The Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout**                      **818**                      **Netherlands**                      **C(i)(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). The Kinderdijk-Elshout Mill network is an outstanding man-made landscape that bears powerful testimony to human ingenuity and fortitude over nearly a millennium in draining and protecting an area by the development and application of hydraulic technology.

**The Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour**                      **819**                      **Netherlands**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (v). The Historic Area of Willemstad is a European colonial ensemble in the Caribbean of outstanding value and integrity, which illustrates the organic growth of a multicultural community over three centuries and preserves to a high degree significant elements of the many strands that came together to create it.

**Historic District of Panama with the Salon Bolivar**                      **790**                      **Panama**                      **C(ii)(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau noted that the Government of Panama had withdrawn the nomination of the site of Panama Viejo and that it maintained the nomination of the Historic District with the Salon Bolivar for inscription on the World heritage List.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). Panama was the first European settlement on the Pacific coast of the Americas, in 1519, and the Historic District preserves intact a street pattern, together with a substantial number of early domestic buildings, which are exceptional testimony to the nature of this early settlement. The Salon Bolivar is of outstanding historical importance, as the venue for Simon Bolivar's visionary attempt in 1826 to create a Pan-American congress, more than a century before such institutions became a reality.

**The Medieval Town Torun**                      **835**                      **Poland**                      **C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (ii) and (iv). Torun is a small historic trading city that

preserves to a remarkable extent its original street pattern and outstanding early buildings, and which provides an exceptionally complete picture of the medieval way of life.

**The Castle of the Teutonic Order in Malbork**      **847**      **Poland**      **C(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). Malbork Castle is the supreme example of the medieval brick castle that characterizes the unique architecture of the Teutonic Order in eastern Europe. It is also of historical significance for the evidence that it provides of the evolution of the modern philosophy and practice of restoration and conservation.

Upon the decision of the Bureau to recommend inscription, the Delegate of Germany and the Observer of Poland made statements (see Annex V).

**Las Médulas**      **803**      **Spain**      **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) considering that the gold-mining area is an outstanding example of innovative Roman technology, in which all the elements of the ancient landscape, both industrial and domestic, have survived to an exceptional degree.

After having taken note of the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Delegate of Germany requested that his disagreement to this recommendation for inscription be noted in the report of the Bureau.

**The Palau de la Musica Catalana and the Hospital de Sant Pau, Barcelona**      **804**      **Spain**      **C(i)(ii)(iv)**

After having taken note of the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe these two properties on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv), considering that the Palau de la Musica Catalana and the Hospital de Sant Pau in Barcelona are outstanding examples of the *Art Nouveau* style that played so important a role in the evolution of 20th century architecture.

**San Millan Yuso            805            Spain            C(ii)(iv)(vi)**  
**and Suso Monasteries**

After having taken note of the evaluation of ICOMOS, the bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi), considering that the Monasteries of Suso and Yuso at San Millan de la Cogolla are an exceptional testimony to the introduction and continuous survival of Christian monasticism, from the 6th century to the present day. The property is also of outstanding associative significance as the birthplace of the modern written and spoken Spanish language.

**Dougga/Thugga            794            Tunisia            C(ii)(iii)**

After having noted the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii) considering Dougga/Thugga is the best preserved Roman small town in North Africa and as such provides an exceptional picture of everyday life in antiquity.

**Maritime Greenwich    795            United            C(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)**  
**Kingdom**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (vi). The public and private buildings and the Royal Park at Greenwich form an exceptional ensemble that bears witness to human artistic and scientific endeavour of the highest quality, to European architecture at an important stage of its evolution, and to the creation of a landscape that integrates nature and culture in a harmonious whole.

**B. Properties for which the nominations were referred  
back to the State Party**

**The Old Town of            811            China            C(ii)(iv)**  
**Lijiang**

The Bureau decided on the referral of this nomination to the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1997 in view of the lack of time to fully analyse the additional documents on the management and protective mechanisms provided by the State Party. ICOMOS however stated the site's outstanding universal value as a unique historic town which merges the indigenous Naxi people's building tradition and external forms of architecture and design. The traditional engineering skills witnessed in the remarkable water system supplying water from the surrounding mountains to every house demonstrates the town's harmonious relationship with its natural environment.



ICOMOS paid tribute to the excellent quality of the reconstruction of the town without loss of authenticity after the February 1996 earthquake which demonstrates the living tradition of the indigenous building skills. In relation to this nomination, the Bureau requested the State Party to provide comparative analyses of the historic towns on China's tentative list.

**San Pedro de la Roca Castle, Santiago de Cuba**                      **841**                      **Cuba**                      **C(iv)(v)**

The Bureau welcomed the revised and extended boundaries for the site that were submitted by the State Party in response to ICOMOS' recommendations. The Bureau decided to refer this nomination back to the State Party in order to enable the State Party to submit, by 1 October 1997, a management plan for the site for evaluation by ICOMOS in time for the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Isands (Palmaria), Tino and Tinetto)**                      **826**                      **Italy**                      **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau referred the examination of this property back to the State Party requesting detailed information on tourism management, and legal instruments and mechanisms and community involvement to preserve the characteristics of this cultural landscape. There was a discussion on the role of IUCN in evaluating cultural landscapes. The Representative of IUCN pointed out that, while the Operational Guidelines call for IUCN to be associated with ICOMOS in evaluating appropriate cultural landscape nominations, no additional finance had yet been allocated to ICOMOS to facilitate this.

If this information is provided and judged satisfactory by the next extraordinary session of the Bureau, the Bureau recommends inscription of this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v).

**The Costiera Amalfitana**                      **830**                      **Italy**

The Bureau referred the examination of this property and requested the State Party to provide information on the management of the site.

In case this information be provided and judged satisfactory by the next extraordinary session of the Bureau, the Bureau



Party prefers to retain this as a separate nomination, further consideration should await the completion of appropriate comparative studies.

**Essaouira****753****Morocco**

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of this property to allow the State Party to formulate and implement a management plan incorporating monitoring and maintenance programmes supported by professionally accepted conservation standards and guidelines and implemented by a formal administrative structure responsible solely for this work. The Delegate of Morocco thanked UNESCO and ICOMOS for having sent a highly qualified expert to complete the evaluation of this site. He assured the Bureau that the recommendations made by this expert mission would be taken into account in the elaboration of a management plan of the city, which would serve for the future resubmission of the nomination.

**V.10** Upon the conclusion of the examination of the nominations, the Delegate of Italy made a statement on the meaning and implications of the establishment of the World Heritage List and the position of the Government of Italy in this respect. His statement is attached to this report as Annex VI.

**VI REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**VI.1** The Bureau examined Documents WHC-97/CONF. 204/4 and WHC-97/CONF.204/4.Add and made the following decisions:

**NATURAL HERITAGE****Technical Co-operation:**

Request approved by the Bureau:.

**International expert meeting on "World Heritage Convention as an International Instrument for Biodiversity Conservation in Tropical Forests", Brastagi, North Sumatra, Indonesia (March, 1998)**

The Bureau approved an amount of US\$ 30,000 for the above meeting and requested IUCN and the Centre to ensure that scientific information used in the preparation of, and discussions during the meeting, is used to deliver products that are directly beneficial to the operations of the World Heritage Convention.

Request recommended by the Bureau for approval by the Committee:

**Support to Strengthening Protection of Kaziranga National Park (India)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee at its twenty-first session scheduled to convene from 1 to 6 December 1997 in Naples, Italy, approve a sum of US\$ 50,000 as a contribution for 1997-98, to enable the construction of 10 guard posts (US\$ 25,000) and 5 highland shelters (US\$ 21,000) and the purchase of audio-visual equipment for the Interpretation Centre at Kohora (US\$ 4,000).

**Emergency Assistance:**

Request approved by the Bureau:

**Contribution to the implementation of an Emergency Rehabilitation Plan for Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Bureau approved a sum of US\$ 75,000 for enabling the purchase of 3 vehicles (US\$ 30,000), 55 wireless communication sets (US\$ 40,000) and 2 boats (US\$ 5,000) for Manas Wildlife Sanctuary, a site included in the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1992. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its twenty-first session scheduled to be convened in Naples, Italy, during 1-6 December 1997, review progress on the use of the US\$ 75,000 approved by the Bureau and consider approving additional amounts of the total sum of US\$ 235,000 requested by the Indian authorities as emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau requested that the Centre ensure that the counterpart contribution of US\$ 1,185,000 expected to be provided, over a 2-3 year period, jointly by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) of the Government of India (GOI) and the State of Government of Assam (SGA) are provided and used as described in the international assistance request for emergency assistance submitted by India. The Observer of India assured the Bureau that the amounts indicated as contributions from MOEF/GOI and SGA will be made available as planned for the rehabilitation of Manas Wildlife Sanctuary.

**Training:**

Request not approved by the Bureau

**Request for financial assistance (US\$ 30,000) for training of an individual specialist from Ecuador in Masters in Natural Resources Administration at the Business Administration Central American Institute (INCAE), Costa Rica**

The Bureau concluded that the training of a specialist over a 10-month period for a Masters programme did not conform with

the "short-term refresher programmes and exchanges of experience" permitted for training individuals under paragraph 95 of the Operational Guidelines. Hence, the Bureau decided not to approve this request.

#### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Prior to the presentation of the international assistance requests for cultural heritage, the Secretariat stated that the amount of US\$ 236,800 is still available under the 1997 budgetary allocation for technical assistance for cultural heritage. The Bureau examined and decided upon the following four requests:

##### Requests approved by the Bureau

#### **Visitors' Centre at Paphos, Cyprus (US\$ 23,267)**

The Bureau approved a sum of US\$ 12,187, recommended by the World heritage Centre, of the US\$ 23,267 requested by the State Party for a mission of two international experts to design the exhibition display of the Visitors' Centre of the site. The Bureau, however, noted that the amount of \$ 12,187 for the experts' mission was deemed too high and requested the Secretariat to apply the consultant rates conforming to those of UNESCO. The Bureau, furthermore, agreed to the recommendation of ICOMOS that the State Party submit a separate request for the procurement of exhibition materials upon the identification of the needs and costs for the exhibition cases and the interior design by the expert mission.

#### **Symposium on the Preservation of Contemporary Heritage: Case of Brasilia (Brazil)(US\$ 30,000)**

The Bureau approved the amount of US\$ 30,000 requested by Brazil, on the condition that the State Party submits for the Chairperson's approval, a more detailed description and budget breakdown of the activities to be financed by a contribution from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau supported the goals of this symposium, aimed at reviewing the experience acquired by the institutions involved in the preservation and management of Brasilia and to discuss and establish new general urban directives for the efficient preservation of Brasilia's heritage.

**Preparation of a Replica of the Hieroglyphic Stairway of the Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (US\$ 29,613)**

The Bureau approved US\$ 29,613 requested by the State Party for the preparation of the replica before further deterioration of the Hieroglyphic Stairway.

Request recommended by the Bureau for approval by the Committee

**Special Course on the World Heritage Convention (Mexico) (US\$ 30,000)**

In view of the recommendations of ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM, and upon considering paragraph 106(b) of the Operational Guidelines which states that requests from members of the Bureau can only be decided by the Committee, the Bureau recommended approval by the Committee of the requested amount of US\$ 30,000. The Bureau, however, agreed to the suggestions of ICCROM to place this special course within the context of the regional training strategy adopted by the Committee, and to IUCN's recommendation to ensure a balanced participation of natural and cultural heritage experts, and better define the target audience of the course.

Requests for carry-over in 1997 from the Reserve Fund for prior-year Approvals

The Deputy-Director of the Centre explained that in accordance with the recommendations of the external auditors, all unobligated balance of funds for international assistance activities had been returned to the Reserve Fund for the closure of the 1996 accounts. He therefore requested the approval of the Bureau to charge the outstanding sums for two of these approved activities described below against the Reserve Fund.

**Joya de Ceren Archaeological Site (El Salvador)**

The Bureau agreed that the balance of US\$ 14,750 of a technical cooperation activity for Joya de Ceren (US\$ 25,000) approved by the Committee in 1994 be charged against the Reserve Fund in order to enable the implementation of the international seminar at the site from 7 to 11 July 1997.

**Exhibition on "From Abu-Simbel to Angkor"**

The UNESCO Cultural Heritage Division (CLT/CH), entrusted to implement this activity for which US\$ 45,000 was approved by the Committee in 1994, reported that the delay was due to the time-consuming negotiations with the major museums which are partners in the organization of this exhibition. The CLT/CH Representative stated that the amount granted from the World Heritage Fund represents only a small share of the overall

cost of the exhibition and therefore additional time is required. Negotiations are, however, progressing smoothly. The Bureau agreed to charging the unobligated balance of US\$ 39,741 against the Reserve Fund.

**VII. PROGRESS REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE'S CONSULTATIVE BODY ON THE OVERALL MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

**VII.1** The Chairperson began by recalling the decision taken by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session in Merida (Mexico) in December 1996 to carry out, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Convention, an external audit of the World Heritage Fund and management review of the World Heritage Centre. The Chairperson also recalled the work of the Consultative Body which has met twice (1 and 2 April, and 20 June 1997) in Paris to define the terms of reference for the evaluation, and study the results of the financial audit, undertaken by the external auditors of UNESCO, the Office of Office of the Auditor General of Canada. The Chairperson informed Bureau members that the documents pertaining to this point are WHC-97/CONF.204/5 and WHC-97/CONF.204/5Add., and WHC-97/CONF.204/10 and WHC-97/CONF.204/10Add.

**VII.2** The Chairperson recalled that the Director-General had been informed of this decision and had approved its implementation, requesting the External Auditors of UNESCO to carry out this task. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Deputy External Auditor of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada to present their report.

**VII.3** Ms B. Miller, Deputy External Auditor, presented the report on the audited Financial Statements of the World Heritage Fund and informed the Bureau that the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund, controlled by their Office, were considered correct, but a series of recommendations, that she presented to the Bureau, are contained in the report. These recommendations have been detailed in the Auditor's Report under the following headings: Coordination, Filing, Expenditures and revenues, Internal controls, Cash monitoring, Unliquidated obligations, Costs for fund raising, Financial information, Training and Internal Audit.

**VII.4** The Chairperson then intervened on the result on the audit as follows:

"Without minimizing the fact that current procedures and controls regarding financial and accounting operations do not guarantee clarity and effectiveness in the presentation of financial information, it is important to consider that the opinion of the external auditors is that:

*"it presents fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Fund as at 31st December 1996 and income over expenditures for the year then ended, in accordance with the Fund's stated accounting policies".*

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the observed mismanagement has clearly affected the efficiency in which programmes and projects have been implemented. Summarizing, the following three are the most clear and serious consequences:

*"the first has to do with the fact that in 1996, budget expenditures were about 25% less if compared to the total allocation approved by the Committee.*

*the second with the lack of clear and on-time financial information, necessary to the Committee in decision-making in terms of budget allocation.*

*and the third relates to the increase in 100% on the expenditures of the external financial audit due to the difficulties associated with the gathering of the documentation required to be the job."*

Furthermore, it is also considered important to fully support the external auditor's opinion regarding the need of precise guidelines in the World Heritage Centre's effort to increase fund-raising activities. The Committee, at its next meeting in December should fully address this matter.

The second stage of this review which has to do with management procedures is scheduled to begin in September. The external auditor is expecting to have this work done by November, so that results can be presented and discussed at the December Committee meeting.

All this being said, the Bureau asked the World Heritage Centre for an effort in implementing such controls and procedures regarding financial activities as recommended by the external auditor. This will assure an effective and efficient budget approval process at the next Committee meeting in December."

**VII.5** The Observer of France, took note that the debate would be held the next day and recalled that the members of this Body were awaiting two additional documents from the Secretariat: one concerning the list of accounts which was requested on Friday, 20 June from the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and the other being the advice of the UNESCO Legal Advisor concerning the consultant contract for promotional activities (Mr A. Goldman).



**VII.6** The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau that the Centre had already prepared several documents, in particular one on international assistance projects approved in 1996 and still ongoing (WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.6Rev), one on 1996 contracts, income and expenditure from media activities (WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.7), and another providing the Director-General's response to the Auditor's report WHC-97/CONF.204/10Add). He also mentioned that the Legal Advisor would respond orally to the question raised by France. Furthermore, he pointed out that the rate of implementation for the budget set aside out of the World Heritage Fund for 1996 amounted to 82% and that a higher rate could not be attained since there was a lack of suitable requests from States Parties.

