

Distribution limited

WHC-99/CONF.204/5  
Paris, 31 May 1999  
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-third session  
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters (Room X)  
5 - 10 July 1999

**Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List:**

**Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.**

## SUMMARY

In accordance with paragraphs 48-56 and 86-93 of the Operational Guidelines, the Secretariat and advisory bodies submit herewith reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Where appropriate, the Secretariat or the advisory bodies will provide additional information during the session of the Bureau.

**Decision required:** The Bureau is requested to examine the attached state of conservation reports and take the appropriate decisions.

## INTRODUCTION

1. This document deals with **reactive monitoring** as it is defined in the Operational Guidelines: "The reporting by the Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the advisory bodies to the Bureau and the Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List (paragraphs 48-56 of the Operational Guidelines) and for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 86-93 of the Operational Guidelines).

2. To facilitate the work of the Bureau, a format has been developed for the state of conservation reports which includes the following items:

- Name of property (State Party)
- Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
- International assistance
- Summary of previous deliberations
- New information
- Action required.

### WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES IN CENTRAL AMERICA:

**Joya de Ceren (El Salvador)**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1993.

**Tikal National Park (Guatemala)**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979.

**Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979.

**Archaeological Park and Ruins of Quirigua (Guatemala)**, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981.

**Maya Site of Copan (Honduras)** inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980.

**Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)** inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982.

*Previous deliberations:* The Secretariat informed the Committee at its twenty-second session of damage caused by Hurricane Mitch to some World Heritage properties in Central America. The Committee requested the Secretariat, jointly with the advisory bodies, to provide a full report on the conditions of the World Heritage in the region of Central America to the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

*New information:* The Secretariat requested IUCN and ICOMOS to prepare such a report.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine the report that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

## NATURAL HERITAGE

State of conservation reports of twenty-six natural World Heritage properties are presented. Of that number, twenty were considered by the Bureau and the Committee at their last sessions (November-December 1998) in Kyoto, Japan. They are reported here either because new information on follow-up activities to implement the recommendations of the Bureau and the Committee is available or is expected to be available by the time of the Bureau session in July 1999. In the case of the other six sites new information pertaining to their state of conservation is submitted to the Bureau for review and action.

The Bureau may recall that at its last session (June 1998) the Chairperson recommended the establishment of an informal contact group during the annual sessions of the Committee and the Bureau. The group is intended to discuss mining threats to the integrity of World Heritage sites and possible policy options which the Committee and the Bureau may wish to adopt with regard to the mitigation of such threats. In this regard, IUCN has transmitted to the Centre the Position Statement on Mining and Associated Activities in Relation to Protected Areas issued by the World Commission of Protected Areas (WCPA). The WCPA Position Statement is included in document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.14. The Bureau may wish to reflect on the relevance of WCPA's Position Statement in the light of its deliberations on mining threats to specific sites, e.g. Huascarán (Peru), Doñana (Spain), whose state of conservation are reported below. The Bureau may wish to consider recommending that the WCPA Position Statement, supported by a paper analysing the pros and cons of its possible adaptation to World Heritage sites, be submitted as a working document to the twenty-third session of the Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, 29 November to 4 December 1999).

### **Great Barrier Reef (Australia)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1981)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997), the Committee was informed by the Australian authorities of the rigorous environmental conditions set for the development activities in the Hinchinbrook region and of other measures implemented to strengthen the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. At its twenty-second session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee noted that the Australian authorities had acted on the findings of the financial review of the GBRMPA (Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority) to further strengthen the conservation of the site. They were however, unable to provide the Centre with a copy of that review since it is considered an internal working document of the Government. In addition, the Committee requested the Centre to transmit the reports from IUCN Australia and other Australian NGOs to the State Party for review and comments and recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

*New information:* IUCN has transmitted to the Centre a report entitled "Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area: Condition, Management and Threats" which has been forwarded to the State Party for review and comment. The report has been prepared by ACIUCN using a comprehensive monitoring process it had initiated to draw together government and non-government members from Australia and focus on key conservation issues. The report, compiled over a six-month period, was adopted by ACIUCN on 30-31 March 1999. Key issues highlighted in this report include:

- the scale and complexity of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area need to be recognised as significant issues in evaluating the threats to the integrity of the area and its management effectiveness;
- there are a range of threats to the integrity of the area, covered in detail in the report under the headings of fishing; catchment issues; oil spills; and oil shale mining;
- in terms of the current threats to the World Heritage site, all of those that are collectively grouped under “catchment issues” would seem to be the most serious; their mitigation is often confounded by State/Federal jurisdictional issues and hence, there is a need for all levels of the Government to take concerted action to address integrated catchment management in order to reduce environmental impacts on the World Heritage site;
- the implementation of a representative system of protected areas, including IUCN categories I and II (no-take zones) should be a high priority; and
- the management of the World Heritage site by a single dedicated authority needs to be strongly supported. While GBRMPA serves this role, its organisational stability and long-term funding adequacy need to be strengthened.

**Action required:** The Bureau, based on comments of the State Party on the ACIUCN report, and IUCN responses to those comments to be provided at the time of its session, may wish to take appropriate decisions thereupon.

### **Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia) (Inscribed on the WH List: 1991)**

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session (Paris, 1998) the Bureau was informed that a petroleum exploration permit had been granted by the State Government of West Australia (WA) for an area located within the World Heritage site. The Australian Observer assured the Bureau that no development that threatened the World Heritage values of the site would be allowed to take place. But IUCN was concerned about the granting of prospecting licences by State Governments for locations within World Heritage areas, and called for closer liaison between Commonwealth and State Governments on this matter. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998) the Bureau was informed that a mining lease of the Shark Bay Salt Joint Venture (SBSJV) had attracted public comment but is outside of the property. Levee construction occurred outside the World Heritage area and approval for the levee construction was granted under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act of 1986 and construction works complied with the environmental requirements set by the Minister for the Environment. The Western Australian Department of Environment was satisfied with the compliance of SBSJV of the environmental conditions set for the construction phase. In accordance with a post-construction environmental requirement, SBSJV, with professional assistance from the Department of Conservation and Land Management, successfully transferred marine mega-fauna, trapped behind the levee, to open marine waters. IUCN had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, and is in the process of reviewing that report. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report of IUCN Australia to the State Party for review and recommended that

IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

*New information:* IUCN has informed the Centre that it has received preliminary advice indicating that potential threats due to actual and proposed mining activities, such as shell mining, expansion of salt extraction, gypsum leases and mineral sands mining are key concerns for the conservation of this area. Other concerns include: inappropriate tourism development, visitor access to environmentally sensitive locations and the need to finalise an overall management plan for the site. ACIUCN has established a process involving key stakeholders to finalise a report on the conservation status for the Shark Bay World Heritage site. The report will be ready for the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (Marrakesh, Morocco on 26 and 27 November 1999).

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to request IUCN to submit an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site to its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

### **Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia) (Inscribed on the WH List: 1988)**

*International assistance:* None

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June, 1998) learned that the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment had determined that clearing of vegetation that may have occurred within this property did not place the World Heritage values of the site at risk. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998), the Bureau was informed that the arrangements for the management of this site were fully effective and met with the full confidence of the Commonwealth Government of Australia. The Management Plan, effective as of 1 September 1998, had been prepared with the full involvement of all stakeholders, including Aboriginal groups, and provides the Wet Tropics Management Authority with a full suite of powers to act in the interests of the World Heritage values of the property. The Bureau noted that IUCN had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee and was in the process of reviewing that report. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from IUCN Australia to the State Party for review and recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

*New information:* IUCN has informed the Centre that preliminary advice it has received indicates that the central conservation in this site will be the effectiveness of implementation of the management plan. Effectiveness of plan implementation to mitigate impacts of invasive species and water extraction and for fire management, tourism development and involving Aboriginal people in site-management are particular concerns. IUCN has informed the Centre that ACIUCN has established a collaborative process to finalise a report on the conservation status of the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area. This report will be ready for submission to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (Marrakesh, Morocco, from 26 to 27 November 1999).

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to request IUCN to submit an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site to its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

**Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1997)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee, when it inscribed this property on the World Heritage List (Naples, 1997) had requested documentation on the marine resources surrounding this property. The Australian authorities informed the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (Kyoto, 1998) that the Australian Antarctic Division had granted funding to collate and analyse existing data on the benthic environments surrounding this property, including the territorial sea. In accordance with Australia's plans to establish a marine protected area in the region, the project aims to assess whether the 12 nautical miles territorial sea provides a representative sample of marine biodiversity in the region. To enable such an assessment, a comprehensive research programme is to be undertaken to clearly identify the marine values of the area. The Bureau had invited the State Party to submit a report, before 15 April 1999, on the findings of the project to establish a marine protected area so as to enable it to review the report at its twenty-third session.