**VII.7** The Delegate of Mexico then recalled that the Consultative Body was still awaiting the reply of the Auditors concerning the questions raised during the first meeting of this Body on 1 and 2 April. The Representative of the Auditors replied that they had only received a copy of this report after the completion of the audit. However, they indicated that the financial aspect requested by the Consultative Body had already been addressed in the audit. In this regard Italy recalled that, following information transmitted by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, the report of the Consultative Body meeting of April had been transmitted to the Director of the Centre and to the Director-General, and that, in spite of this, the auditors had not received it. The Delegate of Italy requested that this point be noted in the report of the Bureau session.

**VII.8** With regard to the study and use of the World Heritage emblem, requested from the UNESCO Legal Advisor or other competent advisor, the Director of the Centre said that this had not been undertaken as no funds were available. He also recalled that this matter had been delegated to the Consultative Body. The Delegate of Italy expressed surprise; he recalled that the advice of the Legal Advisor had already been requested regarding this matter and noted that the Secretariat, in spite of the importance of the problem, had not responded to the demands of the Committee.

**VII.9** The Observer of Lebanon noted that the question concerning the study of the emblem had been discussed at the Consultative Body meeting in April 1997 but the recommendations of that meeting had not been followed up.

**VII.10** The Observer of Malta thanked the Auditors for their report and said that she shared Italy's concerns regarding the fact that a study on the use of the emblem had not been carried out. She expressed the view that the Centre and the Legal Advisor of UNESCO could have studied the matter and that there was no need to hire the services of a consultant.

**VII.11** The Delegate of Germany requested the view of the Legal Advisor on the question of the use of the emblem.

**VII.12** The Legal Advisor pointed out that the emblem was designed and developed by an artist under contract with UNESCO and the legal rights of the emblem belongs to UNESCO. Hence, from a legal point of view UNESCO is responsible for managing the use of the emblem. However, he said that the World Heritage Committee may make policy prescriptions to the UNESCO Secretariat (i.e. the Centre) regarding how the emblem should be used. He continued by saying that the Legal Affairs Office does not hold any views concerning such policy questions.

**VII.13** Regarding the consultant contract on promotional activities the Director of the Centre recalled that the contract had been prepared with the assistance of the UNESCO Legal Advisor, and in accordance with UNESCO procedures.

**VII.14** Discussions on Item 7 of the Agenda continued on Tuesday, 24 June, during the morning session. The Delegate of Italy made a point of order based on the fact that there had not been time to read all the new documents provided by the Secretariat. He requested that the discussions be postponed until later. After an exchange of views, the Chairperson considered that this would not be necessary as the only new document was the one containing information on "Funds-in-trust and other sources administrated by the World Heritage Centre : 1996 Allotment and Expenditure" (WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.11).

**VII.15** The Delegate of Mexico opened discussions by addressing several questions and remarks to the auditors and the Secretariat:

(a) Are there clear instructions concerning the use of income accumulated by the World Heritage Fund? If this is not the case, the Committee should establish them.

(b) Why are expenditures of the 1996 budget less than the amount of US\$ 1,168,197 approved by the Committee for the same year? The unused funds should be resubmitted to the Committee if it is intended that they be used during the following year.

(c) "Additional income" is a term which is used in the Information Document in Merida. It is no longer used today. Will it be used in the future? Of the total amounts obligated (US\$ 552,944), an amount of US\$ 283,973 has been spent. As these funds are part of the World Heritage Fund, have these expenditures been approved by the Committee in conformity with Paragraphs 3.1 and 4.1 of Article 15 of the Convention? It was suggested that precise information be presented by the World Heritage Centre concerning "other income", in conformity with paragraph 3.1(e) of the Financial Rules. Finally, he suggested that the unobligated amounts of "other income", including earmarked and non-earmarked income, for 1996 and

1997, be clearly included in the budgetary proposals to be submitted to the twenty-first session of the Committee.

(d) Further, with regard to "other income", it was recommended that it be recorded in specific accounts in the World Heritage Fund. This would allow the Committee and the Centre to better identify and control the total budget to the benefit of the protection of World Heritage. At the same time, this will improve trust and clarity for donors.

(e) What are the level of payments to consultants and are these payments based on income received?

(f) Are the promotional and fund-raising contracts established and signed in conformity with the World Heritage Convention and the rules of the Organization?

**VII.16** The Auditors first responded concerning interest received on the funds, which are recorded separately and can be used in accordance with the instructions of the Committee. With regard to the fact that the expenditures are less than the budget approved by the Committee, the auditors recalled that this was due to the fact that all the activities had not been implemented during the year and that a part would be carried over to the following year.

**VII.17** With regard to earmarked and non-earmarked income and in conformity with Article 15 of the World Heritage Convention, the Delegate of Mexico remarked that this income should be submitted to the Committee. He asked whether this had been the case. The Auditors said that they have found no stipulation that requires that additional income other than the budget approved by the Committee should comply with the Financial Rules of the Fund. The Delegate of Mexico emphasized the fact that all funds should be submitted for approval by the Committee. The Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller intervened, and referred to the Financial Rules of the World Heritage Fund (Article 4, paragraph 4.1). He said that according to his interpretation of this Article, the resources of the Fund could only be used as defined by the Committee and that expenditures could only be made to the limit of funds available. He continued by saying that consequently, the Committee could define the use of "other income". The Auditors confirmed this, recalling that, in their report, they recommended that the Committee be consulted.

**VII.18** The Delegate of Mexico again requested an answer be given to the question concerning the contracts established regarding "other income", e.g. had they been established in conformity with the procedures of the World Heritage Convention and UNESCO. The auditors said that the consultant contract had been established in the name of the World Heritage Centre and not UNESCO, and that it had been charged to the Regular Programme of UNESCO and not to the World

Heritage Fund because the amount was above US\$ 30,000 and not submitted to the Chairperson of the Committee. It was recalled that in accordance with the Financial Rules, all amounts should be submitted to the Committee and consequently, the Committee should approve the nature of the contracts, and the origin and the use of their funds. With regard to income, it should be shown in the World Heritage Fund. The auditors then recalled that this was in line with their recommendations.

**VII.19** The Director of the Centre drew the attention of the participants to the fact that donors were free to contribute to the World Heritage Fund or other Funds-in-Trust of UNESCO. The promotional contracts, as in the case of those with publishing houses, cannot wait until the Committee session to be approved; they are often concluded during book fairs. With regard to contracts involving income, it is evident that the remaining amounts of these contracts would be transferred to the World Heritage Fund and its use be decided by the Committee. In response to a question put by the Delegate of Germany concerning the legal aspects of this particular case, the Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller replied that the Financial Rules indicated that it was for the Committee to define the use of the funds, within the limit of the approved budget. Therefore, the Centre should provide the Committee with proposals for the use of the funds and estimates for the future income to the World Heritage Fund, including for "other income". The Bureau stated that the use of "other income" should be approved by the Committee.

**VII.20** The Auditors considered that, as the income for promotion would be increasing, they thought it necessary to review the Rules and define the role of the Committee in this domain, whilst allowing a certain flexibility to the World Heritage Centre in the implementation of its daily work.

**VII.21** The Delegate of Germany and the Chairperson were in agreement with the opinion of the auditors, whilst at the same time recalling the importance of reviewing the Rules so as to have a complete and clear picture of all the resources and of their use, all the more so because clear rules and transparency would be more attractive to donors. The Chairperson confirmed, therefore, that this exercise was aimed at improving information exchange between the Centre and the Committee and adapting the role of the Committee.

**VII.22** The Delegate of Australia voiced her agreement with the general trend of the discussions, which should result in a balance between the daily role of the Centre and the role of the Committee. More frequent and regular consultations between the two would be useful and would maintain the spirit of cooperation and good relations.

**VII.23** The Observer of France thanked the Chairperson for having recalled that the World Heritage Centre was part of UNESCO and stated that there existed concise procedures concerning fund-raising, which was debated during the Executive Board. The Observer asked whether these procedures had been followed by the World Heritage Centre and if the responsible UNESCO Unit for fund-raising had been consulted. With regard to the consultant contract in question, the Observer asked whether the remuneration was at a fixed rate, or in function of income, or both.

**VII.24** At the request of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO Legal Advisor replied that his service had been consulted regarding this contract which is not a new type for UNESCO. In this particular case, the contract covered two activities: servicing of on-going promotional contracts, and fund-raising. At the request of the consultant, the two activities were covered in the same contract. This contract did not raise any legal problems, and therefore it was approved by the Legal Advisor. However, the Auditors recalled that they considered that this contract should be reviewed and clarified and it was up to the Bureau to decide. As to income, the Auditors considered that it should be paid into the World Heritage Fund.

**VII.25** The Observer of Thailand remarked that, with regard to the World Heritage Fund, it is necessary to refer to Article 15 of the Convention, paragraph 3 (a, b, c, d, e) which stipulate that all receipts and payments are paid into the World Heritage Fund, and that in paragraph 4 of the same Article which states that "Contributions to the Fund and other forms of assistance made available to the Committee may be used only for such purposes as the Committee shall define. The Committee may accept contributions to be used only for a certain programme or project, provided that the Committee shall have decided on the implementation of such programme or project. No political conditions may be attached to contributions made to the Fund."

**VII.26** He furthermore recalled that, as the Observer of France had mentioned, the Centre is part of the Secretariat of UNESCO, and consequently UNESCO procedures apply. Therefore, if a donor contributes to a project, either this project is not administrated under the World Heritage Fund and therefore the UNESCO procedures are applied, or the contribution is included in the World Heritage Fund and it is submitted to the Committee for approval. A distinction must therefore be made between contributions paid into the Fund and those paid elsewhere.

**VII.27** The Observer of Canada, submitted questions to the Legal Advisor and the Centre concerning fund-raising: in the past, contributions to the Fund were of a philanthropic nature and no return was expected. However, this has changed into a

more commercial approach. What does the Centre give to the donor in exchange for the financial contribution? Are there standard instructions? What is mentioned in the contracts? What about the use of the World Heritage emblem?

**VII.28** In response, the Legal Advisor recalled that in the past, the Organization gave photos, maps, texts, free of charge. Since then, the Director-General has established a unit responsible for private fund-raising and standards and instructions have been elaborated. UNESCO does not give its name to any donor or sponsor, just as it does not accept funds from any source.

**VII.29** The Chairperson drew the attention of the Bureau on the use of the World Heritage emblem and that of UNESCO: it concerns a legal problem and we need clear and precise instructions : how to reconcile the interests of the Convention, the States Parties and the need to protect the sites? The Legal Advisor replied that this concerned legal aspects and policy decisions. Policy issues are the domain of the Committee while UNESCO remains the legal owner of the emblem.

**VII.30** Referring to the consultant contract, the Delegate of Mexico recalled that it was first of all obligated to the World Heritage Fund and then transferred to the Regular Programme of the Centre, as presented in Document WHC-97/204/INF.7. These operations were not approved by the Committee.

**VII.31** The Auditors explained that funds for the consultant contract, e.g. US\$ 45,000, were taken from the Regular Programme of the Centre, whilst the income perceived from the contract, US\$ 290,000, was paid in total into the Fund; there was a confusion and it was decided to use funds from the Regular Programme of the Centre. The Delegate of France stated that she did not understand this manoeuvre; she recalled that first of all the funds were taken from the Regular Programme of the Centre, funds which should have been voted in the 28C/5, but that this does not appear in the C5. Then, she requested whether the US\$45,000 in question was a fixed amount or a percentage, and if so of what funds? This contract was established without the approval of the Committee.

**VII.32** The Auditors responded that the consultant contract did not figure in the workplans approved by the Committee and consequently the amount was taken from the Regular Programme of the Centre; this amount represented the fixed salary of the consultant (e.g. US\$4,000 per month) and covered travel costs. No commission was paid in 1996.

**VII.33** The Delegate of Italy requested the recommendation of the Auditors concerning Document WHC-97/CONF.204/10, paragraph 7 on "Other Funds-in-Trust"; he stated that Article

15 of the Convention does not mention "Other Funds-in-Trust". The Delegate then asked the Auditors several more technical questions concerning the status of "other funds-in-trust"; who approved them and what methods of control exist? Italy is in favour of flexible management vis-à-vis donors on the condition that the status of the funds is transparent and follows defined directives. The Delegate also asked why these funds are not part of the World Heritage Fund under a "Special Account"; finally, he concluded by stating the necessity that these types of funds be approved by the Committee.

**VII.34** The Legal Advisor explained the different types of funds: Regular Programme, funds-in-trust, donations by Member States for specific activities. The Advisor indicated that apart from the Regular Programme, UNESCO may also accept other funds (extrabudgetary).

**VII.35** The Delegate of Lebanon requested that a typology of contracts be established to facilitate the debate: from a technical point of view, distinction must be made amongst others between contracts established to carry out the Centre's activities following the decisions of the Committee, publication contracts and promotional contracts which may not have the same legal regimes. With regard to the policy regarding the establishment of contracts to date, as presented in the Bureau documents, there is unequal geographical distribution favouring contractors from large industrialized countries, whereas the objectives of the Convention are, amongst others, international cooperation and exchange of experiences. Concerning the recommendation of paragraph 53 of the Auditor's Report, (Working Document WHC-97/CONF.204/10) the Delegate of Lebanon enquired as to how long the post of Administrator for the Centre had been vacant and expressed his surprise at the comments of the Direction with regard to the paragraph; he emphasized the fact that a candidate should be chosen in relation to the tasks to be carried out and not to adjust the functions of the post to suit the candidate chosen.

**VII.36** The Observer of Malta took the floor and referred to the Financial Regulations of the Fund; she supported the statement of the Observer of Thailand in paragraphs 23 and 24. She then recalled that the question put by the Observer of Canada concerning what UNESCO provided in exchange for funds on promotional contracts remained unanswered; she underlined the importance of a quality control mechanism to ensure a proper exchange and use of the emblem in line with the spirit of the Convention.

**VII.37** In replying, the Legal Advisor explained that the many different types of contracts existed; the third party sometimes required documentation, films or photos as well as permission to use the UNESCO emblem; other times UNESCO takes a more active role. However, it remains that UNESCO decides

and determines the use of the emblem in the terms of the contract.

**VII.38** The Director of the Centre took the floor to provide explanations. He began by mentioning dates concerning the implementation of the audit: the Consultative Body met on 1 and 2 April and their report reached the Centre end-April, beginning May; this report among other subjects, dealt with the use of the emblem from the legal aspect and recommendations for its correct use; the Director concurred that an in-depth study of the use of the emblem was necessary, as mentioned in the Document WHC-96/CONF.201/17 submitted to the twentieth session of the Committee (December 1996). With regard to promotional activities carried out in 1996, he explained that this was done on an experimental basis which he considered as successful as it had permitted, in cooperation with partners selected with the National Commissions concerned, the production of a large number of quality films on World Heritage sites. He informed that these films were available free of charge - or at a nominal price - to States Parties unable to produce such films. The Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.7 provides details on this experimental year.

**VII.39** With regard to financial management, the Director recalled that the Director-General of UNESCO had responded on 20 June 1997 (Document WHC97/CONF.204/10Add) to the Auditor's comments received on 3 June 1997; concerning the documents which were not submitted to the Auditors, he explained that a large part of the activities of the Centre are decentralized to Field Offices which explained the delay in the transmission of information. He informed the Bureau that very shortly the Centre would be provided with a professional administrator. Since 1996, the Centre has been without a professional administrator and the daily work has been carried out efficiently by a general service staff member (GS-5) whom he warmly praised for the high quality of his work.

**VII.40** The Chairperson considered that the use of the emblem and the promotion contracts were not completely clear. She mentioned that the consultant contract gave rise to different opinions in UNESCO and the Bureau should work upon the elaboration of clear directives for the preparation of such contracts and the use of the emblem. Finally, she requested explanations regarding the contract established with Korea. The Director of the Centre provided the requested information: the agreement with Korea was for the development of the Centre's computing capacity and the World Heritage Web page (Internet), which now enjoys great success on the network.

**VII.41** In agreement with the Delegates of Australia, Germany and Italy, and the Observer of Canada, the Chairperson



underlined the necessity to elaborate clear directives for promotion, fund-raising and use of the emblem.

**VII.42** The Chairperson emphasized the general problems of communication between the Centre and the Bureau and the Committee, and called for improvements in this regard. The second phase of the audit would concentrate on the management aspects and would begin in September (see Annex VII), so that the report could be ready in November for submission to the twenty-first session of the Committee. In this audit work, clarification of legal aspects in line with the spirit of the Convention would also be covered. A concise agenda should be prepared. The Chairperson also proposed to hold a one or two-day workshop between the members of the Consultative Body, the Auditors and the Centre staff to study together new approaches: flexibility for improved functioning of the Centre; implementation directives; improved interpretation and application of the Convention.