*New information:* The Australian authorities, via letter dated 12 April 1999, have informed the Centre that the Heard Island and McDonald Island (HIMI) benthic project to establish a marine protected area includes a desktop study and a field survey. The desktop study commenced in January 1999 and is due to be completed in June 1999. It aims to document the distribution and abundance of different types of benthic habitats on the continental shelf around Heard Island, including an evaluation of the differences between benthic habitats in the territorial waters (0-12 nautical miles) and the remainder of the Australian (200 nautical miles) EEZ surrounding the Island. The field survey will examine the effect of trawling on these types of habitats and develop management options to protect environmental values of the benthic environments. The second stage, i.e. the field survey, is intended to be a pilot study to provide indicative results on habitats. Dependent upon the availability of the necessary ship transport, the Australian authorities estimate that the earliest opportunity for beginning the second stage will be in the summer of 2000/2001. The letter of 12 April 1999 from the Australian authorities has been transmitted to IUCN for comments. IUCN has noted that the process to create a marine protected area around HIMI has commenced and commended the proposal to protect marine biodiversity and manage large-scale commercial fishing impacts.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to recommend that the State Party submit a report on the desktop study, due to be completed in June 1999, to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

**The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)** (Inscribed in the World Heritage List: 1997)

**Sundarbans National Park (India)** (Inscribed in the World Heritage List: 1987)

*International assistance:* N/a

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee when it inscribed "The Sundarbans" of Bangladesh in the World Heritage List (Naples, 1997) encouraged the authorities of Bangladesh

and India to discuss the possibility for creating a trans-frontier site with the adjoining Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage site (India)

*New information:* The Ministry of Environment and Forests of Bangladesh with support from the Asian Development Bank, is undertaking a multi-million dollar project, entitled the "Sundarbans Biodiversity Conservation Project". The Sundarbans World Heritage site is considered to be one of the main components of this project under which a management plan will be developed and implemented. IUCN Bangladesh will be involved as an independent agency assisting with the implementation of this project. A meeting held in Bangladesh in February 1999 informally discussed amongst other items the possibility of having The Sundarbans World Heritage site of Bangladesh and the Sundarbans National Park World Heritage site of India combined into a single-site inscription. In a separate initiative, WWF-International is launching a study financed by a SFR 50,000 grant for investigating trans-border ecological and conservation aspects of the tigers inhabiting the Sundarbans ecosystem. The two World Heritage sites together support the largest and the most viable wild tiger population in the world. The WWF-project intends to promote cooperation between the Bangladesh and Indian site staff and scientists for the conservation and management of tiger populations as a first step that could lead towards discussions to consider the joint inscription of the two sites as a single entry in the World Heritage List.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to commend the Government of Bangladesh and the Asian Development Bank for their efforts to strengthen the management of The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) and WWF-International to launch a study on trans-border aspects of tiger ecology and conservation. The Bureau may wish to encourage the Governments of Bangladesh and India to co-operate with interested parties and consider initiating actions that could eventually lead to the joint inscription of the two sites as a single entry on the World Heritage List.

**Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)** (Inscribed in the World Heritage List in 1979 (Poland) and 1992 (Belarus))

*International assistance :* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations :* At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998) the Bureau commended the Polish authorities for submitting an extension of the Bialowieza Forest and reiterated its previous request that the two States Parties co-operate to prepare a management plan for the Belarus part and consider removing the fence separating the two parts.

*New information:* IUCN has informed the Centre that the IUCN evaluation of the extension of the Bialowieza Forest of Poland will be submitted to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (November, 1999). At that time IUCN will also provide an analysis of trans-frontier management issues in this site and recommendations to the consideration of the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to request IUCN to provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site to its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

## **Iguacu National Park (Brazil)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1986)

*International assistance* : N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* Since 1997, the Bureau and the Committee have repeatedly called for the permanent closure of the 18 km road traversing this Park which had been illegally opened by local people. At its twenty-second session (June, 1998) the Bureau requested a Centre/IUCN mission to review the situation and to assist the State Party to mitigate threats to the Park. The Bureau also asked the State Party to provide, by 15 September 1998: (i) a copy of the revitalisation programme and a time frame for the rehabilitation of damaged areas; and (ii) a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and actions taken with regard to the permanent closure of the road. The twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1998) was informed of a new threat to Iguacu's integrity, arising from plans to fill a hydropower reservoir in Southwest Brazil that would divert a considerable volume of Iguacu's waters for seven to eight weeks per year. The Bureau reiterated its request that the State Party provides information on items (i) and (ii) above and on plans for the hydropower reservoir project. The Bureau noted that a possible Centre/IUCN mission to the site in March 1999 should determine whether the site needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

*New information:* An IUCN/UNESCO mission visited the site in March 1999 and discussed the state of conservation of the site with all the stakeholders including local residents and local Government officials. The mission identified the following four issues as most threatening to the integrity of this site:

- The Colon Road was illegally reopened in May 1997. The Federal Public Prosecutor is presently prosecuting the local communities of the area for reopening the road and the Federal and State agencies for not enforcing the closure of the road. The majority of the local people favour the continued use of the road as it shortens the distance between communities in the northern and southern sides of the Park by about 130 km. The north-south road dissects the Park into two and has resulted in the opening of the forest canopy along most of its length. The road has led to the destruction of parts of the forest, interrupted wildlife movement between the eastern and western sections of the Park and has severely impacted the site's World Heritage values. Research and academic personnel have expressed particular concerns regarding the preservation of the jaguar that may be threatened with extinction in the region, as its habitat has been dissected by this road. The road is leading to an increase in silting of the creeks and rivers and alteration of drainage patterns, further exacerbating the impact on World Heritage values. The road has also opened up the Park for illegal extraction of timber and poaching.
- Helicopter flights originating from Brazil and Argentina began in 1972. Following recommendations from the World Heritage Committee in 1994, flights on the Argentinean side have been stopped, but have continued on the Brazilian side. In 1996, growing concern on this matter led to a discussion between the Presidents of Brazil and Argentina. In 1997 Brazil, in agreement with Argentina, recommenced helicopter flights which are restricted to Brazilian territory, operate between 0900 and 1700 hours, and maintain a minimum altitude of 1600 feet (i.e. 500 metres). The heliport was to be relocated from a site adjacent to the Falls to outside of the National Park. But a suitable location for the heliport outside of the Park has yet to be found and up to 20-25 flights per day, each of 7 to 11 minutes, continue to originate from within the Park. A study of the Environment Institute of Paraná has found that most visitors believe that the flights are interfering with their enjoyment of the Falls. The study however did not investigate the impact of the flights on the fauna.



- The Salto Caixas Dam on the Iguacu River was built recently but is located upstream of the National Park and at present there is no evidence of any impact on the World Heritage values of the Park. The proposal for another dam, Capanema, has been abandoned, as it would have had a direct impact on the Park.
- The new Management Plan for Iguacu National Park is due to be completed by May 1999. This management plan will aim to address all of the above-mentioned problems. It is clear that the management of the two World Heritage sites, i.e. Iguacu National Park (Brazil) and the Iguazu National Park (Argentina) would benefit from closer liaison and co-ordination between their respective management authorities.

IUCN has recommended that, while the Colon Road remains open, the Iguacu National Park should be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger. At a meeting with the Minister for the Environment on 7 April 1999, the Director-General of UNESCO and Centre staff reiterated the Committee's request for the permanent closure of the road.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to request the State Party to immediately close the Colon Road and initiate a recovery plan to increase canopy closure and re-vegetation of ground cover and stabilise soils and control erosion. In the absence of satisfactory progress with regard to the permanent closure of the road and the implementation of the recovery plan by the time it meets for its twenty-third extraordinary session (Marrakesh, Morocco, 26 - 27 November 1999), the Bureau may recommend that the Committee include Iguacu National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, the Bureau may request the State Party to: (i) immediately halt helicopter flights pending a thorough evaluation of their impacts on the fauna, particularly the avifauna; and (ii) provide a copy of the new management plan to IUCN for review in order to enable an assessment of the effectiveness of the plan to address prevailing threats to the integrity of the site.

#### **Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997), the Committee had expressed its serious concerns over the potential threats posed by the Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 2.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this site. A case filed by conservation groups challenging the EIA of the Federal-Provincial Environment Assessment Panel in favour of the mining project was dismissed because the judge decided that the Panel report was not subject to judicial review. In response to a request of the Bureau (June 1998), the Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks Canada informed the Centre that it was unlikely that construction work on any component of the mine will begin before the spring of 1999. Moreover, on 27 August 1998, the Government of Alberta announced the creation of Whitehorse Wildland Park between Jasper National Park and the proposed mine, to help protect the ecological integrity of Jasper National Park and areas surrounding it. At its twenty-second extraordinary session, (November 1998) the Bureau, while reiterating its concerns over the potential impacts of the mining project, welcomed the initiative of the Government of Alberta to establish the new Whitehorse Wildland Park. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide the Centre and IUCN, before 15 April 1999, with an up-date on the status of the proposed mining project for review at its twenty-third session.