**VII.43** The Delegate of Germany endorsed the proposals of the Chairperson and added that he wished that the second phase of the audit begin without delay, that the seminar could be held before the General Assembly of States Parties and insisted upon the importance of a serious study of the comments put forward by Canada. With regard to the Convention and the use of the emblem, he recalled that the notion of World Heritage had to be taken into consideration.

**VII.44** The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau of his preoccupation with regard to the coming months: the staff was already overloaded with the forthcoming General Assembly, the meetings of the Committee and the Bureau as well as the General Conference of UNESCO, and all these activities to be held before the end of the year. Furthermore, the Centre has to follow up on the decisions taken by the Committee in Merida to assist the audit. It appeared to him impossible to keep to such a full timetable. The Chairperson insisted and said that the decisions of the Committee must be implemented at all costs.

**VII.45** The Delegate of Australia supported the opinion of the Chairperson whilst at the same time recognizing the difficulties raised by the Director of the Centre. She suggested that the Consultative Body and the Auditors study together ways and means to facilitate the role of the Centre and that the Bureau studies the possibility of lightening the work load for the preparation of the twenty-first session of the Committee. She insisted however, that the audit be undertaken as foreseen.

**VII.46** In concluding discussions on this Item agenda, the Chairperson distributed the text of a proposed agreement prepared by the Consultative Body concerning the financial management procedures, presentation of the financial

statements and budget of the World heritage Fund and promotional aspects. She submitted this text to the members of the Bureau for approval.

**VII.47** The Director of the Centre explained how the promotion contracts had been prepared, with full compliance of UNESCO's procedures and regulations, on a total auto-financing basis and asked the Bureau to postpone all decisions regarding these contracts until the next session. The Chairperson requested the Director to provide the Bureau with a complete list of all the films produced and foreseen. This list is provided in Information Document WHC-97/CONF.204/INF.12

**VII.48** A discussion on the document of the Consultative Body submitted to the Bureau by the Chairperson followed during which all Bureau members and observers concurred to approve its content and requested its immediate implementation. In particular, the Delegates of Australia, Germany and Italy and the Observers of Lebanon, Malta and the United States of America underlined the importance of better management for an improved application of the Convention and use of the World Heritage emblem.

**VII.49** Delegates also requested that UNESCO's instructions concerning private funds be distributed to the members of the Bureau, that the use of the emblem be in conformity with the wishes of the States Parties, and finally increased communication be established between the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson of the Committee who should be consulted regularly.

**VII.50** It was finally decided that the results of the financial audit, with the comments of the Director-General, as well as the documents of the Consultative Body constitute an official Bureau document (Annex VIII) to be presented to the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee.

**VIII. EXAMINATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON ITS ACTIVITIES FOR 1996-1997 TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE 29th SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO**

**VIII.1.** The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre presented document WHC-97/CONF.204/6 which will be submitted to the 29th session of the General Conference of UNESCO in October 1997. He indicated to the Bureau that the missing figures in paragraph 24 will be included prior to the document being submitted to the 11th General Assembly of States Parties. In response to comments from the Delegates of Japan and Germany, and at the request of the Chairperson, it was agreed that the Document WHC-97/CONF.204/6 be revised and in accordance with their comments for their approval on 27 June.

**IX. INFORMATION ON THE PREPARATION OF THE ELEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (October 1997)**

**IX.1** The Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre presented Document WHC-97/CONF.204/7 to the Bureau. This document indicates that the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties will take place on 27 and 28 October 1997, during the 29<sup>th</sup> ordinary session of the General Conference of UNESCO which is scheduled from 21 October to 12 November 1997. An extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee will be held on the 29 October 1997. As decided by the twentieth session of the Committee in Merida, this extraordinary session will be held to elect its new Bureau, hence permitting the latter to meet in all legality the following month prior to the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee.

**IX.2** The provisional agenda of the Eleventh General Assembly of the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention was adopted without changes.

**X. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FIRST EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (28 - 29 November 1997)**

The Director of the World Heritage Centre presented Document WHC-97/CONF.204/8Rev., the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau to be held in Naples, Italy on 28-29 November 1997. The Provisional Agenda was adopted without modification and is attached as Annex IX.

**XI. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (1-6 December 1997)**

**XI.1** The Director of the World Heritage Centre presented Document WHC-97/CONF.204/9Rev., the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee to be held in Naples, Italy on 1-6 December 1997. The Director noted that Item 5 "Management Review of the World Heritage Centre" which had been included in error in the Provisional Agenda should be removed as it was encompassed by Item 6 "Report on the work of the Committee's Consultative Body on the overall management and financial review of the administration of the World Heritage Convention". Further to earlier discussions by the Bureau at this session a new Agenda Item was added, "World Heritage and the Prevention of the Illicit Traffic of cultural property". The Provisional Agenda was adopted with the modifications noted above and is attached as Annex X.

**XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

The Observer of Thailand expressed his great pleasure in announcing an untied voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund of 350,000 Baht (approximately US\$ 14,000). A cheque was handed to the Chairperson who then thanked the Royal Thai Government for their generous contribution on behalf of the entire Bureau. The Director of the World Heritage Centre expressed his thanks, on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, and noted that this was the second time that the Royal Thai Government had made a contribution to the Fund in addition to their regular obligatory contributions.

**XIII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSING OF THE SESSION**

**XIII.1** Following a detailed examination of the draft report, the Bureau adopted it with the amendments and clarifications noted during the debate. The Rapporteur thanked the Bureau members for the trust they placed in him, and facilitating his work in finalizing the Report. The Director of the Centre, after having thanked all concerned for their hard work, drew attention to some changes and additions to the List of Annexes: the title of Annex VII is now entitled "Reports of the Consultative Body to the twenty-first session of the Bureau", and one of the additional annexes would be the Report of the Nature-Culture meeting held on the morning of 28 June (Annex XI).

**XIII.2** Several delegates thanked the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for their efforts during the meeting. The Chairperson, Ms Maria-Teresa Franco, took the floor and thanked Bureau members, observers, representatives of the advisory bodies, and the Secretariat staff and interpreters and all others concerned for their support in her work to conduct a successful meeting. She expressed her appreciation of the work carried out in the framework of the Convention and said that she considered it an honour to serve as the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. She then declared the twenty-first session of the Bureau closed.

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

**Twenty-first session  
Unesco Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)**

**23-28 June 1997  
23-28 juin 1997**

---

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

---

**I. STATES MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU/ETATS MEMBRES DU BUREAU**

**AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE**

Ms Sharon SULLIVAN  
Head  
Australian and World Heritage Group  
Environment Australia  
GPO Box 787  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dr Warren NICHOLLS  
Director  
World Heritage Unit  
Australian and World Heritage Group  
Environment Australia  
GPO Box 787  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Ms Roni R. ELLIS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO  
4 rue Jean Rey  
75015 PARIS

**GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE**

Ambassador Dr Horst WINKELMANN  
Federal Foreign Office  
Postfach 1148  
D-53001 BONN

Mr Thilo KOEHLER  
Federal Foreign Office  
Postfach 1148  
D-53001 BONN

Dr Hans CASPARY  
 Conservator of Historic Monuments  
 Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Rheinland-Pfalz  
 Gottelmannstrasse 17  
 D-55130 MAINZ

Prof. Dr Harald PLACHTER  
 University of Marburg  
 Faculty of Biology  
 Department for Nature Conservation  
 F-35032 MARBURG

## **ITALY/ITALIE**

H. Exc. Mr Giancarlo LEO  
 Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
 Permanent Delegation of Italy  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mr Francesco FRANCONI  
 Professeur de Droit International  
 Université de Sienne  
 Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
 ROME

Mrs Margherita SABATINI  
 Attachée au Secteur UNESCO  
 Direction générale des Affaires culturelles  
 Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
 ROME

Mme Licia BORELLI VLAD  
 Expert auprès de la Commission nationale Italienne  
 pour l'UNESCO

Mr Luciano MARCHETTI  
 Conservateur des Biens Architecturaux  
 et de l'Environnement  
 Ministère des Biens culturels  
 FLORENCE

Mr Pasquale MALARA  
 Surintendant des Biens Architecturaux et de  
 l'Environnement de Turin  
 Ministère des Biens Culturels  
 TURIN

Mr Francesco FRANCLONI  
 Professor of Law  
 University of Siena

**JAPAN/JAPON**

Mr Yasukuni ENOKI  
Director-General  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Hiroshi KARUBE  
Director  
Second Cultural Affairs Division  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Takahito NARUMIYA  
Counsellor  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Japan  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

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

Mr Tomoyuki ONO  
Attaché  
Permanent Delegation of Japan  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

Mr Nobuhiro OISHI  
Official  
Second Cultural Affairs Division  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

Mr Takafumi GODA  
Director  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency for Cultural Affairs  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100

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

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

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

## **MEXICO/MEXIQUE**

Ms Maria Teresa FRANCO Y GONZALEZ SALAS  
 Director-General  
 National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)  
 CORDOBA # 45, Col. Roma  
 04700 MEXICO D.F.

Mr Jorge DIAZ-CUERVO  
 Secretario Administrativo (INAH)  
 CORDOBA # 45, Col. Roma  
 MEXICO D.F.

Mr Salvador DIAZ-BERRIO  
 Deputy Director for Technical Support and Training  
 National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)  
 CORDOBA # 45  
 04700 MEXICO D.F.

Dr Francisco Javier LOPEZ MORALES  
 Coordinacion Nacional de Monumentos Historicos  
 Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia  
 04700 MEXICO D.F.

Mme Zadalinda GONZALEZ y REYNERO  
 Ministre, Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente du Mexique  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO



**MOROCCO/MAROC**

Mme Naima SEDRATI  
 Deputy Permanent Delegate  
 Permanent Delegation of Morocco  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mr Abdelaziz TOURI  
 Directeur du Patrimoine Culturel  
 17, rue Michlifon  
 RABAT

Mme Jalila KADIRI  
 Architecte-paysagiste  
 Chef de la Division des Interventions et  
 des Etudes Techniques  
 Ministère des Affaires Culturelles

Mr Salah-Eddine EL HONSALI  
 Conseiller

Mr Ahmed SKOUNTI  
 Chargé de recherche  
 Ministère des Affaires culturelles  
 Direction du patrimoine culturel

**NIGER**

S. Exc. M. Lambert MESSAN  
 Ambassadeur et Délégué permanent  
 Délégation permanent du Niger  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Seyni SEYDOU  
 Directeur  
 Parc National du W du Niger  
 Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement  
 B.P. 721 NIAMEY

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

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

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES/  
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES**

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN  
Secretary-General  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

Mme Carmen ANON FELIU  
President of the Advisory Committee  
Puerto Santamaria 49  
MADRID 28043

Mme Carole ALEXANDRE  
Directeur  
49-51, rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

Dr Henry CLEERE  
World Heritage Co-ordinator  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

M. Joseph PHARES  
Vice-Président  
ICOMOS International

Mr Herb STOVEL  
ICOMOS  
49-51, rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO  
Assistant World Heritage Coordinator  
49-51 rue de la Federation  
75015 PARIS

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

Mr Marc LAENEN  
Director-General  
Via di S. Michele, 13  
00153 ROME  
Italy

Dr Jukka JOKILEHTO  
 Chief  
 Architectural Conservation Programme  
 Via di S. Michele, 13  
 00153 ROME  
 Italy

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

Dr James THORSELL  
 Head - Natural Heritage Programme  
 Rue Mauverney, 28  
 CH-1196 GLAND  
 Switzerland

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

Mr Jim PAINE  
 Senior Research Officer  
 World Conservation Monitoring Centre  
 219 Huntingdon Road  
 CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL  
 United Kingdom

**III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS**

**ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE**

Ms Maria Susana PATARO  
 Ministre  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente de l'Argentine  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE**

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

**BANGLADESH**

Mr A.H.M. MONIRUZZAMAN  
 Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Delegate  
 Permanent Delegation of Bangladesh  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**BELGIUM/BELGIQUE**

Mme Bénédicte SELFSLAGH  
 Division du patrimoine  
 Région Wallonne  
 Délégation avec les organisations internationales

M. Pierre RUYFFELAERE  
 Agent de liaison  
 Administration des relations extérieures  
 Communauté Flamande

**BENIN/BENIN**

Mr Isidore MONSI  
 Counsellor  
 Permanent Delegation of Benin  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**BRAZIL/BRESIL**

Mr Armado CARDOSO  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente du Brésil  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Luiz Phelipe ANDRÈS  
 Directeur du Patrimoine Historique  
 et Culturel de Maranhão

Mr Ronald de ALMEIDA SILVA  
 Conseiller technique du Gouverneur  
 de l'Etat du Maranhão

Mme Dora MONTEIRO E SILVA DE ALCANTARA  
 Consultant technique  
 Ministère de la Culture

Mr Jean Pierre HALEVY  
 Conseiller technique du Gouverneur  
 de l'Etat de Maranhão

Mr Alessandro CANDEAS  
 Deuxième secrétaire  
 Délégation permanente du Brésil  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Helena HEWITT  
 Délégation permanente du Brésil  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**CANADA**

Dr Christina CAMERON  
 Director General  
 National Historic Sites  
 Parks Canada  
 Department of Canadian Heritage  
 25 Eddy Street  
 HULL - Quebec KIA OM5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN  
 International Affairs  
 Parks Canada  
 Department of Canadian Heritage  
 25 rue Eddy Street  
 HULL - Quebec KIA OM5

**CHINA/CHINE**

Prof. GUO Zhan  
 The State Bureau of Cultural Property

Ms Jiang CHEN  
 Engineer  
 Ministry of Construction  
 BEIJING

Mr Fu Shuang  
 Urban Planner  
 Ministry of Construction of China  
 BEIJING

**COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE**

Mr Henry QUINTERO  
 Deuxième Secrétaire  
 Délégation permanente de Colombie  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Liliana TAFUR  
 Délégation permanente de Colombie  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**COSTA RICA**

Mme Iris LEIVA de BILLAUT  
 Ministre conseiller  
 Délégation permanente du Costa Rica  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**CUBA**

Mme Marta ARJONA PEREZ  
 Presidenta del Consejo Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural  
 Ministerio de Cultura  
 LA HABANA

**CZECH REPUBLIQUE/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

M. Michal BENES  
 Secrétaire pour les Affaires culturelles  
 Ministère de la Culture

**ECUADOR/EQUATEUR**

H. Exc. Juan CUEVA  
 Ambassador  
 Permanent Delegation of Ecuador  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mr Juan Carlos PAEZ  
 Under-Secretary for the Environment

Mr Mauricio MONTALVO  
 Deputy Permanent Delegate  
 Permanent Delegation of Ecuador  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mme Maria Eugenia MARTINEZ ESPINDOLA  
 Counsellor (Education)  
 Permanent Delegation of Ecuador  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**EL SALVADOR**

H. Exc. Mr Ramiro ZEPEDA ROLDAN  
 Ambassador  
 Permanent Delegation of El Salvador  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mme Rosa Ester MOREIRA de LEMOINE  
 Ministre Conseiller  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente d'El Salvador  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**FINLAND/FINLANDE**

Mr Henrik LILIUS  
 State Archeologist  
 Director-General of the National Board  
 of Antiquities

Mme Anne LAMMILA  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente de la Finlande  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**FRANCE**

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC  
 Chargé d'affaires a.i.  
 Délégation permanente de la France  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Catherine DUMESNIL  
 Conseiller technique  
 Commission nationale de la France pour l'UNESCO  
 34-36, rue La Pérouse  
 75775 Paris Cedex 16

**GREECE/GRECE**

Mme Eleni METHODIOU  
 Conseiller (Culture)

**HONDURAS**

S. Exc. Mme Sonia MENDIETA DE BADAROUX  
 Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire  
 Délégué permanent  
 Délégation permanente de la République du Honduras  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 Maison de l'UNESCO

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Mr Béla KOVACSI  
 Counsellor  
 Ministry for the Environment  
 H-1121 Kőltő u 21  
 1121 BUDAPEST

**INDIA/INDE**

H. Exc. Mr Chiranjiv SINGH  
 Ambassador  
 Permanent Delegation of India  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Dr NEENA  
 Second Secretary  
 Permanent Delegation of India  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**KOREA (REPUBLIC OF)/COREE (REPUBLIQUE DE)**

H. Exc. KIM Hyun-Gon  
 Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary  
 Permanent Delegate  
 Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

Mr YOO Jung-Hee  
 Counsellor  
 Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea  
 to UNESCO  
 UNESCO House

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC/  
REPUBLICUE DEMOCRATIQUE POPULAIRE DU LAO**

M. Khamliène NHOUYVANISVONG  
Acting Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of  
Lao People's Democratic Republic  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