*New information:* Parks Canada, via its letter of 14 April 1999 has informed the Centre that the Federal Court of Canada, had a recent hearing from 1 to 3 March 1999 on this case and

rendered its decision on 8 April 1999. The Federal Court quashed the Federal Fisheries Act authorisation of August 1998 to allow work to start on the access road and railway and concluded that the environmental assessment did not comply with the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA). Furthermore, the Federal Court stated that the Project could not proceed until the Joint Review Panel's environmental assessment is conducted in compliance with the CEAA. The proponent of the Cheviot Mine Project, Lumar Coal Ltd, announced, on 10 March 1999, that it was delaying decisions on the construction of the mine for at least a year. Progress has been made with regard to preparing an Integrated Framework for the Conservation of Grizzly Bears. A document incorporating results of the consultations undertaken with regard to the preparation of the Framework is to be sent to stakeholder groups in May 1999. IUCN has noted that the markets for coal are on the decline, and that the State Party is preparing a state of conservation report on the site. IUCN will provide further comments once it has received the report of the State Party.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to welcome these developments and to thank the State Party for the actions taken. The Bureau may wish to compliment the members of the environmental coalition for their efforts in ensuring the protection of the site. The Bureau may invite the State Party to submit the state of conservation report on the site for review at its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

#### **Los Katios National Park (Colombia)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International Assistance* : N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations* : In November 1997, IUCN was informed that conflicts between armed groups had rendered a significant portion of the Park off-limits to staff and that tourism to the area had come to a halt. The twenty-second session of the Bureau (June 1998) requested IUCN to review a report from the Colombian authorities to the Centre and submit its findings to its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998). IUCN informed the Bureau in November 1998 that a major restructuring of Colombia's conservation administration was underway for devolving responsibilities for the site management to the provincial level. However, IUCN was of the view that the site was under serious threat and should be considered for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger. A second report from the Colombian authorities informed the Bureau that the Park was affected by the confrontation between guerrilla and paramilitary groups and that four sectors of the Park received only limited attention from the staff. However, in 1997 and 1998 activities to strengthen protection of the Park through control units and others activities such as inter-institutional meetings, collaboration with local communities, definition of the buffer zone and the elaboration of the management plan had been undertaken. Support for the creation and consolidation of the Darien Special Management Area (DSMA) to co-ordinate the management of the two World Heritage sites (Darien of Panama and Los Katios of Colombia) has been provided and actions to create a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve were being considered. A number of meetings of the Bi-national Commission of Colombia and Panama took place and a US\$ 500,000 MacArthur-funded project for a rapid ecological evaluation of the area was being implemented by the NGOs from both countries.

The Bureau noted the State Party's conclusion that although there have been impacts, the Park had not been invaded by colonists and the pressure on the Park and its natural resources had reduced considerably. Preventive measures had been taken for the security of the personnel and the Park had returned to a certain normalcy and calm, allowing the staff to control the area and

to implement operations. The State Party did not see any need for inclusion of Los Katios in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to remain in contact with the State Party to monitor progress and to report back to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau reiterated the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site to establish a single World Heritage site linking Darien (Panama) and Los Katios (Colombia).

*New information:* In its review of the November 1998 report submitted by the State Party, IUCN has acknowledged progress made in the preparation of the management plan. IUCN has also noted improvements in co-operation with the local communities, promoting trans-boundary co-operation with Panama and preventing illegal extraction of resources in areas of the Park controlled by the staff. IUCN has recommended that the Bureau compliment the State Party for these efforts despite the difficult situation facing this site. However, IUCN has reiterated its concern about the serious threats facing the Los Katios and recommends that it should be considered for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In a letter dated 22 April 1999 the Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO has submitted a four-page report on the current situation in Los Katios. The letter and the report have been forwarded to IUCN for review.

**Action required:** The Bureau, based on new information to be submitted at the time of its session, may take appropriate decisions thereupon, and determine whether it wishes to recommend that the Committee, at its twenty-third session, consider including this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC))** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984)

*International assistance:* US\$ 6,000 as preparatory assistance, US\$ 72,000 as technical co-operation and US\$ 7,500 for staff training.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* This is the only one of the five sites of this country that has not been included in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The site is located in the more central parts of the country and hence is relatively less impacted by on-going armed conflicts in the eastern parts of the country. (Please refer to document WHC-99/CONF.204/4 for state of conservation reports on those four World Heritage Sites in Danger located in the eastern parts of DRC).

*New information:* IUCN has received a report (February 1999) on this site from the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN). The status of the habitats and abundance of elephants and the Bonobo chimpanzees seem satisfactory. Human activity within the Park, however, is a concern and poaching and human settlements threaten the integrity of the site. There are too few guards and they are ill equipped to effectively deal with poachers. The dire need for boats to better control the waterways, which are the main arteries for the transport of weapons and poached wildlife products has been stressed and crackdown on arms-traffic within the Park has been called for. IUCN has commended ICCN for its comprehensive report and supports the following recommendations made by ICCN:

- (i) the need to encourage active participation and education of local populations;
- (ii) improvement of infrastructure and communications;
- (iii) development of sustainable tourism around the Bonobo; and
- (iv) improved management of scientific research.

Lack of vehicular transport, funds and monitoring equipment, and limited communications facilities are inadequacies that need urgent attention.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to recommend that the State Party submit a detailed list of equipment and other assistance required to strengthen site management to the Centre before 1 September 1999. The Bureau may request the Centre and IUCN to determine the costs of meeting the needs of site management and propose, to the twenty-third session of the Committee, a plan to finance the costs and identify priority activities that could be supported by contributions from World Heritage Fund.

**Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1997)

*International Assistance* : US\$ 13,000 as preparatory assistance; US\$ 9000 as technical co-operation for the preparation of the management plan and US\$ 30,000 for a regional seminar on Caribbean World Heritage.

*Summary of previous deliberations* : At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau was informed of a cable car construction project that would traverse this Park, proposed by a private individual concerned with tourism development. The feasibility of the project was questionable due to the heavy rains, high winds and the steep terrain that characterises this site. The Bureau noted that construction of such major access facilities was not consistent with the management plan of the Park and agreed with IUCN that the Dominican authorities need to exercise great caution when evaluating the feasibility of this proposal. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau was informed that in view of the Director of the Centre, based on a site visit, the proposed project is unlikely to be compatible with Dominica's obligations under the Convention for the conservation of this site. The Bureau noted that the Government of Dominica has prepared the terms of reference (TOR) for an EIA of the proposal. The proposal and the TOR for the EIA have been reviewed by the Natural Resource Management Unit of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States and the TOR has been forwarded to the proponent of the cable way system. The Bureau invited Dominica to submit a report on the outcome of the EIA and the status of the cable car development proposal before 15 April 1999.

*New information*: Recent communications from the State Party indicate that the proposed alignment of the aerial tramway will not enter the Park, but will terminate on State Lands, 500 m. from the boundaries of the World Heritage site. The State Party has assured UNESCO that the Government intends to maintain these adjoining State Lands as a buffer zone, limiting the activities to be undertaken there. IUCN welcomes this development that shows the State Party's commitment to the protection of this site. However, IUCN is still concerned that the aerial tramway will terminate too close to the boundary of the site. The State Party, via its letter of 19 April 1999, has transmitted a report on the EIA of the cable car project. The report has been sent to IUCN for review.

**Action required:** The Bureau, based on IUCN's comments on the report of the EIA of the cable car project to be submitted at the time of its session, may take appropriate decisions thereupon.

## **Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1978)

*International Assistance* : Preparatory assistance (US\$ 15,000); Emergency assistance (US\$ 60,500); Technical assistance (US\$ 324,500); Training (US\$ 100,000).

*Summary of previous deliberations*: At its last session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee commended the State Party for ensuring the passage of the «Special Law on the Galapagos» on 18 March 1998, by the Official Registry of Ecuador as Law No. 278, and decided not to include Galapagos in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Law provides for the extension of the outer boundary of the marine reserve from 24 to 64 km offshore and for the establishment of a significant 130,000 km<sup>2</sup> Reserve for the conservation of marine biodiversity where only tourism and artisanal fisheries will be permitted. Furthermore, the Law addresses most of the key issues relating to conservation and sustainable development of Galapagos, including those five issues which had been described in the reports of the Bureau and Committee sessions in 1998.

*New information*: Recent information received by IUCN indicates that positive actions have been taken to enhance the integrity of this site. The general regulation to implement the Special Law for Galapagos has been approved. However, the various special regulations have yet to be developed and thus many sections of the law are yet to be enforced. The greatest concern is that there is still no regulation governing the application of the various provisions of the law dealing with the control of introduced species, environmental impact assessment, environmental auditing and other environmental protection tools. There are pressing needs for fisheries regulations, co-ordinated with the marine reserve management planning and for tourism regulations. In relation to tourism, a specific concern is that the combination of environmental and tourism regulations should tightly regulate the application of the fourth Transitory Disposition of the Special Law for Galapagos, which exempts Isabela Island and its residents from certain constraints on tourism expansion. This Special Law could, if misapplied, open-up loopholes for undesirable development with negative effects on Galapagos conservation.

In August 1998 a new Constitution came into force in Ecuador. This Constitution contains various national environmental provisions, which could potentially benefit the Galapagos. It also changed the judicial system by transferring to the local judiciary much of the power that allows authorities such as the Galapagos National Park to apply sanctions. With respect to the Galapagos, the new Constitution reaffirms the special status of the Archipelago.

Despite the delays in developing regulations, activities are moving rapidly towards the establishment of the quarantine inspection system for the Galapagos. Inspections should start in ports and airports, both on the mainland and in the islands, by mid-1999. The Charles Darwin Research Station (CDRS) is helping to co-ordinate activities in the Islands, providing some technical assistance and running an intensive awareness programme. The USA's quarantine service (APHIS) and the Ecuadorian Institution are providing technical assistance. There are prospects for funding a large part of the quarantine inspection infrastructure, training and expert services through two projects of the Inter-American Development Bank

In relation to the eradication of alien species from the islands, the Ministry of Environment has prepared a request to the Global Environment Facility for funding to protect the terrestrial biodiversity of Galapagos. The project is in the preparatory stage and focuses on eradication of introduced mammalian species. It complements other parts of the conservation strategy for the Galapagos Islands which aim to control the spread of invasive species belonging to other animal and plant taxa. A proposal has been tabled by UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, in

co-operation with the CDRS, for funding under the Environment and Biodiversity Programme of the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP). The Project, entitled Control and Eradication of Invasive Species: A Necessary Condition for Conserving Endemic Biodiversity of the Galapagos World Heritage site, is estimated to cost US\$ 3,999,850. Of this amount US\$ 2,000,000 will be used to set up an Endowment Fund to provide long-term support for the control and eradication of invasive species in Galapagos. Several international partners, e.g. UNESCO-MAB, FAO Regional Office for Latin America, ICSU, and SCOPE (Scientific Committee for the Protection of the Environment) have endorsed the project and the Ecuadorian Government and IUCN have called for the favourable consideration of the project by UNFIP. The decision of the UNFIP for financing this project will be reported at the time of the Bureau session.

The Management Plan for the Marine Reserve was approved on 18 March 1999, despite complications caused by the lack of a General Regulation to the Special Law. The approval of the Management Plan should mark the end of commercial fishing in the Marine Reserve and the establishment of the Participatory Management Group for the Reserve. Essential for the implementation of the Management Plan is a clear definition of management zones, especially no-take zones. The details of artisanal fisheries regulations, including the definition of "artisanal" in the Galapagos context, are also to be decided through a technical exercise, which has been initiated with the co-operation of the National Fisheries Institute, but would benefit greatly from international technical expertise in fisheries. A third issue to be considered in implementing the management plan is the establishment of mechanisms to regulate total fishing capacity in the islands.

Despite all these positive developments, the decision to reopen the sea cucumber fisheries for two months (from 1 April to 31 May 1999) had raised serious concern among national and international conservation NGOs. The two fundamental concerns are the status of the resource itself and the capability to effectively manage fisheries activities. A report received from the Charles Darwin Foundation indicates that the reopening of sea cucumber fisheries, follows an assessment of the populations in the fishing zones. A joint monitoring and patrolling programme between GNPS, CDRS and the Ecuadorian Navy has been established using six patrol boats. Thanks to the support of the Frankfurt Zoological Society, the marine patrol is supported by an aerial patrol. This patrolling system is proving to be an effective enforcement mechanism. The current situation relating to the number of boats and fishermen is still unclear and this is an issue of concern. Monitoring indicates that the level of the catches is extremely low in comparison with that of 1994 and that the divers are now harvesting sea cucumbers in deeper waters. Results to date indicate that this activity is unsustainable and could have additional impact on the overall marine life of the Reserve.

The Permanent Delegation of Ecuador to UNESCO, via its letter of 8 April provided a response on the question of sea cucumber fishing. It also transmitted, via another letter of 27 April 1999, a copy of the resolution of the Inter-institutional Authority for the Management of the Galapagos Marine Reserve and statements concerning the fisheries situation. Both documents have been forwarded to IUCN for review.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to compliment the State Party for its efforts to improve the conservation of the Galapagos Islands World Heritage site, particularly during difficult economic times. The Bureau may wish to recognise the support provided by USAID, Frankfurt Zoological Society, The Barbara Delano Foundation, WWF, and The David and Lucile Packard Foundation to strengthen management of this site. The Bureau may request the State Party to provide copies of the recently approved

Management Plan for the Marine Reserve to the Centre and IUCN for review. The Bureau may request IUCN to determine whether the plan provides a satisfactory basis for the re-nomination of the marine reserve as an extension to the World Heritage site and submit its findings to its next session in November 1999. The Bureau may also invite the State Party to submit the first of its annual reports on the state of conservation of Galapagos to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

**Kaziranga National Park (India)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1985)

*International assistance:* US\$ 50,000 under Technical Co-operation

*Summary of previous deliberations:* This site supports the largest population of the greater Indian one-horned rhinoceros; a 1993 census revealed 1164 animals in the Park. Other important species in the Park include the swamp deer, the tiger, the elephant and the water buffalo. At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997) the Committee approved a sum of US\$ 50,000 for constructing 10 guard camps and five upland wildlife refuges and for the purchase of audio-visual equipment for the Park interpretation centre.

*New Information:* Record rainfall in mid-1998 resulted in exceptional flooding of the Brahmaputra River and parts of the Park went under 6 metres of water. More than a square kilometre area of the floodplain was lost and the Director of the Park informed IUCN that an estimated 652 animals, including 42 rhinoceroses, were lost due to the flood. During the floods WWF-India provided material assistance and the Indian army constructed ten islands on high ground for wildlife to take refuge. The rain had delayed the beginning of the construction of the five upland wildlife refuges using the financial assistance approved by the Committee in December 1997. A staff member from UNESCO Office in New Delhi, India, visited Kaziranga from 7 to 9 March 1999 and reported that work on the construction of the five upland refuges and other aspects of the World Heritage funded project had begun and is progressing satisfactorily. IUCN has noted that 44 km<sup>2</sup> of new land had been added to the Park which now covers a total area of 470 km<sup>2</sup>.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to recognise the support provided by WWF-India and the Indian Army for wildlife protection during the 1998 floods. The Bureau may invite the State Party to provide a detailed report on wildlife censuses that may have been undertaken after the 1998 floods and on long-term measures which are currently being implemented to mitigate future flood damage to Kaziranga. The Bureau may request the State Party to clarify whether it intends to propose the inclusion of the recent extension (44 sq. km) of the Park into the World Heritage site.

**Komodo National Park (Indonesia)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1991)

*International assistance:* US\$ 2,500 as Preparatory Assistance; US\$ 119,500 under Technical Co-operation and US\$ 10,000 for staff training.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* Since the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1991, the site has benefited from financial assistance from the Fund for the purchase of boats and for training staff in marine protected area management in Queensland, Australia. A monitoring report on the site was provided via the UNESCO Office, Jakarta, to the Centre in 1995.

*New information:* IUCN has informed the Centre that it has received a report indicating an increase in illegal dynamite and cyanide fishing in coastal waters which has had a serious impact on large areas of coral in the northern half of the marine component of the Park. The Nature Conservancy has provided two speedboats for patrolling the coastal waters but destructive fishing techniques have had a major impact. Immigration to the islands is increasing bringing more pressure on fisheries resources.

**Action required:** The Bureau may request the State Party to consider inviting a monitoring mission to the site to assess the damage caused by destructive fishing practices and to jointly review management issues and identify priority measures needed to build management capacity and for international assistance.