**LEBANON/LIBAN**

Mr Noel FATTAL  
Counsellor  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Delegation of Lebanon to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

Ms Agnès ROUSSEAU  
Consultant  
National Museum of Beyrouth

**MALTA/MALTE**

H. Exc. Mr Vincent CAMILLERI  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Malta to UNESCO  
Embassy of Malta  
92 Avenue des Champs Elysees  
75008 PARIS

Dr Tanya VELLA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Malta to UNESCO  
Embassy of Malta  
92 Avenue des Champs Elysees  
75008 PARIS

**MYANMAR (UNION OF)/ MYANMAR (UNION DU)**

S. Exc. M. U NYUNT TIN  
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de l'Union du Myanmar

M. Aung MYINT  
Attaché culturel  
Ambassade du Myanmar  
60, rue de Courcelles  
75008 Paris

**NEPAL**

Mr Shyamanand Das SUMAN  
Ministre conseiller  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente du Népal  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO



**NETHERLANDS/PAYS BAS**

Mr Robert DE JONG  
Observer

**PANAMA/PANAMA**

Ms Maria Elena DE AGUILAR  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Panama  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**PERU/PEROU**

Mr Carlos VASQUEZ  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Pérou  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

M. Carlos M. VELASCO MENDIOLA  
Ministre Conseiller  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente du Pérou  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**PHILIPPINES**

Ms Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO  
Délégation permanente des Philippines  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**POLAND/POLOGNE**

M. Krzysztof PAWLOWSKI  
Président du Comité national polonais  
de l'ICOMOS

**PORTUGAL**

Mr Jorge RITTO  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Portugal  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

Mr Rosado Correia JOAO  
Président  
Fondation pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine

M. Liberto CRUZ  
Délégué pour la culture

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

Mme Olga IVANOVA  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de la Fédération de Russie  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

M. Vladimir KOROTKOV  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de la Fédération de Russie  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**SAINT LUCIA/SAINTE LUCIE**

Ms Vera LACOEUILHE  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation de Sainte Lucie auprès de l'UNESCO  
21 bis avenue d'Iena  
75116 Paris

**SLOVAK REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE**

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

Ms Anna ADAMCOVA  
Expert  
Slovak Environmental Agency

**SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD**

Ms Nelia BARNARD  
Permanent Delegation of South Africa  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

**THAILAND/THAILANDE**

Prof.Dr Adul WICHIENTHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee on the Convention for Protection  
of the World Heritage

Mr Viroj PIMMANROJNAGOOOL  
Director of Wildlife Conservation Division  
Royal Forest Department  
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives

Mr Manit SIRIWAN  
Secretary  
National Committee on the Convention for Protection  
of World Heritage

Mrs Siriporn NANTA  
Environmental Official  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning

Mme Sasithara PICHAICHANNARONG  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Thailand  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

**TURKEY/TURQUIE**

Mr Muzaffer ADALI  
Chercheur

**UKRAINE/UKRAINE**

Mr Oleh YATSENKIVSKY  
Délégation permanente de l'Ukraine  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME UNI**

Ms Hilary IZON  
Deputy Observer  
Embassy of Great Britain  
35, rue du Faubourg St Honoré  
75383 Paris Cedex 08

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

Mr John J. REYNOLDS  
Regional Director  
Pacific Northwest Region  
National Park Service  
600 Harrison Street  
Suite 600  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

Mr William McILHENNY  
United States Observer to UNESCO  
American Embassy to France  
PARIS

**VENEZUELA**

Mme Mariana ROMERO  
Deuxième secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Venezuela  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
Maison de l'UNESCO

**ZIMBABWE/ZIMBABWE**

Mr Josiah Jasper MHLANGA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Zimbabwe  
to UNESCO  
UNESCO House

**IV. EXTERNAL AUDITORS**

Ms Bonnie MILLER  
Deputy Auditor General  
External Auditor  
OTTAWA, Canada

Mr John DUNNING  
External Auditor  
OTTAWA, Canada

Ms Julie CHARRON  
External Auditor  
OTTAWA, Canada

**V. SECRETARIAT****WHC**

Mr Bernd von DROSTE  
Director  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Georges ZOUAIN  
Deputy Director  
World Heritage Centre  
Ms Minja YANG  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Herman VAN HOOFF  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Mechtild ROSSLER  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Junko TA NIGUCHI  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Margareta KARLSSON  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Peter STRASSER  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Sabine SAMADY  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Sarah TITCHEN  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Peter STOTT  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Michel LINCOURT  
World Heritage Centre

Mr Carlos ROMERO  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Jane DEGEORGES  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU  
World Heritage Centre

Mr David MARTEL  
World Heritage Centre

Ms Marianne RAABE  
World Heritage Centre

**BOC**

Mr Dan DALY  
The Comptroller

**LA**

Mr John DONALDSON  
Legal Advisor

**CLT**

Mr Azedine BESCHAOUCH  
Sector for Culture

Ms Lyndel PROTT  
Sector for Culture

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS  
Sector for Culture

Mr Etienne CLEMENT  
Sector for Culture

Mr Alfeo TONELLOTTO  
Sector for Culture

Mrs Ana DUMITRESCU  
Sector for Culture

Ms Anne LEMAISTRE  
Sector for Culture

Ms Ana PAOLINI  
Sector for Culture

Mme Khim My a Kyu  
Coordinatrice du Myanmar pour la Culture

**CII/INF**

Mr Abdelaziz ABID  
Information and Informatics Divisions

**SC/ECO**

Mr Sami MANKOTO  
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms Jane ROBERTSON  
Division of Ecological Sciences

(Mrs. Ma. Teresa Franco's, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, opening speech)

Good morning, I am very glad to welcome you to this opening session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

We appreciate the participation of the delegates of the country members of the Bureau: Australia, Germany, Japan, Italy, Mexico, Morocco and Niger.

We also welcome the representatives of country members of the Convention that assist as observers. We greet the representatives of the Consultative Bodies ICROM, ICOMOS and IUCN- and, of course, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and representative of the Director General of UNESCO, and his staff. We welcome too, and wish best luck, to our translators that will certainly have a difficult job.

I am sure this session will be a successful and very productive one. We have a high commitment and a rich agenda for the next 6 days.

The reinforcement of the application of the Convention, certainly obliges to serve it with the best expertise and also from a daily better organisational and management capability.

Absolute loyalty to the Convention and, on the other hand, a great spirit of innovation are needed to face the real and fast changing (not always for better things) conditions in which we must promote equal conditions for all regions to nominate and conserve those cultural and natural properties that demonstrate that nature all over the planet, and human groups and civilisations have been producing those special sites where mankind recognises the best of itself.

Through years, a lot has been done and for sure we are walking on the right path. We must recognise Mr. Federico Mayor's contribution to peace and the extension of UNESCO's programmes. But we can not feel satisfied with our own work (just remember that approximately half of the countries that have signed the Convention have submitted to the Committee their tentative list), yes we can not feel completely satisfied until scientific co-operation, training programmes, follow-up processes, the agenda of promotion and conservation of properties, lead to a more equilibrated picture in terms of a multicultural point of view and of a well recognised biodiversity, and until a stronger socio-cultural policy with enough financial support through new well administrated mechanisms and models, is launched in favour of World Heritage.

There is too much to achieve, so I think we better start this session and I will ask the distinguished representative of the Director General of UNESCO if he's so kind to take the floor. Thank you.



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-first session  
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

23 - 28 June 1997

**Item 1 of the Provisional Agenda: Opening of the session by the Director-  
General of UNESCO or his representative**

Madam Chairperson,  
Your Excellencies,  
Distinguished Permanent Delegates,  
Observer Delegations,  
Members of the Advisory Bodies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have the privilege to welcome you to UNESCO Headquarters on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO who, unfortunately, cannot be with us today due to other prior commitments.

1997 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the *World Heritage Convention* by the General Conference at its seventeenth session on 16 November 1972 and the fifth anniversary of the creation of the World Heritage Centre on 30 April 1992.

The universal appeal of the *World Heritage Convention* is demonstrated by the fact that it has been ratified by 149 countries, and that the World Heritage List now counts 506 cultural and natural heritage properties of exceptional value to all humanity.

Important progress has been achieved in the last five years. In 1992 the *Convention* counted only 122 States Parties. Emergency cases such as Dubrovnik and Angkor had moved to the forefront of the Committee's preoccupation. Still today the loss of human life and the destruction of humankind's heritage in war and peacetime continues to preoccupy us.

The World Heritage Centre was established to build a transdisciplinary capacity within UNESCO to meet the all embracing challenges of World Heritage conservation; to permit work at the interface of culture and nature; to facilitate rapid action in cases of emergency; to better reach out to the public at large through joint programmes with the media; and most importantly to prepare young people as stewards of our World Heritage through an ambitious programme of World Heritage education.

The Director-General has reaffirmed his deep commitment to ensuring that the World Heritage Centre is a strong, well performing unit of the House for the benefit of all Member States of UNESCO.

The Director-General is pleased to report that the financial audit of the World Heritage Fund for 1996 is completed and that the opinion of the auditor is, and I quote,

" ... the transactions of the [World Heritage] Fund that have come to my notice during my audit of the financial statements have, in all significant respects, been in accordance with the Fund's and UNESCO's Financial Regulations and legislative authorities."

Of course all recommendations made by the auditor for improving administrative performance will be immediately followed up.

As a result of consultations with Member States the draft 29C/5 presents five main lines of action for World Heritage conservation for 1998/1998 for which we will seek close cooperation with our partners, notably ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN. Let me briefly summarise the proposals that will be discussed by the General Conference this year.

Continuing efforts to better ensure the representativity of the World Heritage List will continue.

Local and national capacities for the long-term management and protection of sites will be strengthened. In particular the urgent conservation needs of World Heritage sites in danger will be met.

Importantly, additional efforts will be made to implement the World Heritage Training Strategy, particularly in Africa.

Our scarce resources will be used as a catalyst to attract additional support from donors.

We propose that assistance to IUCN, ICOMOS and States Parties for the monitoring and reporting of the state of conservation of sites will continue.

World Heritage information and awareness-raising activities will receive particular attention.

Finally, the Special Project "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" launched in 1994 through the Associated Schools Project will be reinforced. The World Heritage Education Kit will be distributed to 5,000 schools around the world and teacher-training courses will be held at a sub-regional level.

On behalf of the Director-General I would like to wish you every success in your deliberations.

**STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF PAKISTAN**

"The proposed site of the Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802), submitted by Pakistan is located in the northern area of Pakistan which is under the administrative control of the Government of Pakistan. Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory, as recognized by the United Nations. The question of designating the Central Karakorum National Park as a World Heritage site should be decided on merits and objective criteria. The political status of the territory should have no relevance to the decision. The IUCN should therefore carry out its technical mission to Central Karakorum national park scheduled for August 1997."

**ANNEX V.1**

**STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATE OF GERMANY**

"Germany welcomes the decision of the Polish Government to nominate the 'Castle of the Teutonic Order in Malbork' on the World Heritage List and wholeheartedly supports that nomination. The Castle is an important landmark of German as well as Polish history. As the seat of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order until 1466 and later of the Polish kings, the Malbork Castle has always had a special significance in the history of German-Polish relations. In the course of the conservation work, Poland has involved experts from Germany as well as from other countries bordering the Baltic Sea. We commend the Polish authorities for their outstanding conservation efforts and for their cooperative approach and express our gratitude for their valuable contribution to the benefit of World Heritage."

DECLARATION DE L'OBSERVATEUR DE LA POLOGNE

L'Observateur de la Pologne a remercié l'ICOMOS pour l'excellent travail de ses experts et le Bureau du Comité pour l'approbation des deux candidatures présentées par la Pologne, ainsi que pour l'intervention de l'Ambassadeur Horst Winkelmann.

L'inscription du château de Malbork prend en effet des significations symboliques mettant en valeur une excellente coopération entre les conservateurs polonais et allemands.

Le château de Malbork témoigne d'une histoire commune, quelquefois mouvementée de nos deux pays, constituant un élément très important du patrimoine européen. Il a été protégé prioritairement déjà à l'époque juste après la deuxième guerre mondiale quand les autres monuments polonais ont été en ruines, puis un effort très considérable a été accompli pour restituer et mettre en valeur cet énorme complexe architectural. Récemment Malbork est devenu le centre de recherche sur la conservation de la brique, travaillant en coopération étroite avec l'Université de Torun, spécialisée dans la technologie de conservation. Le colloque international sur ce sujet s'est tenu en septembre 1996 avec une large participation des conservateurs allemands ainsi que des représentants d'autres pays européens. Malbork rend ainsi son rôle éminent dépassant les frontières de nos pays.

## ANNEXE VI

### DECLARATION DU DELEGUE DE L'ITALIE

Madame la Présidente,

A la fin de cet exercice, permettez-moi de dire quelques mots.

Nous remercions toutes les délégations présentes pour l'attention et la patience avec laquelle elles ont procédé à l'évaluation des sites que nous avons proposés.

Nous avons pris bonne note des déclarations de caractère général qui ont précédé cet examen et des observations plus spécifiques qui ont été formulées.

Nous en feront un rapport fidèle à nos Autorités en mentionnant les différentes prises de position, sans aucune exception.

Mais, permettez-moi de dire que le moment semble être arrivé pour essayer de comprendre quel est le sens qu'on veut donner à l'application de la Convention.

Nous n'avons jamais conçu l'idée que l'inscription d'un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial équivaut à l'attribution d'un prix, d'une sorte de "cinq étoiles" sur la liste des "leading hotels of the world" ou encore d'un "trois étoiles" dans le guide Michelin.

Permettez-moi de le dire avec orgueil. Nous n'en avons pas besoin. Cette reconnaissance nous vient de l'amour des historiens de l'art, des artistes, des créateurs, de tous les voyageurs qui, au fil des siècles, sont venus dans mon Pays (Byron, Goethe, pour citer quelques-uns des plus célèbres "Voyages en Italie"), des millions de visiteurs qui tous les ans remplissent nos villes d'art, jouissent de nos côtes, admirent nos monuments.

Nous avons toujours conçu l'inscription sur la Liste comme un moyen d'assurer une protection plus accrue à nos sites, comme une sorte d'impulsion à nous-mêmes, un engagement pour les sauvegarder au mieux et les mettre à disposition, dans les meilleures conditions, des savants, des étudiants, des visiteurs du monde entier.

La notion du patrimoine culturel et naturel comme patrimoine de l'humanité nous est chère. Nous avons toujours favorisé l'inscription des sites naturels et culturels proposés par tous les pays du monde. Les nôtres, d'ailleurs, reflètent la présence de plusieurs cultures et de différents courants de civilisation (je rappelle à cet égard la notation du Comité, à



Mérida, qui s'était félicité pour l'approche suivie pour nos propositions d'inscription, ces dernières illustrant "toutes les catégories patrimoniales et témoignant de l'enchaînement et de l'interaction des cultures sur la longue durée").

A cette fin, nous avons essayé de rattraper, en quelque sorte, le temps perdu.

Nous avons aussi repris des propositions qui étaient depuis longtemps sur la table de ce Comité, nous avons recueilli l'incitation que certains Pays membres de ce même Comité nous ont adressée (je me rappelle, pour citer un exemple, qu'à maintes reprises on nous avait demandé de proposer l'inscription de Pompei et Ercolano). Nous avons fait un effort à notre intérieur. Nous avons constitué une structure d'évaluation ad hoc.

Mais nous constatons que ces efforts, déployés avec les meilleures intentions, posent quelques problèmes. Nous en tiendrons certainement compte. Si la liste du patrimoine mondial deviendra ainsi plus crédible, c'est une question à suivre.

Mais nous tiendrons compte de ça. Certaines observations, parfois un petit peu trop pointilleuses nous ont frappés. Mais nous pensons qu'il faut vraiment se poser la question de principe et de faire une réflexion sur les buts de cette Convention et sur la méthodologie de sa mise en oeuvre. Et, bien évidemment, nous sommes prêts à participer à cet exercice et à en tirer les conclusions.

**Proposal of agreement presented by the Consultative Body  
for the consideration of the Bureau**

The reports and documentation presented at this bureau meeting in relation to the World heritage Fund's external financial audit are considered important steps in an effort to improve the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. In accordance with the mandate of the Consultative Body given by the World Heritage Committee in Merida, a management review must now be completed to be presented at the twenty-first session of the Committee in December of this year.

A workshop on management practices, fund-raising and emblem usage, with the participation of the Consultative Body, the External Auditors and the World Heritage Centre, is suggested to take place at a mid-point in the management review. The agenda and objectives are described below (see "The Management Review").