### **Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico) (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1993)**

*International Assistance :* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations :* At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau recalled that during 1996-97 the State Party had established a Scientific Committee which set up stringent environmental conditions on the proponents of an industrial salt production facility, and successfully averted threats which the construction of that facility would have posed to the integrity of this site. The Bureau was informed that a renewed consideration of the project for constructing an industrial salt production facility was once again threatening the site and some conservation organisations had called for the declaration of El Viscaïno as a World Heritage site in Danger. IUCN pointed out that new settlements were occurring in the area and that increasing pollution and over-fishing were crowding out endangered and endemic species. There were indications of a decline in the populations of various marine mammals, shellfish, and sea turtles that are unique to the area. IUCN recommended a mission to the site in 1999 to evaluate threats to the integrity of the site and assess whether or not this site should be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed that a report submitted by the State Party on 26 November 1998 indicated that the State Party did not consider the site to be in Danger. A representative of the Mexican Environmental Agency (SEMARNAP) informed the Bureau that there were no indications of a decline in the populations of various mammals, shellfish or sea turtles in the area. He noted that the El Viscaïno Lagoons were not in danger and that Mexico has a strong environmental legal framework that regulates any activities in the site. His Government continues to take actions to reinforce environmental regulations to preserve the marine resources of the site and that the reserve is included in the GEF programme for ten Mexican priority conservation areas. In his view the grey whale population is recovering and has not been affected by the salt extraction. He stressed that his Government has not authorised any project to construct anew or extend the salt-production facility. The International Scientific Committee established by SEMARNAP, which, during 1997-98 had averted threats due to the proposal to construct a salt-production facility will review the EIA as soon as it is completed. Hence, the Mexican Government will not authorise any proposal that would jeopardise the conservation of the site and that there was no reason to include the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the new report submitted by the State Party on 26 November 1998 to IUCN for review. The Bureau was pleased to note that the State Party, upon receipt of IUCN's comments on the report would invite a mission to the site as soon as possible. The Bureau requested that the mission prepares an up-to-date state of



conservation report on the site and submit it to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

*New information:* IUCN in reviewing the report submitted by the State Party on 26 November 1998 has noted that it is rather general and does not provide a detailed assessment of the impacts on natural World Heritage values. The scope and extent of future proposals to expand the existing salt facility is not clear in the report. The report does not mention the fact that the Mexican National Institute of Ecology refused a similar proposal in 1994. The report, while strongly emphasising the existing legal and institutional framework for the management of the area provides limited information on enforcement and site management activities. IUCN has pointed out that while the grey whale has been moved from Appendix I to Appendix II of the CITES Convention, the Pacific grey whale population inhabiting this site has been retained in Appendix I. The report claims that resource uses in the area are consistent with the management objectives of the El Vizcaino Biosphere Reserve. But it is important that the World Heritage site should be managed to ensure the conservation of the values for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List. An informal coalition of environmental groups has filed a case with the Mexican Federal Prosecutor on the grounds that the Exportadora de Sal, SA (ESSA) has violated environmental laws at its existing Guerrero Negro salt-works operations and requests that the Prosecutor bring criminal charges against ESSA. The sea turtle, an internationally protected species since 1996, is the focus of this suit. A July 1998 report by "Profeda" stresses that sea-turtle deaths are a result of toxic salt brine waste released from the salt-works. IUCN notes that there is contradictory information from the Government, NGOs and other experts, in relation to the environmental problems affecting this area. The report of 26 November 1998 from the Government does not include scientific and monitoring data to adequately support the statement that the lagoons are not in danger. Based on the report, it is not possible to make a judgement on the issues raised by NGOs in relation to environment and conservation issues at this site. Hence, a mission to consult with all stakeholders, assess the situation in the field and identify the plans and commitments related to the expansion of the salt-work production facility is urgently needed. The Centre transmitted the IUCN comments on the report and a set of draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for a mission to the State Party for comments. In the meantime more than 20,000 protest letters (in addition to the 30,000 received during the last session of the Committee in Kyoto, Japan) addressed to the Chairperson of the Committee and calling for the declaration the site as World Heritage in Danger have been received by the Centre. Continuous negotiations between the Centre, the State Party and IUCN have resulted in the Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO proposing to the Centre, via its letter of 7 May 1999, a revised set of TOR and an invitation for an IUCN/Centre mission from 14 to 19 June 1999. These proposals are now being reviewed.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine new information that will be provided at the time of its session and take appropriate decisions thereupon.

#### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International assistance:* US\$ 27,000 under Preparatory Assistance and US\$ 40,000 for Training.

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

Sanctuary. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau agreed with IUCN's position that it would be better to review the zoning plan and other associated proposals after the overall management plan and the boundaries for the site are finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre about progress with regard to the finalisation of the management plan and submit the plan to IUCN and the Centre for review. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau noted with concern that the boundaries of the site remain undefined since the inscription of the site in 1994 and that the management plan has yet to be finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to submit the final plan for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999 and requested the Centre and IUCN to submit the findings of their review to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

*New information:* Recent reports have alerted IUCN to the fact that the Arabian oryx could be threatened with extinction in the wild in Oman for the second time in the last thirty years. Available data indicates that the number of wild Arabian oryx in Oman has fallen from 400 (in October 1996) to 100. Of the 100 or so remaining oryx, only eleven are females, which greatly reduces the species' chances of survival. Uncontrolled hunting and capture were the major reasons why the oryx originally became extinct in the wild in 1972. Re-introduction projects in 1982 and 1984 appeared to be successful and numbers rose to a high of 400 in 1996. However, as the number of oryx increased, poachers have returned. Recommendations from a recent conference in Abu Dhabi suggested the creation of co-ordinating body with a permanent secretariat in one of the range states to enhance co-operation and exchange of experience among concerned countries of the Arabian Peninsula. The tightening of regulations and improved regional co-operation to prevent illegal trans-boundary movement of poaching and trade in the Arabian Oryx were also recommended.

**Action required:** In addition to the final management plan, including the boundaries of the site and its management zones, the Bureau may request the State Party to produce a status report on the Arabian oryx within the Sanctuary for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999. The Bureau may wish to recommend that the findings of the Centre/IUCN review of the management plan and the status report be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

### **Huascarán National Park (Peru)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1985)

*International Assistance* : US\$ 70,000 under Technical Co-operation and US\$ 5,300 for staff training.

*Summary of previous deliberations* : At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau was informed that a Canadian/Peruvian mining consortium was in the final stages of obtaining approval to develop one of the world's largest copper and zinc deposits found at Antamina, located 20km east of this Park. Mining will commence in 2001 and proceed for 20 years. The Bureau noted that the concentrates may be transported from the mining site to the coast, either via a Central Road that traverses the Park, or an alternative Southern Road encircling the Park. The mining company had agreed to use the Southern Road, which is outside the Park, but traverses the buffer zone of the Huascarán World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve. No EIA has been carried out for the use of the Southern Road so far. The Central Road would however, be used for bringing heavy equipment to the mining area for approximately one year, until the construction of a by-pass along the Southern Road is completed to allow for the transport of such equipment along that road. IUCN underlined the importance of monitoring all impacts of the use of the Central Road during the one-year period. The Bureau took note of the

different options for accessing the mining area and the preference of INRENA to use the Southern Road. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational. The Bureau suggested that a future mission to this site might be useful, and requested the State Party to provide a status report on the mining project to its twenty-second extraordinary session in November 1998.

In November 1998 the Bureau was informed that a “Working Group” on the management of the site had been established by INRENA and representatives from the IUCN Office in Peru had participated in its meetings. This “Working Group” on the management of the site, particularly to oversee the use of the Central Road, will work independently from the Antamina Mining Company and will invite local participation. Antamina has confirmed that it will complete the construction of the bypass along the Southern Road by July 1999, provide traffic estimates and expressed an interest in the use of the Central and Northern Roads for vehicles transporting personnel. Antamina has reaffirmed its commitment to road maintenance and support to the Park and provided a report concerning the agreement it had concluded with the Government of Peru on 16 September 1998. Antamina will provide information on the use of the Central Road including an addendum to the EIA, and the revised mine plan with rearrangements of waste storage. The Bureau while commending the Government of Peru for establishing a “Working Group” was however concerned over the permanent use of the Central and Northern Road for the transport of the mine personnel

*New information:* The copy of the additional EIA, on the impacts of the use of the Central and the Northern Roads for the transport of mine personnel, and a status report on the project, requested by the Bureau by 15 April 1999 have not yet been received by the Centre. IUCN has informed the Centre that the Antamina Mining Project is progressing rapidly and that there is renewed discussion of developing a pipeline for mineral transport. No specific route has been chosen for the pipeline, however it poses another serious potential environmental threat to the Park. NGOs have raised their strong concerns with IUCN about the effectiveness of the “Working Group” and have encouraged the fielding of an IUCN/UNESCO mission to the site to ascertain current status and to derive clear recommendations to the Committee and the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to express its concern over the uncertainties associated with the impacts of the proposed Antamina mining project on the integrity of the site and request that the State Party invite a UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site. The mission should assess the impacts of on-going and proposed mining activities, including the various proposals for the use of the Northern, Central and Southern roads, on the integrity of the World Heritage site and propose recommendations to the consideration of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau in mid-2000.

### **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1996)

*International Assistance* : US\$ 15,000 as Preparatory Assistance and US\$ 48,259 for an *in-situ* training workshop.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau was informed that a number of laws for the national protection of the Lake existed and that the Duma had adopted the Federal Law on “The Protection of the Baikal Lake” which was, however, vetoed by the President. The Federal Law had been tabled for a third reading in the

Duma, taking into account comments made by the President's intervention. The Russian authorities had not come to any conclusions regarding the re-profiling of the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill at Baikalsk, one of the main polluters of the Lake. The Observer of the Russian Delegation was of the view that the unresolved legal status, continuing and increasing pollution, lack of resources for management and monitoring, and logging and other negative factors seriously threatened Lake Baikal. He was of the view that the State Party would not oppose the site's declaration as World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau expressed its serious concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal, and urged the State Party to inform the Centre, before 15 September 1998, of the status of the Baikalsk Law and its adoption, and a timetable for its implementation. The Bureau drew the attention of the Russian authorities to paragraphs 82-89 of the Operational Guidelines ("Procedure for the Inclusion of Properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger") and invited them to prepare a programme of corrective measures for submission to its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1999).