In following the conclusions of the financial auditors' report, and after examining the documentation distributed at this Bureau meeting, it is considered appropriate to establish the following recommendations which are intended to help the inclusion of the financial information which is needed for an efficient budgetary process.

The budget presented to the Committee should clearly state its sources of income. In addition to the Regular Programme whose budget is financed and approved by UNESCO, the following sources have been identified:

1. unobligated balance from previous years;
2. assessed contributions;
3. other income;
4. emergency and contingency reserve funds.

In the case of other income, it is important to recognize at least three types:

1. earmarked;
2. non-earmarked;
3. interests.

It is recommended that specific guidelines be developed regarding contracts for earmarked and non-earmarked projects in order to comply with Article 15 of the World heritage Convention and items 3.1 4.1 of the World Heritage Fund Financial Regulations, which requires other income to be accepted and expenditures to be approved by the World heritage Committee.

Regarding income generated through other trust funds, the Consultative Body believes that if the objectives of these funds are related to, or supportive of, the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, acceptance and expenditure of such income should be approved by the World Heritage Committee, specially if it involves the use of the World Heritage emblem for commercial purposes.

It is also believed that specific guidelines related to donations and corporate sponsorship should be approved by the World heritage Committee based on the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO" so that the World Heritage Centre insures the proper management and promotion of this type of income-generating activities.

2. Budget expenditures should be presented according to the source of income. Yearly approved budget expenditures related to programmes and projects not disbursed or obligated during that period, should be reviewed and, if considered appropriate, re-approved by the World Heritage Committee. Expenditures related to "other sources of income" should be approved by the World Heritage Committee based on precise guidelines.

3. The presentation of the financial information to the Committee of the World Heritage Fund should be improved in accordance with the external auditors' recommendations (paragraphs 49-53 of the external auditors' report).

Apart from:

1. the statement of Assets, Liabilities and Fund Balances;
2. the Statement of Income and Expenditure and Changes in Reserves and Fund Balances;
3. the Schedule of Appropriations and Expenditure,

the following information should be presented:

- a. Budget Allocation vs. total Expenditure vs. Project Progress Report, by source of income and by project
- b. Detailed analysis of "Other Income Account"
- c. The budget submitted for approval shall include all possible sources of income and the proposed expenditures schedule should be approved by source of income, programme and project.

In the particular case of the fund-raising contract observed in paragraphs 46-48 of the external auditors' report, the advisory body recommends not to charge any expenditures pertaining to this contract to the World Heritage Fund if, in the view of the Chairperson of the World heritage Committee, it does not fully comply with the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO".

## THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The financial audit has provided valuable initial information to aid the management review. The consultative group recalls the initial outline agreed upon at Merida (page 92 of the 20th session of the World Heritage Committee report), as well as the progress reports related to the April 1-2 and June 1997 20th meetings (documents WHF-97/conf.204/5 and WHF-97/conf.204/5Add.), and adds the following for the further guidance of the auditors.

The overall questions to which the group would like to have clear and useful answers and advice at the end of the review are:

1. What are the primary aims of the Committee in implementing the Convention, in enhancing World Heritage identification, conservation and presentation?
2. To what extent does the Centre assist the Committee in fulfilling its mission?
3. What are the key difficulties for the Centre in assisting the Committee?
4. What are the changes -structural, operational, attitudinal- which can be made to substantially improve the efficiency of the Committee and the Centre in their respective roles?
7. What are the priorities for these changes?
8. What is the suggested timetable for their implementation?

There are a number of particular concerns at this stage identified which the consultative group believes should be resolved. These include sponsorship guidelines, use of the emblem and staffing levels and qualifications. There are a number of documents and sources of information which will be useful. These include:

- The financial audit results
- The strategic plan of 1992, prepared on the 20th anniversary of the Convention
- The organizational chart of the World Heritage Centre

- "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO".

### **Timing**

The preliminary informations on the above mentioned issues will have to be available for the workshop and distributed beforehand.

The workshop will be held at UNESCO's headquarters in Paris on the following date: October 31 - November 1, 1997.

The consultative group, whether they attend the workshop or other meetings or not, would appreciate to be circulated with regular progress reports at the following suggested dates: Third week of September and third week of October, 1997.

A draft final report of the management review, is suggested to be sent to the members of the consultative group on the second week of November, 1997. The report will be also presented to the Director General of UNESCO for comments to the 21st session of the World Heritage Committee which will meet in Naples.

Comments will be compiled and it is suggested that a final report will be presented to the consultative group meeting at Naples on November 26, 1997, prior to the extraordinary session of the Bureau meeting.

### **MANAGEMENT REVIEW WORKSHOP**

**When:** October 31 - November 1, 1997.

**Where:** UNESCO Headquarters, Paris

**Duration:** 2 days

#### **Purpose:**

Scheduled to take place at a mid-point in the management review, the workshop will provide an opportunity for clarification of key issues emerging from the review and identification of options to resolve them.

**Attendance:**

- All professional staff of the World Heritage Centre and other UNESCO staff upon invitation.
- Members of the Consultative Group
- Representatives of the scientific advisory bodies
- External auditors

**Preparatory Work:**

- Survey of participants indicating their views on the role of the World Heritage Centre and areas where activities could be done differently (each participant).
- Interim report of external auditors on progress.
- Description of present activities of the Centre.
- List of staff positions of the Centre.
- Working group report on the use of the emblem.

**Workshop Agenda**

Day 1                      Aims/roles of World Heritage Centre

This session will focus on aims/roles of the World Heritage Centre. After an identification of potential roles, a preliminary assessment of feasibility will be carried out by examining these roles in terms of efficiency and affordability.

Day 2

(i) Guidelines for private sector fund-raising

This session will examine UNESCO's guidelines for private sector fund-raising (April 1997) and recommend adaptations, if necessary, to meet the specific needs of World Heritage activities.

(ii) Guidelines for use of the World Heritage Emblem

This session will examine existing guidelines for use of the emblem and recommend, in necessary, amendments to the Committee's Operational Guidelines.

(iii) The way forward

This session will propose plans for improvements in key areas, and agreements on collective plan of action.

## **Expected Results of the Workshop**

1. The clarification of aims/roles of the World Heritage Centre, and the analysis of existing activities and priority of activities, will be forwarded to the external auditors for their further consideration in the overall management review.

2. Recommendations for guidelines for private sector fund-raising for World Heritage activities will be forwarded through the Bureau to the World Heritage Committee for its consideration in December 1997.

3. Recommendations for amending guidelines for use of the World Heritage Emblem will be forwarded through the Bureau to the World Heritage Committee for its consideration in December 1997.

4. In addition to the specific results above, the workshop will improve our collective understanding of the challenges faced by the Centre, will develop consensus on how to approach these challenges and will foster mutually beneficial working relationships. In this way, the purpose of the Convention will be better served.



**World Heritage Fund**  
Report of the External Auditor

# World Heritage Fund

## Report of the External Auditor

---

### Introduction

1. At the request of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, the Director-General asked us to audit the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996. He also asked us to prepare a report on the financial matters arising from this audit. We have also been requested to conduct a review of management practices of the World Heritage Centre. We plan to carry out this examination later.

2. We wish to express our gratitude for the co-operation and support received from the staff of both the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller in this audit.

### Financial Statement Audit

#### Scope of the Financial Audit

3. We conducted our audit in accordance with UNESCO's Financial Regulations and with generally accepted auditing standards, conforming with international standards in auditing, and with the common auditing standards adopted by the Panel of External Auditors of the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

4. Those standards require that we plan and perform an audit to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial presentation.

5. We obtain our assurance by evaluating internal controls where applicable, analysing balances and testing transactions. All transactions selected for testing the fairness of financial statements, were reviewed for compliance with the World Heritage Fund's and UNESCO's Financial Regulations and the appropriate legislative authority. In the audit of the World Heritage Fund, we determined, within reasonable assurance, whether the transactions tested were properly credited or charged to the Fund.

6. In an audit it is not possible to obtain absolute assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This is because of the limitations inherent in the audit process, including factors such as the use of judgement, the use of testing, the inherent limitations of internal control and the fact that much of the evidence available to the auditor, is persuasive in nature rather than conclusive.

7. The responsibility for preparing the financial statements and accompanying notes, including adequate disclosure, rests with the Bureau of the Comptroller. Maintaining

adequate accounting records and internal controls, selecting and applying accounting policies, and safeguarding the assets of the World Heritage Fund are a shared responsibility of the Bureau of the Comptroller and the World Heritage Centre secretariat.

8. As part of the audit process, we obtained written confirmation from UNESCO's Comptroller, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and other appropriate officers concerning representations made to us orally during the audit as well as representations that are implicit in the World Heritage Fund's records.

## **Explanation of the External Auditor's Report on the Financial Statements**

9. There are three main parts to the External Auditor's Report on the financial statements: the introductory paragraph; the scope paragraph; and the opinion paragraphs.

### **Introductory Paragraph**

10. The introductory paragraph identifies the specific financial statements and notes to the financial statements that are audited. This paragraph also explains the responsibilities of the Secretariat and the External Auditor. The Secretariat, not the External Auditor, develops the underlying information and takes responsibility for the assertions made and the critical judgements that are embodied in the financial statements. They are the Secretariat's representations. The External Auditor audits the evidence supporting the financial statements and, based upon this work, expresses an opinion on them. The audit process thus adds credibility to management's financial statements.

### **Scope Paragraph**

11. An audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, the auditor's professional responsibility is fulfilled by complying with those standards. These standards require that the auditor design procedures to reduce the risk of not detecting a material misstatement in the financial statements to an appropriately low level.

12. In the scope paragraph, the External Auditor states that the examination was made in accordance with the standards of the auditing profession. These standards apply equally in any financial statement audit, regardless of the type or size of the entity. The scope paragraph provides the reader with some explanation of the nature and extent of an audit: that it entails examining audit evidence and that this is done on the basis of testing, not examining all the available evidence.

### **Opinion Paragraphs**

13. The opinion paragraphs contain the External Auditor's conclusions about two matters: whether the financial statements may be relied on to present fairly the Fund's overall financial position and results of operations in accordance with the Fund's accounting policies; and whether the transactions that we audited comply with the financial regulations and legislative authority of the Fund.

14. The auditor is not an insurer and his or her opinion does not constitute a guarantee. The audit is not designed to detect an intentional misstatement that is concealed through manipulation, falsification or alteration of accounting records or documentation to disguise the fact that the accounting records are not in agreement with the underlying facts and circumstances.

15. The External Auditor's opinion on the financial statements points out that the amounts reported in the statement of income and expenditure for the two year period ended 31 December 1995 and the statement of assets, liabilities, reserves and fund balances at that date are unaudited. As a result, an audit opinion is not given on these amounts and they are clearly marked as unaudited.

16. The External Auditor's opinion on the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 1996 is that they present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Fund as at 31 December 1996 and income over expenditures for the year then ended and that the statements are in accordance with the Fund's accounting policies. Further, the Auditor's opinion states that the transactions of the Fund that were examined in the audit of the financial statements were in accordance with the Fund's and UNESCO's Financial Regulations and authorities.

## **Matters arising from this Audit**

### **Observations and Recommendations**

17. The balance of this report makes a number of observations and recommendations directed to Bureau of the Comptroller and the Centre secretariat. I firmly believe that the recommendations put forward in this report, if properly implemented, will contribute in the improvement of the management and accountability of the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO.

#### **There needs to be better co-ordination between the Bureau of the Comptroller and the World Heritage Centre secretariat in the preparation of financial information for the World Heritage Fund.**

18. In developing our audit strategy we start by gaining an understanding of the basic features of the Fund's financial and internal control systems. We found that management has put in place some procedures designed to account for the operations of the Fund within the accounts of UNESCO. However, the procedures that are in place do not allow for clearly segregating the Fund's activities from those of the UNESCO's Regular Programme and other trust funds. In addition, the chart of accounts for the Fund is not detailed enough and needs to be revised and updated.

19. At the beginning of our audit, we encountered considerable difficulties in obtaining accurate information to support the draft financial statements prepared by the

Bureau of the Comptroller. Audit trails were difficult to establish and several accounting adjustments were required. For example, the accounts had not been analysed to ensure that they truly reflected the Fund's activities in the draft financial statements, transactions had been charged to UNESCO's Regular Programme or other trust funds when they should have been charged to the World Heritage Fund (Fund), and vice versa. In many instances there was incomplete information on the financial status of projects. Furthermore, the financial statements presented to us had not been reconciled to UNESCO's general ledger.

20. On April 21, 1997, we brought these matters to the attention of both the Bureau of the Comptroller and the Centre. On April 23, 1997, they agreed that we should stop the audit so that they could undertake a major effort to analyse financial transactions with the objective of producing revised financial statements for 1996 and an audit trail that would support these financial statements.

21. We restarted our audit on May 12, 1997. Some thirty adjustments had been made by the Bureau of the Comptroller to reconcile the financial statements with UNESCO's general ledger. This allowed us to progress with our audit.

22. Much of this additional work and our audit effort and costs could have been reduced if the Bureau of the Comptroller and the World Heritage Centre co-ordinated their efforts in analysing the Fund's accounts and in preparing financial information.

23. *We recommend that the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller develop a more detailed chart of accounts for the Fund.*

24. *We recommend that the Bureau of the Comptroller and the World Heritage Centre secretariat improve their accounting and administrative preparedness through better co-ordination in the analysis of the Fund's accounts and in the preparation of financial statements for the Fund.*

### **The World Heritage Centre needs to improve its records that contain the documentation supporting financial activities related to the World Heritage Fund.**

25. We asked the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller to provide us with files that contained the documentation to support the obligations we selected for audit. We expected that the obligations would be adequately supported by such documents as a signed copy of the contract, amendments if necessary, evidence of approvals, invoices, reports by the contractors on the performance of the contract, copies of journal vouchers when required, etc.

26. Many of the files we reviewed did not contain sufficient documentation. The Centre managed to obtain some of the required documentation from other files in the Centre or elsewhere in UNESCO. Although we were able to reach an audit opinion based on the files and documentation provided to us, not all of the files and documentation we requested could be located before the end of our audit.

27. Most contracts require an initial payment when the contract is signed. Subsequent payments are made against the obligation in line with the terms and conditions of the contract. However, there is no supporting documentation, in the files we reviewed, that clearly indicates that the work has been performed before final payments are made or before any remaining balance in the obligation is liquidated.

28. This situation does not provide for good control and hampers the Centre's ability to monitor financial activities for these obligations and to respond to requests from its own management, the Committee and others about these activities.

29. *We recommend that the Centre takes immediate steps to improve its records that contain the documentation supporting financial transactions related to the World Heritage Fund. At a minimum, each file should contain copies of documentation and approvals to support all financial transactions including; a signed copy of contracts, amendments if necessary, evidence of approvals, invoices, copies of journal vouchers when required, evidence to support the performance of the contract before any final payments are made or before any remaining balance in the obligation is liquidated.*

### **The accounting for and reporting of expenditures and revenues needs to be strengthened considerably.**

30. Except for the staff costs associated with the support to the Secretariat, it is not always clear how the expenditures for a world heritage project are accounted for when the project costs are shared by the World Heritage Fund and UNESCO's Regular Programme or another trust fund. We found no documentation to support the amounts allocated. It appears that the determination is made on budget availability and/or a judgemental basis rather than an analysis of how costs should be shared.

31. Furthermore, information is not maintained on projects whose lives extend beyond the calendar year in which they were approved. Any income received or expenditures incurred after the year end in which a project started are simply credited or charged to activities in the next year's budget. Obligations totalling some \$190,000, were charged as 1996 expenditure in respect of projects approved in a prior year.

32. When the Centre raises obligations, it maintains a numerical control over each one as they are issued. However, the same series is used for all of the Centre's world heritage activities and not just those of the Fund. It would be advisable to use a separate numerical series for World Heritage Fund obligations in order to avoid any confusion in the recording of the obligations.

33. In two contracts that we audited, we noted that the Centre raised an obligation in UNESCO's Regular Programme since funds were not available in the Fund's budget for these obligations. At a later date, when funds become available, the expenditures were transferred back to the Fund. The Centre does not maintain a listing of the Fund expenditures that have been charged to UNESCO's Regular Programme. Instead, it relies on the corporate memory of the Director or acting Administrative Officer to ensure that World Heritage Fund expenditures, recorded initially in UNESCO's Regular Programme

because of budgetary concerns. are charged back into the World Heritage Fund when funds are available.

34. The contracts for additional income attribute such income to the “World Heritage Centre”. The contracts were ambiguous and did not clearly specify if the income was for the World Heritage Fund, UNESCO’s Regular Programme activities or for other UNESCO trust funds.