In November 1998, the Bureau was informed that the Baikalsk Law was being revised due to the need to include financial measures to implement the Law. Both the Region of Irkutsk and the Buryat Republic were contributing to the revision of the Law and the revised draft was due to be approved by the Duma by end of 1999. The Minister for Economy had proposed that international bids might have to be called for transforming the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill. However, no solution had been finalised yet and closing the mill would aggravate the social problems of the region. Despite financial problems monitoring of the site was underway. IUCN informed the Bureau that it does not recommend the inclusion of Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present. The Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998) noted the Bureau's deliberations and recommendations on Lake Baikal described above. It expressed its serious concerns about the problems facing the site and re-iterated its requests made at the time of the inscription of the site, particularly the urgent need to re-profile the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and adopt the Baikalsk Law.

*New information:* The revised draft of the Baikalsk Law was adopted by the State Duma in mid-March 1999 in its second reading and experts believe that there is a good chance that it will be fully adopted during the first half 1999. IUCN has commended the efforts of the Russian authorities but is concerned by unconfirmed reports suggesting that a number of important provisions essential for the conservation of the site have been removed from the latest version of the Law. IUCN will withhold its final assessment of the effectiveness of the Law until such time when it has had the opportunity to review the full text of the Law. One of the issues which is of concern to IUCN is the financial resources to implement the Law. In this regard IUCN supports the creation of a special fund for Lake Baikal which could be used solely for the management of this site. There must be a clear mechanism for accountability and effective management of such a fund. The pollution of the Lake, particularly by two pulp and paper mills operating in close proximity to the site, remains a continuing concern. A recent British-Russian study argues that the level of pollution in the Baikal region has been exaggerated; however, Greenpeace has cited strong scientific evidence that the toxic effluents emitted from the pulp and paper mills caused mass deaths of freshwater seals in 1987 and 1997. The UNESCO Office in Moscow convened a small workshop in March 1999 to review the draft of the Baikalsk Law. It has informed the Centre that it will hold a similar workshop on the subject of re-profiling the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill in July 1999.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to reiterate its concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal. While complimenting the State Party on its efforts to adopt the Baikalsk Law, the Bureau may wish to emphasise that the State Party expedite the process to adopt the Law with all the legal provisions essential for the effective

conservation and management of Lake Baikal. The Bureau may wish to request the State Party to give particular consideration to the legal, financial and other prerequisites needed for re-profiling the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and other enterprises that continue to pollute Lake Baikal. The Bureau may wish to invite the State Party to provide a detailed report, by 15 September 1999, on measures implemented to mitigate the pollution threats to Lake Baikal.

**Doñana National Park (Spain)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session (June 1998) the Bureau was informed that a giant holding pool of the Aznalcollar mine owned by the Canadian-Swedish Boliden-Apirsa Company burst resulting in an ecological disaster. Although the main toxic flow had been diverted away from the National Park, the adjoining areas have been badly damaged. The Bureau was informed that the spill could spread into the World Heritage area as pollutants dispersed more widely. The State Party had submitted a number of technical reports on the situation and on actions taken to mitigate the threats. The President of the Spanish MAB Committee had proposed the organisation of an international conference to review actions taken and rehabilitation plans elaborated for the conservation of the site and provided an outline for a project entitled “Doñana 2005”. The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns on the long-term restoration of the property and urged the State Party to undertake all possible measures to mitigate the threats. Furthermore, the Bureau had requested the State Party to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to prepare an international expert conference to develop a long-term vision and to compile a detailed report in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998) the Bureau reviewed the findings of a Centre mission to the site from 10 to 13 November 1998. The Centre received a number of documents presented by the Spanish authorities on the actions undertaken since the June 1998 session of the Bureau, including the Doñana 2005 project. The project “Doñana 2005 - hydrological regeneration of the watersheds and river channels flowing towards Doñana National Park”- prepared by the Ministry for the Environment, mainly proposes measures to:

- (a) avoid the influx of contaminated water into the Doñana marshes;
- (b) restore the flow of waters towards Doñana in the long term (drinking water; original hydrological dynamism); and
- (c) maintain the connections between the hydrological systems of Doñana and the Guadalquivir Estuary.

The Bureau noted that the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve are currently little affected whereas the Natural Park around the site has been impacted by the toxic spill. The Bureau and the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) while noting and commending the substantial actions taken by the Spanish authorities suggested that the State Party proceed with great caution in re-starting mining activities and requested that EIAs be carried out for each step. The Committee requested that the long-term impacts of mining on both the World Heritage site and the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve be monitored

*New information:* IUCN has expressed its concerns regarding the reopening of the Aznalcollar mine, which is in close proximity to Doñana National Park. IUCN notes that the tailings dam should be fully impermeable and that a hydrological study should be performed for modeling

potential infiltration of wastewater to the aquifers existing in the area. IUCN believes that the results of these projects should be reviewed by an independent technical experts group prior to any decision being made on the reopening of the mine. Second, according to national regulations, reopening of the mine must follow a public hearing involving the Stakeholders Committee of Doñana National Park, in consultation with the Technological and Geo-mining Institute of Spain. In addition, IUCN strongly believes that the Committee should also be consulted. IUCN is due to undertake a mission to the site, in response to an invitation from the Provincial Government of Andalusia, to assess the area and to evaluate progress achieved by corrective measures from 7 to 12 June 1999. IUCN will submit the report of this mission to the twenty-third session of the Committee at the end of 1999. The Minister for the Environment of Spain, via a letter of 21 March 1999 to the Director-General of UNESCO, has proposed that the conference on the future of Doñana be organized during May – June 1999. The Director of the Centre, via his letter of 4 May 1999 to the Minister has suggested that more time should be given for collaboration between the State Party, UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention in preparing such an important conference for developing a long-term vision for Doñana. Furthermore, the Ambassador of Spain by letter of 3 May to the Director of the Centre has submitted the following documents which were requested by the Bureau in June 1998: (a) “Doñana 2005 - hydrological regeneration of the watersheds and river channels flowing towards Doñana National Park” and its development; (b) copy of the decree, i.e. the law 7/1999 concerning Doñana 2005; and (c) information on the accident that occurred in 1998 and its implications for the conservation of the site as of 23 April 1999. These documents have been transmitted to IUCN for review.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to review the comments of IUCN on the documents (a), (b) and (c) and any new information that may be available at the time of its session and take appropriate decisions thereupon.

**Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1991)

*International assistance:* US\$ 1,666 as Preparatory Assistance; US\$ 30,000 as Emergency Assistance and US\$ 20,000 under Technical Co-operation.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau was informed of fires that had affected Thailand and other countries in the region. The Bureau learned that the Chairperson had approved a sum of US\$ 20,000 for a project on research, training and raising awareness of local people on forest fire prevention and control in and around this site. The project foresees the implementation of joint activities by site staff and representatives of local communities in forest fire prevention and control during the dry season that would begin after November 1998. The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate to ensure the timely implementation of the project to review and revise the forest fire management policy of this site and to elaborate a forest fire management policy that solicits the co-operation of local people. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report on the outcome of fire management practices that may be tested out during the forthcoming dry season for the consideration of the twenty-third session of the Bureau. At its twenty-second session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee received a report from the Delegate of Thailand (included as Annex V of the Report of the Committee) which noted that the fires damaged only a small part of this site and are integral to the ecology of the dry dipterocarp forests within the site.

New information: A progress report on the fire control and prevention project, being implemented with the US\$ 20,000 grant from the World Heritage Fund, is awaited.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to review the contents of the report that may be available at the time of its session and take appropriate decisions thereupon.

### **Bwindi Impenetrable Forest (Uganda)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

International assistance: US\$ 2,600 as Preparatory Assistance.

Summary on previous deliberations: N/A

New information: In March 1999 eight tourists visiting the site to view mountain gorillas and four camp staff members were killed by rebel forces. Both the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the Committee issued statements condemning the killings and calling for the restoration of security conditions that would enable visitors to enter this World Heritage site without fear and risk. The negative publicity surrounding this event appears to have greatly affected visitation to this site as well as to other parks in Uganda. As a result the income received by the site to protect the gorillas and their habitat has decreased. In the absence of a rapid recovery of tourism and the income it generates, the effectiveness of the protection of this site may decline.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to recommend that the State Party submit to the Centre, before 15 September 1999, a report on measures taken to enhance security conditions in this site and to ensure recovery of visitor numbers to pre-March 1999 levels. The Bureau may request the Centre and IUCN to submit their analysis of the report and recommendations to the consideration of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

### **Rwenzori Mountains (Uganda)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

International assistance: US\$ 32,249 as Technical Co-operation.

Summary of previous deliberations: N/A

New information: IUCN has recently received a report from its Uganda Office confirming that due to continued and worsening rebel activity and insecurity in the districts of Kasese and Bundibugyo, which encompass the Rwenzori Mountains, all Park staff has been withdrawn and temporarily relocated to the Town of Kasese. The Ugandan Project Manager of the WWF Project was killed and the Project has been temporarily halted. Rebels of the Allied Democratic Forces are supposedly based in the Park and frequently descend to kill and kidnap civilians from nearby towns. The Chief Warden of the Park has confirmed these reports, and adds that this situation has not affected Bwindi Impenetrable Forest.

**Action required:** The Bureau may express its serious concerns regarding the worsening security conditions in the site and may invite the State Party to submit to the Centre, before 15 September 1999, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site. The Bureau may request the Centre and IUCN to analyse that report and submit their

findings and recommendations to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

**St. Kilda (United Kingdom)** (Inscribed in the World Heritage List: 1986)

*International Assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998) was informed that the Centre had transmitted the report entitled “Threats to St. Kilda World Heritage Site from Proposed Oil Exploration and Production in the Atlantic Frontier”, prepared by Greenpeace International, to IUCN for review. This report had raised serious concerns on potential impacts to this site, particularly in the event of a possible oil spill that may result from the use of the Floating Production, Storage and Offloading Facilities (FPSOs). There are important threats associated with pollution derived from by-products of oil exploration and drilling activities. IUCN had informed the Centre that the State Party is currently considering the establishment of a Special Area for Conservation of the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago under the European Union’s Habitats and Species Directive. IUCN had welcomed this initiative and expressed the hope that it would lead to the eventual extension of the World Heritage site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago. The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that his Government is in the process of preparing a detailed response on the issues raised. Any licence is subject to a thorough review, which is co-ordinated by Scottish Heritage. The decision on the blocks offered for petroleum licensing was agreed with the Joint Nature Conservation Committee who co-ordinated their response with Scottish Nature. The Bureau invited the State Party to take all possible measures to protect St. Kilda from potential adverse impacts of oil exploration and production in the Atlantic Frontier and to consult with all interested parties before proceeding with such activities. The Bureau welcomed the State Party’s initiative to extend the boundaries of the site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago.

*New information:* The Scottish Office of the Agriculture, Environment and Fisheries Department, via its letter of 12 April 1999, has informed the Centre of the responses of the authorities with regard to threats arising from the proposed oil exploration and production at the Atlantic Frontier. This information has been transmitted to IUCN for review. The authorities indicate that they are satisfied with the implementation of various oil and gas round licensing procedures and that the risks to St. Kilda are minimal. They are firmly of the opinion that there is no case for inclusion of St. Kilda in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN however, has informed the Centre that new information it has received since the conclusion of the last session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) indicates that threats to this site have become greater. More than 150 blocks have now been licensed for oil development, including one located only 120 km from St. Kilda. Seismic testing continues to be carried out over hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of the Atlantic Frontier, with inadequate consideration of either the importance of the area for whales and dolphins or the effects of acoustic disturbance on these species. The Atlantic Frontier is the most important place in the UK, and possibly in Europe, for large whales and dolphins and the case for negative impacts of seismic testing on cetaceans is becoming stronger. A number of NGOs are concerned that current measures employed by the UK Government to protect the offshore marine environment are inadequate. Despite this, there are now plans to speed up further the process of approval for new oil developments and to offer new licenses more frequently. There are also concerns regarding the standards of EIA being applied to the area. The UK marine environment has



experienced some of the worst oil pollution incidences in the world in recent years. New oil developments in the Atlantic Frontier increase the pollution potential. A significant increase in shuttle tanker traffic is expected as the new oil fields develop. Previous experience shows that the transfer of oil from drilling ship to shuttle tanker can be an inherently high-risk process made all the more risky by the extreme weather conditions experienced in these parts of the Atlantic Frontier. Should a spill occur, it is by no means certain that the capacity exists within the region to deal adequately with contingency actions. The potential for increased oil pollution presents serious threats to the bird and marine life around St. Kilda and throughout the Atlantic Frontier. Oil spills reaching the shores of St. Kilda would affect breeding birds, while spills remaining further offshore could have an impact on those species which feed in this area. Recent research has seriously challenged previous understanding of the effects of even small amounts of oil-related compounds on marine life, showing that even one part per billion can have serious effects. The two most serious oil spills in UK waters have occurred on the north and south sides of the Atlantic Frontier. Predictions are that the UK will experience spills of this scale every 12 years. Day-to-day pollution from smaller spills and routine oil industry discharges, that have degraded the North Sea, could gradually impact St. Kilda and its surrounding waters in a less dramatic albeit significant ways. Despite the high risk to the integrity of this site from the development plans, IUCN has not received a detailed response that the Observer of the United Kingdom said was under preparation during the last session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998). Increasing potential threats from oil development to the St. Kilda World Heritage site and the lack of an adequate response from the State Party on issues of concern has led IUCN to suggest that the Bureau consider declaring St. Kilda as a World Heritage in Danger.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to review new information that may become available at the time of its session and take appropriate decisions thereupon.

**Canaima National Park (Venezuela)** (Inscribed in the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International Assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997) the Committee expressed its concern over threats due to a proposal to erect a series of power transmission lines across this Park. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau learned that the President of Venezuela had re-affirmed his Government's commitment to protect the site and had welcomed the possibility of a UNESCO mission to evaluate the power-line construction project and to determine the boundaries of the site. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau learned that an IUCN-Centre mission to Venezuela, including a site visit to Canaima, foreseen for August 1998 had to be postponed. In the meantime, IUCN had received several reports from indigenous people living in the Gran Sabana and the Imataca areas expressing their strong concerns over the future of this site. IUCN pointed out that although the Committee's deliberations had revolved around the construction of the power line serious attention needs to be given to other plans to open up the fragile ecosystem of this Park and the Imataca rainforest to large-scale mining, tourism and logging concessions. A second invitation extended by the Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO to field a site visit as soon as possible had to be delayed once again because the Office of the UN Resident Representative in Caracas, Venezuela, indicated that it would not be able to issue security clearance for the mission until 9 December 1998. At its last session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee called upon the Centre and IUCN to field a mission to Canaima as soon as security clearance from the UN Resident Co-ordinator for Venezuela was obtainable. IUCN suggested

that the Committee's recommendation, made at the time of the inscription of the site (December 1994), i.e. that the Government of Venezuela co-operate with the Centre and IUCN to "initiate a process to review the boundaries of the site, taking into consideration the interests of the local people and the need to focus the nomination on the Tepui portion (approximately 2 million ha) of the Park", be used as a basis for establishing the terms of reference for the mission. The Committee requested that the findings of the mission and its recommendation concerning whether Canaima needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999.

*New information:* A Centre/IUCN expert mission has been issued security clearance by the UN Resident Co-ordinator's Office in Caracas, Venezuela, for a visit to Caracas and Canaima from 19 to 24 May 1999. The Terms of Reference for the mission have been derived from the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1994. The mission will consult with the Government and other stakeholders to determine the boundaries of the World Heritage site in order to strengthen the conservation of the Tepui portion of the nomination. In addition, the mission will assess threats to the site's integrity arising from the proposed power line construction project. IUCN has pointed out that a number of NGOs have raised the following concerns which threaten the integrity of the site: (i) potential land ownership conflicts between the Government and indigenous peoples resident within the boundaries of the Park; (ii) extensive incursion of cattle into the savannah areas; and (iii) increasing, large-scale tourism businesses in the area.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine new information that the Centre/IUCN mission is expected to make available at the time of its session and take appropriate decisions thereupon.

### **Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International assistance:* US\$ 28,857 under Technical Co-operation and US\$ 24,250 under Training.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second ordinary session (June 1998), the Bureau had noted that the Government of Vietnam/JICA study on environmental management for Ha Long Bay had commenced in February 1998 and was due to be completed in October 1999. The Bureau was informed of the loan agreement signed (March 1998) by the Government of Vietnam and OECF, Japan, for the construction of the Bai Chay Bridge, to link Bai Chay Beach to Ha Long City across the Bai Chay Bay. The agreement foresaw a feasibility study as well as an environmental impact assessment of the bridge construction project. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998) the Bureau noted that the State Party had provided the Centre with several documents relevant to the consideration of the impacts of the various construction projects proposed for implementation in coastal and marine areas in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay. The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN to undertake a thorough review of the information provided by the State Party and due to be generated via on-going and proposed donor financed studies and conferences. A state of conservation report on Ha Long Bay should be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999. The Observer of Vietnam informed the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) that his Government considers that the preservation and conservation of the World Heritage site should proceed in harmony with the socio-economic development of the area. He noted that initial results of the JICA Environmental Management Study indicated no serious environmental impacts in the World Heritage area and that final results are likely to provide a clearer picture.