35. The present method for accounting for earmarked projects makes it virtually impossible to determine individual project balances at any one point in time. Revenues and expenses for these projects can be coded in one of three accounts. In order to obtain information on the financial activity for an individual project and to determine the amount of the surplus or deficit at the end of a project, a detailed manual analysis of each account has to be carried out.

36. *We recommend that:*

- *there be a separate clause in each World Heritage Centre contract that identifies, when necessary, how revenues and expenditures should be shared between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other trust funds;*
- *written guidelines be developed by the Centre to assist administrative staff to determine how costs should be shared between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other trust funds;*
- *the Centre maintains records for each project and track revenues and expenditures over the life of each project;*
- *a dedicated numerical series be used for the raising of World Heritage Fund obligations;*
- *the accounting for obligations pertaining to the World Heritage Fund be recorded in the Fund’s accounts and not in those of UNESCO’s Regular Programme or another trust fund;*
- *if, for some exceptional reason, the obligations have to be recorded in UNESCO’s Regular Programme for transfer back later to the Fund’s accounts, there be a clear, recorded audit trail that identifies these obligations;*
- *contracts for additional income should contain a clause specifying precisely if the income pertains to the World Heritage Fund, UNESCO’s Regular Programme or for another UNESCO trust fund; and*
- *each earmarked project for the Fund should have a separate financial code. The overall structure of the coding should be in accordance with the Fund’s workplans.*

**Internal controls over the recording of revenues need to be strengthened.**

37. In 1996, prior to the commencement of our audit of the World Heritage Fund, the Centre made a few entries to correct errors in coding revenues to UNESCO's other trust funds when they should have been coded to the Fund, and vice versa. These corrections were significant in value and better internal controls over the recording of revenues would have been detected and corrected these errors earlier.

38. *We recommend that the World Heritage Centre needs to improve its tracking of anticipated revenues to ensure that receipts are deposited promptly and to ensure that it provides the Treasury Division in the Bureau of the Comptroller with the accurate information it needs on expected revenues, the anticipated date of receipt and the financial codes that the funds should be credited to.*

**The Fund should develop procedures to monitor its "Cash and term deposit account".**

39. When receipts are received, they are deposited by the Treasury Division into a pooled bank account for UNESCO's trust funds. The Treasury Division monitors the balance in its bank accounts on a daily basis and invests excess funds in fixed term deposits. At 31 December 1996, UNESCO's accounts showed that approximately \$400,000 was maintained in the bank accounts and over \$100,000,000 was maintained in fixed term deposits for its trust funds. The accounts showed that the World Heritage Fund's share of these pooled amounts was \$5,019,320. The average interest rate earned by these pooled accounts was approximately 5.3% in 1996.

40. The World Heritage Fund is not like most UNESCO trust funds. For example, it has its own Convention, Financial Regulations and is administered by the World Heritage Centre secretariat. It also has more day-to-day financial activity than other trust funds. However, since the inception of the World Heritage Fund, there has been no reconciliation of cash receipts, interest earned and disbursements against the balances reported by UNESCO.

41. *We recommend that the Centre develop adequate records to monitor the Fund's receipts and disbursements on a regular basis.*

**Unliquidated Obligations are not reviewed and adjusted on a regular basis.**

42. Under the terms of UNESCO's and the Fund's Financial Regulations, the appropriations, voted by the World Heritage Committee, constitute an authorization to incur obligations and make payments for the purposes for which the appropriations were voted and within the limits of funds available. However, appropriations may remain



available if they are required to discharge obligations in respect to goods supplied and services rendered in the financial period and to liquidate any other outstanding legal obligations of the financial period.

43. While the overall responsibility for the proper recording of the Fund's unliquidated obligations rests with the Comptroller, for very practical reasons and in accordance with regulations, this responsibility has been delegated to the Centre.

44. In our audit we found that the draft financial statements presented to us for audit contained obligations outstanding at the year end that had not been reviewed and adjusted. On our request, the Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller, at the end of May, undertook a major effort to analyse the balances outstanding in the draft financial statements. The amounts reported in these statements had to be reduced by over twenty percent.

45. *We recommend that unliquidated obligations be analysed on a regular basis throughout the year. Adjustments should be made on a timely basis for those obligations that no longer represent a valid legal liability.*

### **The World Heritage Committee needs to address concerns regarding costs for fund raising contracts.**

46. In 1996, the World Heritage Centre entered into a fund raising contract with a consultant to raise additional income for the Fund. This type of contract was new for the Centre and it was not foreseen in the Fund's approved budget or workplans for 1996. There were no official guidelines in the Fund's or UNESCO's financial regulations or in the UNESCO Manual that would set the parameters for contract payments for this type of contract..

47. We could not determine if the costs for this contract should be charged as a servicing fee against the additional income earned. All costs associated with this contract are now recorded in UNESCO's Regular Programme.

48. *The World Heritage Committee should address the question of whether costs associated with fund raising contracts should be charged as a servicing fee against the additional income earned for the Fund.*

### **Better financial information can be provided to the World Heritage Committee.**

49. At its meeting in December 1996, the World Heritage Committee recommended a new format for financial information and a summary report of all world heritage activities. We support this recommendation. It is also essential that financial information include budget information against which actual performance can be measured.

50. With respect to a summary report of all world heritage activities, the Centre currently does not have this information readily available which would be a valuable tool

in its decision making process. Such a summary would also assist the Committee in setting the Fund's priorities and workplans.

51. Currently, the financial statements for the World Heritage Fund are not prepared on a yearly basis with comparative figures for the preceding year. Annual statements with comparative figures would improve not only the transparency of the Fund's world heritage activities but also enable the Centre and the World Heritage Committee to better review and monitor actual results of these activities against budgets and workplans.

52. At the present time there is no budget information for earmarked income and expenditures related to this income. There should be. Without such information, it becomes difficult to measure results and performance. While resources for some of these activities are more difficult to estimate, the budget can be amended as more information becomes available.

53. *We recommend that the Centre improve the financial information provided to the World Heritage Committee by providing the Committee with financial information against which actual performance can be measured, a summary report of all world heritage activities, annual financial statements with comparative figures for the preceding year and budget information for earmarked income and expenditures related to this income.*

#### **Training for administrative staff should be provided.**

54. The Fund's administrative officers must ensure that adequate records are maintained, that transactions recorded to the Fund are proper and that UNESCO's and the Fund's financial activities are reconciled on an ongoing basis. In addition administrative staff need periodic training on financial and accounting matters. No such training is currently provided.

55. *We recommend that training, co-ordinated by the training unit in UNESCO's Personnel unit and with the possible assistance of the Bureau of the Comptroller, be provided for those responsible for accounting and administrative duties relating to the World Heritage Fund.*

#### **Internal Audit should review the activities of the Centre and Fund.**

56. Internal audit can provide management with an ongoing assessment of whether policies and procedures are being adhered to. The activities of the Centre and the Fund have not been the subject of an internal audit recently. If internal audit had reviewed the activities of the Centre and the Fund, many of our observations and recommendations might have been addressed.

57. *We recommend that internal audit periodically review the activities of the Centre and the Fund and report their findings and recommendations to UNESCO's management.*

Distribution limited

WHC-97/CONF.204/10 Add.  
Paris, 19 June 1997  
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL  
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twenty-first session  
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

23 - 28 June 1997

AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 1996 AND REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL  
AUDITOR

SUMMARY

In accordance with standard practice, this addendum presents the written comments of the Director-General on the above-mentioned report of the External Auditor (WHC - 97/CONF. 204/10)

1. In his report on the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996, the External Auditor made certain observations and recommendations. The Director-General submits hereunder comments on each recommendation or group of recommendations made by the External Auditor under the following headings

- A. Co-ordination
- B. Filing
- C. Expenditures and revenues
- D. Internal controls
- E. Cash monitoring
- F. Unliquidated obligations
- G. Costs for fund raising
- H. Financial information
- I. Training
- J. Internal Audit

2. The Director-General wishes to refer to the Audit Opinion and to paragraph 16 of the External Auditor's report that the financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996 present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Fund as at 31 December 1996 and income over expenditure for the year then ended.

It is to be noted that the External Auditor has thereby issued an audit opinion that makes no reservation or qualification regarding the financial statements and their conformity with the Financial Regulations of UNESCO.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

---

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

---

(Paragraph numbering hereunder is taken from the Audit Report)

A. Co-ordination

23. We recommend that the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller develop a more detailed chart of accounts for the Fund

24. We recommend that the Bureau of the Comptroller and the World Heritage Centre secretariat improve their accounting and administrative preparedness through better co-ordination in the analysis of the Fund's accounts and in the preparation of financial statements for the Fund

The Director-General agrees with these two recommendations. A more detailed chart of accounts, which applies in particular to earmarked activities, will be developed. The World Heritage Centre will review the computer financial statements on a more regular basis so as to co-ordinate better with the Bureau of the Comptroller on a more timely basis. It should be noted that the year end adjusting entries were mostly between accounts of the Fund, which was consequently globally correct.

B. Filing

29. We recommend that the Centre takes immediate steps to improve its records that contain the documentation supporting financial transactions related to the World Heritage Fund. At a minimum, each file should contain copies of documentation and approvals to support all financial transactions including; a signed copy of contracts, amendments if necessary, evidence of approvals, invoices, copies of journal vouchers when required, evidence to support the performance of the contract before any final

Although this recommendation is accepted, it should be noted that the External Auditor in paragraph 26 states that he has been able to provide an opinion on the basis of the files and documentation presented. Nevertheless in some cases not all the files and documentation could be provided. The External Auditor has been requested to provide the Centre with a list of the cases where they found inadequate documentation. The Centre will then undertake a thorough investigation of these cases with the

---

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

payments are made or before any remaining balance in the obligation is liquidated.

C. Expenditures and revenues

36. We recommend that:

- there be a separate clause in each World Heritage Centre contract that identifies, when necessary, how revenues and expenditures should be shared between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other trust funds;

- written guidelines be developed by the Centre to assist administrative staff to determine how costs should be shared between the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and other trust funds;

- the Centre maintains records for each project and track revenues and expenditures over the life of each project;

- a dedicated numerical series be used for the raising of World Heritage Fund obligations;

- the accounting for obligations pertaining to

---

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

object of providing the outstanding documentation.

The determination on how the expenditures for a World Heritage project are accounted for when project costs are shared by the World Heritage Fund and UNESCO's Regular Programme or other trust fund is made on the basis of the annual workplan which is presented in advance each December to the World Heritage Committee and on the eventual need to complement the allocated funds by additional resources if so required subject to their availability.

Whilst accepting to using a special numerical series for the raising of World Heritage Fund obligations on a trial basis, the Director-General does not consider that this should increase administrative work when an activity or a contract should be financed from more than one source. It is accepted however that documentation on such matters should be clear within each file. A separate financial code for each earmarked project will be developed in the more detailed chart of accounts.

the World Heritage Fund be recorded in the Fund's accounts and not in those of UNESCO's Regular Programme or another trust fund;

- if, for some exceptional reason, the obligations have to be recorded in UNESCO's Regular Programme for transfer back later to the Fund's accounts, there be a clear, recorded audit trail that identifies these obligations;

- contracts for additional income should contain a clause specifying precisely if the income pertains to the World Heritage Fund, UNESCO's Regular Programme or for another UNESCO trust fund; and

- each earmarked project for the Fund should have a separate financial code. The overall structure of the coding should be in accordance with the Fund's workplans.

#### D. Internal controls

38. We recommend that the World Heritage Centre needs to improve its tracking of anticipated revenues to ensure that receipts are deposited promptly and to ensure that it provides the Treasury Division in the Bureau of the Comptroller with the accurate information it needs on expected revenues, the anticipated date of receipt and the financial codes that the funds should be credited to.

The Bureau of the Comptroller possesses full information on the assessed contributions, most of which are received by bank transfer. The major problem referred to in this section of the report concerned a transfer received from a Member State of UNESCO. The information from the bank did not state that the contribution was for the Fund and on the basis of information received from one of the UNESCO Programme Sectors it was posted to a Trust Fund of the same Member State where a similar amount was

---

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

E. Cash monitoring

41. We recommend that the Centre develop adequate records to monitor the Fund's receipts and disbursements on a regular basis.

expected. This unfortunate coincidence was corrected prior to the Audit. The World Heritage Centre follows up outstanding contributions due with reminders to States Parties, but is very seldom given information by them as to when payments will be made. To the extent possible, the Centre will inform BOC on the anticipated date of receipt of other contributions, together with the code to which the funds should be credited.

The Centre will cover this requirement when reviewing the monthly computerized accounts.

F. Unliquidated obligations

45. We recommend that unliquidated obligations be analysed on a regular basis throughout the year. Adjustments should be made on a timely basis for those obligations that no longer represent a valid legal liability.

Agree

G. Costs for Fund Raising

48. The World Heritage Committee should address the question of whether costs associated with fund raising contracts should be charged as a servicing fee against the additional income earned for the Fund.

The fund-raising contract in question was drafted by the Legal Office of UNESCO in conformity with the Organization's rules and procedures.

All costs associated with the fund-raising contract are exceeded by the funds received from the fund raising activities of the fund raiser. This is a self-financing activity, generating an



---

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

H. Financial Information

53. We recommend that the Centre improve the financial information provided to the World Heritage Committee by providing the Committee with financial information against which actual performance can be measured, a summary report of all world heritage activities, annual financial statements with comparative figures for the preceding year and budget information for earmarked income and expenditures related to this income.

I. Training

55. We recommend that training, co-ordinated by

overall surplus income to the World Heritage Fund.

The Financial Statements at 31 December 1996, which were drafted in co-operation with the External Auditor, have been improved, inter alia, to show clearer budget information against actual expenditure and more clarity on earmarked income. The Financial Statements for the biennium ended 31 December 1995 that were included in an information document at the World Heritage Committee Meeting in Mérida will be restated in a similar format for the General Assembly meeting later this year.

It should be noted that the Committee considered that the presentation of the budget information had much improved at its 20th session in Mérida. However, they considered that a reduction of documentation and an action plan for the coming year with forecasts for the forthcoming two years, as well as an annual balance sheet, would be more than adequate and provide the necessary global overview to facilitate the full comprehension of the proposals.

Perhaps the External Auditor could assist the Centre in the development of a format for budget presentation during the management review that will soon take place and make appropriate recommendations to the World Heritage Committee thereon.

Whilst agreeing with the need for training, it

---

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

the training unit in UNESCO's Personnel unit and with the possible assistance of the Bureau of the Comptroller, be provided for those responsible for accounting and administrative duties relating to the World Heritage Fund.

J. Internal Audit

57. We recommend that internal audit periodically review the activities of the Centre and the Fund and report their findings and recommendations to UNESCO's management.

COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

should be remembered that the vacant professional administrator post is under recruitment and training required will depend on the qualifications of the candidate chosen.

Agree

---

## **Report of the Consultative Body (Paris, 1-2 April 1997)**

### **Introduction**

The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Maria Teresa Franco, opened the meeting by saying the Director-General had demonstrated a very open, positive attitude to the work of the World Heritage Committee and has expressed his support for developing the activities of Committee, its Consultative Body and the Centre. She expressed her gratitude to the Director-General and the Secretariat for the assistance given to the Consultative Body and hoped the meeting would be very positive and constructive.

All the members of the Consultative Body created at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee in Merida (2-7 december 1996) were represented : Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta and Mexico. The representative of the United States of America, Member State of the World Heritage Committee, has been invited to attend after the agreement of the members of the Consultative Body.

In accordance with the adopted agenda, the Consultative Body has paid a particular attention to clarify the questions mentionned in the Merida document in order to facilitate the external auditor's task ; it has also studied other points which the Committee had recommended to review.

### **I. Questions to be answered by UNESCO's external financial auditor**

#### **A. Financial aspects**

Agreement was reached on the need to make a list of questions on the financial aspect. (See Annex.)

Many participants see the Centre as a unit making expenditure from the ordinary programme (document C/5) and from the World Heritage Fund, as well as other expenditure. As regards revenue, a distinction needed to be made between "normal", foreseeable revenue and other, "commercial" revenue. Their origin and destination had to be clear. In that respect, the participants considered that the term "revenue" was preferable to "profits".

As for promotional contracts, which may be sources of revenues, several delegations asked whether the Chairperson had signed new contracts since the Merida meeting. The Chairperson replied that she had not signed any.

Concerning the relation between ordinary budget and Word Heritage Fund, the fear was expressed that an assessment of the ordinary budget might duplicate those already carried on by UNESCO for past biennia, but it was pointed out that it was a matter of a

specific audit concerning the Centre's income. There was detailed discussion of the idea that any expenditure designed to implement the Convention was a contribution to the World Heritage Fund and therefore came within the Committee's jurisdiction.

Reference was also made to Article 15, paragraph 4 of the Convention concerning contributions to the Fund, the purposes of which must be defined by the Committee. This point was raised in reference to the presentation to the Committee of some expenditures made in some countries without the Committee's approval.

Several members wanted the period covered by the assessment to be extended beyond that planned, i.e. the financial year 1996, so that the Consultative Body could have a comprehensive view of practice over several years. The reservations about this are as follows : the Consultative Body should not go beyond its mandate, it should consider consulting the Director-General on the matter ; earlier years might be referred to only if the needs of the assessment required it. It was pointed out that the Centre was established in 1992, that the issue of commercial income did not arise until 1995, so it would be useful to go back at most only one year. With respect to this point, reference was also made to cases in which several versions of the same document had been submitted to the Committee.

One delegate wondered whether an attempt should not be made to supplement the financial regulations.

Some members of the Consultative Body thought it was also important to add to these questions on purely financial matters, the following question :

What exactly are the Centre's functions ? What is their relationship in particular with those of the Physical Heritage Division, and generally with the Culture and Science Sectors, and with other units of the Organization, such as the UNESCO Publications Office and the Audiovisual Division ?

It was pointed out that the Consultative Body's ideas about financial and administrative matters could provide the basis for a "philosophical", "legal" and "technical" debate about the application of the Convention, but that, for the moment, the auditors' task was to provide the Consultative Body with answers from which it could draw conclusions. These conclusions should include examination of possible imbalances in the implementation of the Convention on the global and regional levels, particularly in some commercial activities, bearing in mind that some of these imbalances reflect the priorities set by the Committee or the Centre for their action.

## **B. Presentation of the Budget**

As regards the presentation of the budget, one delegate repeated a request that had been made many times at previous sessions of the Committee, that a satisfactory model for

presentation of the budget be submitted, as the members of the Committee were not satisfied with the models submitted up to now. Modes of presentation may vary considerably from one country to another and this should not lead to misunderstandings. The matter is to reach an agreement on the informations which, according to the Committee members, should appear in all budgetary presentations.

The information should concern the budget the Committee has to approve as well as the execution of the current budget.

As for the expenses, differences should be clearly shown between those estimated in the budget and those really made.

As for the incomes, some are difficult to foresee exactly but can be estimated, according to the number of contracts concluded.

A clear budget can thus be approved including well defined incomes and an approximative part according to "other sources" of income.

The suggestion was also made that unforeseeable income should not be spent in the year in which it is received, but the following year, after the Committee has been informed of it and is aware of the content of the Fund.

Discussion then turned to the Reserve Fund, which amounts to some two to three million U.S. dollars, and which the Committee alone should allocate. The Reserve Fund should be distinguished from the Emergency Fund that was designed to cover emergencies and the amount of which the Committee had recently set at \$ 500 000.

Several members stressed the need of having only one financial instrument, one account and one budget.

### **C. Management practices**

The first questions in this area concerned the staff. The members of the Committee had not been fully informed about the people working at the Centre as general services, professionals, directors, consultants, volunteers, supernumeraries, associated experts, etc. If the Committee had a complete table it could draw conclusions.

Questions were also raised regarding the way the auditors should proceed in this matter, whether the administrative aspects were regarded as being part of their mandate, following the Director-General's decision to give the external auditors both tasks. Once the auditor's responsibilities were explained, an agreement was reached on the possibility of combining the two aspects of the assessment so to submit them to the next Bureau meeting in June 1997.

The auditors will interview people in the Centre and the staff of other divisions of UNESCO or outside UNESCO, for example, some delegations and former Chairpersons of the Committee.

## **II. Proposals to be submitted at the next session of the Bureau**

### **A. Global Strategy**

Some members of the Consultative Body mentioned that this question was not relevant to their mandate ; while others considered it was, given the financial aspects and the management practices implied. This item should be submitted to the Bureau for discussion at the meeting on the Global Strategy planned for 1997.

It was recalled that the Committee had decided in Merida to draw up a list of experts endorsed by States so as to avoid certain diplomatic misunderstandings ; nevertheless, many delegates mentioned very successful examples of co-operation in some regions of the world.

### **B. The emblem**

In this connection, it was recalled that the Committee had decided to use the term "emblem" and not "logo".

The discussion of the use of the World heritage emblem began by discussion of certain practical problems with which heritage officers in the field, far from UNESCO Headquarters, are often confronted. Some delegations mentioned experiences in their countries and guidelines they might follow for each type of product planned. All the delegations stressed that the requests for the use of the emblem would increase.

To deal with the uncontrolled use, all the members of the Consultative Body agreed on the need to lay down precise guidelines for the use of the emblem.

The following questions were raised :

1. Who at UNESCO has authority to authorise use of the emblem ? For commercial or other ends ? For non-profit-making activities ? for loss-making or for promotional purposes ?
2. Is there a code of conduct on the subject ?
3. Who makes a profit and how is it distributed ?
4. How are products carrying the emblem distributed ?
5. How many emblems are there ?
6. Should use of the emblem be granted with no charge ?
7. How do the Centre and Governments use the emblem ?
8. How can the emblem be protected by the various national legislation ?

9. How can the procedure be simplified or clarified so that legitimate use of the emblem is simpler ?
10. How can a cost-benefit analysis of "commercial" and "promotional" contracts be carried out ?

In conclusion, the question of seeking the opinion of UNESCO's legal adviser or some other competent legal adviser was discussed and it is hoped it will be available at the next meeting of the consultative body which will take place just before the Bureau session in June 1997.

**I. Questions to be answered by UNESCO's external auditor.****A. Financial aspects**

1. What is the whole financial situation at the 31st of december 1996 of the World Heritage Fund, the Reserve Fund and the Emergency Fund ? Where are they deposited, what are the interests and the periods ?
2. What are the differences between the estimated expenses in the budget provisions and those really made ?
3. Analysis of "Other Income" and of "Additional Income" accounts.
4. What are the expenses on personnel and their relation to the sources of income ?
5. What are the existing contracts and income generated during 1997 in addition to the approved budget ? What is the use of this income ?
6. Are all the incomes of the Heritage Centre paid into the Fund ? Are there other accounts ?
7. In view of the fact that some organizations might want to give themselves a respectable image by donations and services, how the private sources of funding can be clearly identifiable so that the Committee may advisedly decide whether or not to accept their offers ?

**B. Presentation of the budget**

1. To answer requests that had been made many times is it possible to propose a satisfactory model for presentation of the budget be submitted, as the members of the Committee were not satisfied with the models submitted up to now ?
2. The last ordinary budget of UNESCO allocated \$1 100 300 to the direct costs of the programme and the Centre's running costs. What is this money used for ? Article 15 3 b (ii) of the Convention provides for the contributions UNESCO may make to the World Heritage Fund. Should the sums allocated from UNESCO's ordinary budget not be paid totally or in part, directly into the Heritage Fund ?
3. The auditor should see whether all the spending by the Secretariat of the Convention has been legitimately carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the Guidelines and the Committee's decisions.



## **C. Management practices**

### **a) Questions of staff**

1. What is the organisational chart of the World Heritage Centre? How are the tasks distributed amongst general services, professionals, directors, consultants, volunteers, supernumeraries, associated experts? What are the real tasks they accomplish?
2. If the Center uses consultants, how are they chosen and paid?
3. Are there consultants paid according to the income they bring in?

### **b) Questions of contracts**

1. What is the procedure of conclusion of contracts?
2. What do they contain?
3. How many have been signed?
4. What rights do countries have over images?
5. Which companies carry them out? Is there sub-contracting?
6. Who assesses the management?
7. Who has contractual capacity and how is competence divided between the Director-General, the Committee, the Chairperson of the Committee and the Centre? To what extent does the Director-General delegate his authority to the Director of the Centre?

## Summary of the meeting of the consultative body

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters

20 June 1997

### Introduction.

1. The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Maria Teresa Franco opened the meeting by consulting the members of the consultative body on the organisation of the agenda and on the discussion with the auditors, the UNESCO comptroller and the Director of World Heritage Centre. The Director was accompanied by the Deputy Director.
2. All the members of the Consultative Body created at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee in Merida (2-7 December 1996) were represented : Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, and the observer from the United States of America also participated.
3. Since the consultative body did not have an English copy of the external auditors' report available before the beginning of the meeting, some time was given to the members to read it. The French version was not available before the afternoon. The audited financial statements of the World Heritage Fund for the year ended 31 December 1996 are annexed to the auditors' report

### Presentation of the report of the External Auditor.

4. The External Auditor began by presenting the report. She explained the method of tests and risk assessment. She also drew attention to paragraph 15 of the report which indicates that the amounts reported in the statement of income and expenditure for the two year period ended 31 December 1996, the statement of assets, liabilities, reserves and fund balances at that date were unaudited.

5. She recalled the difficulties encountered by the External Auditors in the implementation of their task and said that some of them could have been avoided by a better co-ordination between the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller, as well as by a better organisation of the documentation related to the Centre's activities. The External Auditors had to interrupt their work because they could not obtain, in the cases tested, all the documentation to support the activities and financial operations. According to the Secretariat, some of these lacunae could be explained by the decentralisation of activities.
6. She then mentioned paragraph 33 of the report concerning the contracts where the Centre had raised an obligation in UNESCO's Regular Programme since funds were not available in the Fund's budget for these obligations ; then, once the funds were available, had transferred back the expenditures to the Fund. Concerning the contracts for additional income, she called some of them « ambiguous » particularly in relation to the beneficiaries of these incomes (cf. paragraph 34).
7. She suggested that improvements should be made in the internal control procedures, for the recording of incomes, by setting a log book for the follow up of the files to avoid duplication of work between the Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller. She drew the members attention to the whole set of recommendations.

#### **Discussion.**

8. The members of the Consultative Body thanked the External Auditors for the work accomplished.

9. The first questions were about the **co-ordination** between the World Heritage Centre and the Bureau of the Comptroller of UNESCO, on their respective fields of competence. The Comptroller described the contractual procedures followed by the Centre and by UNESCO, the obligations and their classification and he recalled the delegation of powers to the Centre for the implementation of the activities planned in the budget approved by the World Heritage Committee.
  
10. In this regard, members of the consultative body expressed their concern about the expenditures of a project where the costs were **shared** by the World Heritage Fund and UNESCO's Regular Programme or another trust fund. On the basis of the paragraph 30, they asked how many other funds existed, how many special funds? The absence of clear guidelines on this matter in the Financial Regulations was outlined. In the answer to these questions, the example of the Norwegian Fund was mentioned, which co-finances some activities. For the Comptroller, the auditing of such co-financing is a complex operation. There are roughly ten accounts the list of which will be given to the members of the Bureau.
  
11. As far as the **documentation missing** in the files is concerned, a question was raised on the amounts of the sums concerned. Many questions were raised about the paragraph 33 quoted before, and related to the expenditures made from the Fund and the Regular Programme. What are the amounts concerned? 32.000 \$? On how many contracts has this shuttling been done? On this matter, the Comptroller recalled the method of tests used to implement this audit and according to the Director of the Centre, the filing system should be reviewed to facilitate access to the files at the regional level.

12. The members of the consultative body inquired into the **financial position** of the Fund (cf. paragraph 39 of the report), into the excess funds in fixed term deposits They asked for clarification of the causes of this surplus and of the fact that it did not appear in the documentation of the session of the Committee in Merida. The Director of the Centre gave explanations on the different chapters of the budget and suggested that the Committee could perhaps give larger amounts to the State Parties requiring assistance. To a query on the interest earned which did not appear in the Merida accounts, the members of the body were told that these revenues amounted to approximately 245.000\$ (at an average interest rate of 5,3%) in 1996.
13. Questions were raised about the **voluntary contribution** from France for 1995 which had been mistakenly recorded in another trust fund (IPDC) in 1995 and correctly recorded in the Fund for 1996 ; clarifications were given by the UNESCO Comptroller.
14. Questions were raised about the contracts for which there was no supporting documentation indicating clearly that the work had been done before final payments were made or before any remaining balance in the obligation was liquidated.

15. The question of « **contracts for additional income** » (paragraph 34) has been discussed in depth: the members of the consultative body asked for clarifications on their contents, on the authority competent to sign such contracts, on the co-contracting party which pay the servicing fees and the amounts of these fees. Are such practices in accordance with the relevant financial regulations and the ethics of international organisations? Who utilizes the incomes thus generated and for which purpose? The auditor replied that she did not know of other UN agencies that enter into this kind of activities. The Director of the Centre assured the members of the consultative body that the legal adviser had been consulted, that there were precedents at UNESCO and that he would provide the Bureau with the relevant documents. The Director of the Centre stated that there was no « black account » separated from the Fund and that the different campaigns related to heritage undertaken by UNESCO and with a fund raising dimension were not submitted to the same contractual and financial regime, but that such practices would be taken into account in the preparation of the budget. The members of the consultative body questioned whether these « self-financed contracts » should be encouraged, whether they were even necessary, given the amount of excess funds.
16. The members of the consultative body expressed their surprise that the External Auditors had not received a copy of the report of their April session containing the questions addressed to them and available to the members of the Bureau in document W.H..C. 97/CONF.204/5 of 26 May 1997 and on Internet. They also regretted that the audit had taken more time than estimated (cf. paragraph 5) and expressed their concern at whether the cost might exceed the amounts set aside by the Committee in Merida.
17. To a question on the use of the emblem and the legal opinion asked by the consultative body in its report of April 1997, the Director of the Centre answered that he considered that the Body could not ask the Centre to undertake such a study and further that he had received the report too late to make a start.

18. The participants in the meeting concluded that a number of questions raised by the financial audit might be answered in the management audit which is its logical extension. The Director of the Centre drew the attention of the members to the difficulties he would face to put the staff resources of the Centre at the disposal of the auditors, because of the departure of some professionals and the preparation of statutory meetings. Nevertheless, according to the agenda suggested by the Auditor, the consultative body deemed it preferable that the audit should start in September so as to be presented - together with the comments of the Director General - to the Bureau in December 1997.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
Twenty-first extraordinary session

Naples, Italy  
28 - 29 November 1997

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the Agenda and the timetable
3. Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
4. Examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
5. Requests for International Assistance
6. Other business
7. Closure of the session



Distribution Limited

WHC-97/CONF.208/1  
Naples, 1997  
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-first session

Naples, Italy  
1 - 6 December 1997

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the Agenda and the timetable
3. Report of the Secretary on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twentieth session of the Committee
4. Report of the Rapporteur of the sessions of the World Heritage Bureau held in 1997
5. Report on the work of the Committee's Consultative Body on the overall management and financial review of the administration of the World Heritage Convention
6. Report on the decision of the 29th General Conference of UNESCO on the resolution adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 20th session (December 1996) with regard to monitoring and its implementation
7. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:
  - 7.1 Methodology and procedures for reporting on the state of conservation
  - 7.2 Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties

8. Information on Tentative Lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger
9. Progress report on the global strategy, and thematic and comparative studies
10. Requests for International Assistance
11. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1998, and presentation of a provisional budget for 1999
12. World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education activities
13. World Heritage and the Prevention of the Illicit Traffic of Cultural Property
14. Date and place of the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
15. Date and place of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee
16. Other business
17. Closure of the session

**Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Nature-Culture Consultation Meeting, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France, 28 June 1997, 10.00-12.00**

**Introduction**

On Saturday 28 June 1997 a consultative meeting on the World Heritage Global Strategy was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France from 10 am to 12 pm. The meeting was convened to discuss the scope and detail of a future meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts, as had been requested by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session held in Merida, Mexico in December 1996. The consultation meeting was organised following the earlier written approval of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

An invitation to the meeting was extended to Bureau members, observers and representatives of the three Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS) on the morning of Monday 23 June 1997 at the opening of the twenty-first session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

**1. Introductory remarks by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee**

The Chairperson welcomed Bureau members and representatives of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* and the Advisory Bodies. She recalled that at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee held in Merida, Mexico, from 1 to 7 December 1996, the Committee discussed the results of the Expert Meeting "Evaluation of General Principles and Criteria for Nominations of Natural World Heritage Sites" (Parc National de la Vanoise, France, 22 to 24 March 1996). The report of this Expert Meeting was sent to all States Parties under cover of Circular Letter 5/96 for comments, as requested by the twentieth session of the Bureau.

Furthermore, she recalled that the Committee at its twentieth session decided that a truly joint meeting of natural and cultural heritage experts ("nature-culture meeting") be organised, and approved the financial means for such an event. The Committee specifically noted that a more in-depth discussion was needed on:

- (a) the application of the "conditions of integrity" versus the "test of authenticity,
- (b) the question of a unified or a harmonised set of criteria, and
- (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts (see Report of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, Merida, Mexico, 2-7 December 1996, paragraph IX.14).

The Chairperson commented that in order to implement the Committee's decision to organise the Nature-Culture Expert Meeting in the most cost-effective and efficient way, the consultation meeting was suggested. It also should be noted that the Nature-Culture meeting is scheduled for 1998 - due to the high number of meetings already

scheduled for 1997, including the 3rd Global Strategy meeting in the Pacific, the General Assembly of States Parties, the UNESCO General Conference, extraordinary session of the Bureau and Committee and the twenty-first session of the Committee.

She informed the participants that their task was based on the decisions of the World Heritage Committee - to prepare the work of a "Nature-Culture Expert Meeting" by defining the scope of issues and the terms of reference to be addressed and to also suggest names of experts to be invited. She noted that, in this spirit a Draft Agenda (Attachment A) had been prepared by the Secretariat.

The Chairperson then invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present a brief introduction.

## **2. Introductory remarks by the Director, World Heritage Centre**

The Director of the World Heritage Centre commented that while both the *Convention* and the World Heritage Centre bring together the conservation of both cultural and natural heritage, most countries still do not have technical or administrative organs for a combined or joint approach to cultural and natural heritage conservation.

He referred to the need to now develop an overarching Global Strategy in accordance with the spirit of the *Convention* and to acknowledge that we are working with a nature-culture continuum. The conceptual links between natural and cultural heritage conservation mean that we can no longer separate the two, however, he commented that we are far from having a global and unifying view.

On the notion of outstanding universal value he referred to great difficulties in its interpretation and noted the very different applications of the notion by IUCN and ICOMOS. He mentioned that outstanding universal value is an evolving concept whose definition has not been resolved. IUCN defines outstanding universal value as the "best of its kind". He asked how this can be reconciled with an approach that combines uniqueness and representativeness? He called for a regional perspective and asked what is the regional definition of World Heritage?

He referred to Paragraph 6 of the *Operational Guidelines* which outlines "general principles" to guide the Committee's work, including Paragraph 6(i) that the *Convention* provides for protection of a select list of the most outstanding sites from an international viewpoint. Our ideal view of the World Heritage List would be one of fairness to all cultures of the world and that the strong basis for this would be a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach.

He stressed that we must remember Article 12 of the *Convention* and that the fact that a property is included in the List does not mean that it does not have outstanding universal value.

On the question of integrity and authenticity he mentioned that integrity was important for the assessment of both natural and cultural heritage, and especially for cultural landscapes. He asked, how do we develop a more unified view? He mentioned that previously we have seen nature and culture as two separate entities. Cultural

landscapes demonstrate interactions between culture and nature, but there are of course many more transitions between the two. Natural heritage criterion (iii) which refers to natural beauty illustrates this problem as natural beauty is a social construction and cultural concept.

He referred to the tremendous challenge and collective insights needed to develop a proper interpretation of the *Convention* and a more selective World Heritage List based on higher standards and a unified approach to cultural and natural heritage conservation.

### **3. Adoption of the Agenda**

After thanking the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his introduction, the Chairperson asked the participants whether they had any comment or changes to the Draft Agenda which had been distributed.

The Draft Agenda (see Attachment A) was adopted without modification.

The Chairperson then asked Ms. Cameron, Canada, and Mr. Nicholls, Australia, whether they would be rapporteurs for the consultative meeting. Ms. Cameron had been Chairperson of the 1994 Global Strategy meeting, and Mr. Nicholls had been one of the rapporteurs of the 1996 meeting held in the Parc de la Vanoise, France. Ms. Cameron and Mr. Nicholls agreed to act as rapporteurs.

### **4. Scope and Agenda for the Proposed Nature-Culture Meeting (1998)**

The representative of IUCN informed the meeting that the outcomes of the La Vanoise meeting had been discussed at a World Heritage workshop held as part of the World Conservation Congress in Montreal in October 1996, in which a number of NGOs and State Parties to the *Convention* who are Members of IUCN attended. He informed the meeting that IUCN did not dispute or argue with pursuing the course of action outlined by the Vanoise meeting or by the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The representative of Canada commented that the subjects under discussion are very important and that a lot of preparatory work had been done in the field of cultural heritage conservation. She referred in particular to the Bergen meeting (31 January to 2 February 1994), which was followed by the Nara Conference on Authenticity (1 to 6 November 1994), whose discussions were amplified at the 1996 San Antonio meeting when representatives from North, Central and South America discussed the concepts of integrity and authenticity in relation to colonised new world contexts and aboriginal peoples. She predicted that the concept of integrity was likely to be applicable to both natural and cultural heritage and that authenticity may be better applied to artefacts. She questioned whether similar discussions had been held in the field of natural heritage conservation.

The representative of ICOMOS recalled the history of the drafting of the *Operational Guidelines*, where in the first draft integrity was used for both cultural and natural heritage. He then noted difficulties in the application of the "test of authenticity".

The Delegate of Niger agreed with both the remarks by the representatives of Canada and ICOMOS. He emphasized that integrity is a cultural concept and that its interpretation is just as debatable as it is for authenticity. He questioned the application of the "test of authenticity" and asked for whom it is meaningful and significant. He recalled the 1994 Global Strategy and the 1996 Vanoise meeting and commented that there are questions of substance which should be investigated further.

A staff member of the World Heritage Centre recalled the centuries-old philosophical debate on this subject and suggested that these issues be discussed in broader terms. He commented that it was interesting but insufficient to try and identify the application of these concepts from one culture to another.

A representative of ICCROM noted that a simple change in terminology would not solve the problems of its application. Whilst appreciating the fact that integrity may relate to the entire spectrum of cultural and natural World Heritage he noted that it had to be determined whether integrity applies to cultural heritage. He commented that the word "authentic" has two meanings: creativity relating to universal value, and to documentary evidence and its legality and authenticity. Therefore, the concept of authenticity is to some degree static. Since the 18th Century we have seen a shift from absolute to relative values. Integrity is a way of understanding relationships in context, for example in an urban situation between the physical and the cultural. If we could define integrity in relation to the context, we would better understand dynamic processes. Whereas in the past we had static conservation policies, we now have a dynamic conservation policy in which we need to combine the two issues of integrity and authenticity.

The Delegate of Japan commented that in the Japanese language no words exist for authenticity and integrity. She noted that they are concepts that are interpreted as "what can we change?" and "what can't we change?" She noted that outstanding universal value and integrity are important to define the concepts, and limits of change whereas (b) derives naturally from (a) and (c), referring to the Agenda (see Attachment A).

A representative of ICOMOS referred to an almost insoluble problem with the interpretation of authenticity. Firstly it is a semantic problem as it is a concept that can be interpreted in different ways by different languages and cultures. In addition, it raises deep philosophical and legal problems. It is impossible to define authenticity as our definitions and interpretations will always change. She commented that she was in favour of consensus to be applied cautiously relying on a thorough analysis of each individual nomination.

The Delegate of Morocco also noted the importance of the discussion but noted that the political must also be considered in addition to the scientific, technical, philosophical and legal. We have to choose and decide in the assessment of nominations, and this is political. Criteria are tools to facilitate this assessment. In noting his interest in the proposal of by the Delegate of Japan, he questioned how do we move ahead? It would be important to start by again analysing the concept of the universal.

IUCN referred to the general lack of documentation in the field of natural heritage on global and regional values although he referred to the recent preparation of reports in Australia on outstanding universal value. He referred to a global protected areas meeting to be held in Western Australia in November 1997. It would be possible for this meeting to produce a perspective from the field of natural heritage. He noted how far interpretations in the field of natural heritage had shifted already. He noted as an example that the 1996 Vanoise meeting had defined natural heritage as:

"A natural area is one where bio-physical processes and landform features are still relatively intact and where a primary management goal of the area is to ensure that natural values are protected. The term "natural" is a relative one. It is recognized that no area is totally pristine and that all natural areas are in a dynamic state. Human activities in natural areas often occur and when sustainable may complement the natural values of the area."

He suggested that with respect to the test of authenticity ICCROM's view should not be dismissed. He referred to an inconsistency in the *Operational Guidelines* - the concept of traditional protection is referred to for cultural properties but not for natural properties. The criteria, test of authenticity, and conditions of integrity need to be reanalysed to bring the best of authenticity and integrity together. With respect to outstanding universal value he referred to a recent expert group convened in Australia where "outstanding universal value was defined as "the best of the best". This is an even narrower definition than that of IUCN who consider the best of the best plus regional considerations.

The Delegate of Italy commented that she was bothered by the concept of authenticity and integrity and it is not possible to give a universal interpretation to something (heritage) that is so changeable. She mentioned the legal implications of trying to apply such a universal interpretation. She warned against an interpretation of integrity that relied on a fixed moment in time. She noted that outstanding universal value and integrity and authenticity are closely linked but discussions should begin with outstanding universal value.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre highlighted the two key notions of integrity and their significance for natural and cultural heritage: structural and functional integrity. Both notions are of particular importance when dealing with the conservation of living systems such as cultural landscapes, traditional settlements and their land use, biodiversity protection of the ecosystems etc.

The Delegate of Australia reminded the meeting that authenticity and integrity are tools to help us decide why do we value and how do we keep these places? The criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity are tools to help us with these decisions and with how to protect places in the future.

The Delegate of Niger also referred to structural and functional integrity as referring to the functioning of sites as a whole. These different notions of integrity have to be integrated in the management of a site.

ICOMOS reminded the meeting that authenticity was not being used to reject nominations. The manner of interpretation of authenticity is just one component of the notion of integrity.

The Chairperson, in noting the comments of the Centre, the representatives of Japan, Australia and ICOMOS, referred to the anthropological, political, cultural and technical act of assessing nominations. She called for an effort to be made to move away from positivist thinking on criteria. She referred to one of the main problems as being the size of the List and questioned whether a better distribution of resources would be possible with a representative List. She expressed the need for an anthropological and philosophical rethinking on how standards can be achieved, and whose standards. These issues should also be considered in the World Heritage Centre. Most importantly the positivist methodology needed to be abandoned.

A staff member of the World Heritage Centre cautioned that there were two obstacles to be fought, both absolute relativism and traditional Eurocentrism. A new *modus operandi* is required.

The representative of Canada referred to authenticity and integrity as a vital link to management. The assessment of authenticity and integrity should guide ongoing management of a site and be an ongoing component of monitoring.

ICCROM agreed on the approach of linking authenticity and integrity to management and as the basis of monitoring. This approach would be particularly useful for cultural landscapes and urban areas to help us decide what to keep. ICCROM agreed that these are concepts, not words, and should be used as tools for management and monitoring.

IUCN emphasised the need to reinforce this link with ongoing monitoring. He referred to the recent reassessment of the World Heritage values of the Great Barrier Reef as contributing to the monitoring of the site.

The Delegate of Germany stated that he completely agreed with the Delegates of Japan, Italy, Niger and the Director of the Centre - these notions need to be interpreted regionally. He agreed that the notions are tools as stated by the Delegate from Australia. He noted that for all regions there must be something in common and that we are close to finding a solution. He commended the comment of the Canadian Delegate to link outstanding universal value and monitoring. He emphasised the need to make much greater use of tentative lists. Finally he questioned the range of nominations of properties to the World Heritage List. He recalled the aim for the List to be select and asked whether the List will eventually reflect the whole range of human diversity? Would, for example, the igloo be included? Why are certain types of properties not on the List? For political reasons?

The Chairperson asked the participants whether (a), (b) and (c) (see Attachment A) would be the main items for the agenda of the forthcoming joint meeting of natural and cultural heritage experts. It was agreed that there was sufficient scope for the agenda of the meeting to be held in 1998.



ICOMOS commented that further efforts were required to try to provide a balanced and representative List. ICOMOS offered to prepare a background document to further contribute to discussions. The document would be made available for the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1997.

## **5. Proposed list of participants**

With reference to the selection of participants for the meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts, the Director of the World Heritage Centre made reference to Circular Letter 4/1997 that had been sent to all States Parties to the *Convention* on the selection of experts.

The Circular Letter sought the names and addresses of experts who could contribute intellectually and/or practically to cultural and natural World Heritage conservation. The Director noted that, to date, no replies had been received to the Circular Letter. He furthermore commented that it was up to States Parties to make suggestions as to who should be attending the forthcoming meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts. Finally he suggested that the size of the meeting should be restricted.

The Delegate of Japan commented that it would be important for the forthcoming meeting to reflect on what had already been achieved and discussed at earlier Global Strategy meetings (including the meetings on authenticity, cultural landscapes, etc.)

The Director of the World Heritage Centre requested that States Parties inform the Centre of their selection of experts for the forthcoming meeting by 15 September 1997.

## **6. Venue of the Meeting**

The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the meeting that the Royal Government of the Netherlands has offered, in principle, to host the Global Strategy Expert Meeting on Natural and Cultural Heritage in early 1998 (February/March most likely). The Director thanked the Government of the Netherlands for their very welcome offer.

## **7. Other Matters**

The Chairperson concluded the meeting by expressing her opinion that the scope and content of the consultation meeting, of the joint meeting of cultural and natural heritage experts in 1998, and of the Global Strategy were critical to redefining the future role and identity of World Heritage conservation.

Finally, the Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for having prepared the consultation meeting, and all the Bureau members, representatives of States Parties and the Advisory Bodies for their contributions to the discussion. The Chairperson asked that the report of the consultation meeting be annexed to the report of the twenty-first session of the Bureau after it had been approved by the rapporteurs.

ATTACHMENT A

Draft Agenda

**Nature-Culture Consultation Meeting**

**28 June 1997, 10.00 -12.00, UNESCO Headquarters, Room VIII**

1. Introduction by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
2. Introduction by the Secretariat
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Scope and agenda for the proposed Nature-Culture Meeting (1998)
  - (a) the application of the "conditions of integrity" versus the "test of authenticity"
  - (b) the question of a unified or a harmonised set of criteria,
  - (c) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts
5. Venue of the meeting
6. Proposed list of participants
7. Other matters

## **Background Documents**

### **Documents de référence**

#### **1996**

WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9

Report of the Expert Meeting on Evaluation of general principles and criteria for nominations of natural World Heritage sites (Parc national de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 March 1996)

Rapport de la Réunion d'experts sur l'Evaluation des Principes généraux et des critères pour les propositions s'inscription de biens naturels du patrimoine mondial (Parc national de la Vanoise, France, 22-24 mars 1996)

WHC-96/CONF.202/INF 10

Report on the Expert Meeting on European Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value (Vienna, Austria, 21 April 1996)

Rapport de la Réunion d'experts sur les paysages culturels européens de valeur universelle exceptionnelle (Vienne, Autriche, 21 avril 1996)

WHC-96/CONF.201/INF.7

Synthetic Report of the Second Meeting on Global Strategy of the African Cultural Heritage and the World Heritage Convention (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 29 July -1 August 1996)

Rapport de synthèse de la Deuxième Réunion de Stratégie globale sur le patrimoine 'culturel africain et la Convention du patrimoine mondial (Addis Ababa, Ethiopie, 29 juillet-1 août 1996)

#### **1995**

WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.8

Asian Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes. Report of the regional thematic study meeting (Philippines, 28 March- 4 April 1995)

WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.9

Report of the Asia-Pacific Workshop on Associative Cultural Landscapes (Australia, 27-29 April 1995)

#### **1994**

WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.6 Report of the Expert Meeting on the "Global Strategy" and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List (UNESCO, 20-22 June 1994) Rapport de la réunion d'experts sur la "Stratégie globale" pour assurer la représentativité de la Liste du Patrimoine mondial (UNESCO, 20-22 juin 1994)

WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.008

Report on the Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention (Nara, Japan, November 1994)

WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.10

Information Document on Heritage Canals (Canada, September 1994)

Document d'information sur les Canaux du Patrimoine (Canada, septembre 1995)

WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.13

Report on the Expert Meeting on Routes as Part of the Cultural Heritage (Spain, November 1994)

Rapport de la Réunion d'Experts: Les Itinéraires comme patrimoine culturel (Espagne, novembre 1994)

### **1993**

WHC-93/CONF.002/INF.4

Report of the International Expert Meeting on "Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value", Templin, Germany (12-17 October 1993)

WHC-93/CONF.002/8

Global Study

Etude globale

### **1992**

WHC-92/CONF.002/ 10/Add

Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention: Report of the Expert Group on Cultural Landscapes, La Petite Pierre, France (24-26 October 1992)

Révision des Orientations pour la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial: Rapport sur le Groupe d'experts sur les paysages culturels, La Petite Pierre, France (24 - 26 octobre 1992)