New information: IUCN Vietnam and the Centre participated in a seminar, hosted by the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) and the World Bank Office of Vietnam, in Hanoi and Ha Long City, Vietnam, from 6 to 8 April 1999. The seminar was organized with the co-operation of the Hai Phong and Quang Ninh Provincial Governments. It reviewed options for the comprehensive development of the Haiphong-Quang Ninh coastal zone that includes the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area. As part of the seminar, a visit to the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area for all participants, including representatives of bi- and multilateral donor agencies, was arranged. The field visit helped to raise the awareness of the international conservation significance of the site and drew attention of the donors to the need to address a range of potential threats to the integrity of the site arising from the rapid socio-economic development of the surrounding region.

Representatives of the Government of Vietnam, including those from the two Provincial Governments, committed themselves towards the comprehensive development of the Hai Phong-Quang Ninh coastal zone. They voiced their intent and willingness to protect and manage the environment of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area in accordance with international norms and standards. Ha Long City, Hai Phong and Hanoi form the most important growth triangle in northern Vietnam. Development of the region is influenced by the growing affluence of the population in Southern China for whom Ha Long Bay is becoming an important tourist destination. The Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone is expected to experience rapid growth in infrastructure development, particularly in transport, shipping, coal mining and tourism sectors. The key development issues that will impact the future management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area and possible ways to mitigate them include:

- Coal loading and transport operations. Coal loading operations were recently moved from Ha Long Bay to Cam Pha - Mong Duong. Barges still carry coal to waiting ships through the inshore waters of the Ha Long Bay, although most of them do not enter the World Heritage area. There is a possibility that the construction of the Cai Lan Port and the improvements to roads and railways in northern Vietnam may provide opportunities to transfer coal loading and transport operations to entirely land-based modalities.
- There is a large fishing presence in Ha Long Bay with some fishing communities living in 'floating villages' within the World Heritage area itself. The role of these "villagers" in the management of the site, particularly in patrolling and surveillance and environmental clean-up operations within the Bay, including selected locations within the World Heritage Area, needs to be explored.
- Because of the availability of limestone, clay and other construction materials, cement and brick manufacturing industries have been established in coastal areas in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay with potential impacts through airborne pollution, run off and sedimentation. The industrial activities in the entire Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone could impact the environmental management of the Ha Long Bay, and the World Heritage area.
- Urban development in the Ha Long City area impacts the waters of Ha Long Bay through sewage discharge, litter, and land reclamation. The development of Ha Long City as a "green city" is of critical importance to the long-term conservation of Ha Long Bay, and the World Heritage Area.

- Deepwater ports are planned for Cai Lan and Cua Ong. Port development will increase shipping traffic and this will increase the risk of environmental damage. The present Cailan facility is rather small, with a capacity of 500,000 tons per year. The World Bank estimates that the total throughput for the year 1998 to be about 400,000. The Cai Lan feasibility study foresees demand rising to 2.7 million by the year 2000 equal to the capacity associated with the three berths planned in Phase 1 of the Cai Lan port expansion. However, this estimate in the rise of the demand is based on predicted total growth for all northern port services through the year 2010. The economic crisis that affected south-east Asian economies after 1997 has put some of these predictions into serious doubt. During the World Bank/MPI seminar the Governments of Japan and Vietnam indicated that future plans to expand the Cai Lan port capacity would be based on regular reviews of expected rises in total demand. This cautious approach should be supported with regard to any expansion of the Cai Lan port capacity beyond Phase 1.
- The development of Cai Lan and other deepwater ports in northern Vietnam must be seen as complementary to parallel efforts to restore the port in Hai Phong which is Vietnam's second largest port. Dredging operations to increase the volume of vessels entering the ports should be concentrated to the Hai Phong port. In connection with the development of the Cai Lan port, dredging activities should be avoided; dredging should be strictly prohibited within the World Heritage area.
- Tourism development within the World Heritage area must be co-ordinated with the overall tourism development strategy for the Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone. Coloured lighting and walkways in one of the caves within the World Heritage area may be justifiable given their interest to the increasing numbers of national and local as well as Chinese visitors to the area. However, the management needs to guard against adopting the same strategy in the development of all caves that may be opened for visitation since other international visitors may prefer that the caves remain more "natural". The World Heritage area is estimated to have as many as 100 such caves and it may not be necessary to open a majority of the caves to visitors. A survey of all the caves within the World Heritage area and the development of a strategy to guide their use as scientific as well as tourism resources in the management of the World Heritage area appears to be an urgent priority.

The key to effective mitigation of all potential threats to the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area is a fully professional and well resourced management agency. Except in the case of senior positions, e.g. the Head, the Ha Long Bay Management Department staff, neither have sufficient authority nor status to counter the various threats posed by pressures in a region of rapid economic development. The satisfactory management of shipping and tourism would greatly reduce potential threats to the World Heritage site. Similarly, the sustainable development of tourism within the World Heritage area and related interpretation and management arrangements to the benefit of visitors also require staff with specialised skills. At present, the Ha Long Bay Management Department does not have the capacity to cope with the growing range of problems and issues that require their attention. When the mandate, objectives, tasks, and organisational issues required to manage the World Heritage site are compared with the current structure of the management department, it is clear that the Department does not have the resources or the status to develop strategically. IUCN Vietnam has prepared a project proposal to improve the capacity of the management department, and is now looking for possible funding sources. Several recent initiatives that have occurred to guide developments and to control pollution in Ha Long Bay could also be expanded in ways by which they could contribute towards strengthening the management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area:

- The Government of Vietnam and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) have commissioned a comprehensive environmental study of the World Heritage site and the coastal area adjacent to Ha Long town. The study is investigating a range of pollution sources and indicators. Preliminary findings of the study were reported at the April 1999 seminar. The study is to be concluded in October 1999. The possibility of building a second phase to the study whereby the international standards and norms for the environmental management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area are determined and the capacity to monitor them established is worth exploring.
- The project “Capacity building for Environmental Management in Vietnam” is developing a GIS database for Quang Ninh province, which includes the World Heritage site. However, the effective management of the Ha Long Bay environment in the future clearly needs further research and studies in a number of areas, particularly biodiversity, cave morphology, visitor rates and destinations, role of fishing “villagers” resident within the Bay in environmental management and social impact of developments.
- IUCN Vietnam has received funding from the Royal Netherlands Embassy to develop a checklist of selected plants in Ha Long Bay. This will be included in a visitor brochure that can be used to raise awareness about the need to conserve the biodiversity of the World Heritage site.

**Action required:** The Bureau may welcome the expression of the National and Provincial Governments’ commitment and willingness to manage the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area in accordance with international standards and norms befitting a coastal and marine protected area located in a region of intense economic development. The Bureau may wish to recognise the efforts of The World Bank and the State Party in placing the conservation of the World Heritage Area as a central theme in their efforts to manage the environment and conserve nature in the comprehensive development of the Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone. The Bureau may invite the Government of Vietnam to consider upgrading the profile, status and capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department so that it can fully meet its responsibilities to effectively manage the World Heritage area. The Bureau may request the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate to develop a list of critical projects essential for building the capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department and for establishing internationally acceptable standards and norms for monitoring the environment of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area. This list of projects, if approved by the Committee at its twenty-third session, could serve as a basis for negotiations between the State Party and suitable donors for supporting the conservation of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area.

**Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1989)

*International assistance:* US\$ 7,000 as Preparatory Assistance and US\$ 20,000 as Technical Co-operation.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau was informed of IUCN’s review of the “Scoping Report: Potential impacts associated with the proposed development of the Mosi-Oa-Tunya Hotel Complex”. This report was commissioned by Sun International, the company that would like to develop this hotel complex on the

Zambian side of this trans-border site. IUCN had raised the following key issues of concern: (a) the proposed development site is within the World Heritage area and particularly close to the river banks; (b) institutional support to be provided by the Zambian Government to address environmental problems is not defined; and (c) the Government of Zambia needs to discuss the project with the Government of Zimbabwe to seek the latter's agreement on implementation policies, procedures and schedules. The Zimbabwean Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (ZDNPWLM) had emphasised the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and stressed that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures that invite full public involvement. Since it lacked detailed information on the hotel development proposal, ZDNPWLM had been unable to make specific and constructive comments or endorse the development proposal.

The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa to bring representatives from the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe together. The bi-national meeting should be designed and organised in such a manner so as to clarify issues concerning this development project in accordance with the joint responsibility of the two States Parties to conserve and properly manage this trans-border World Heritage property. The Bureau supported the ZDNPWLM's position to preserve the site as a global asset and to subject any development proposal to EIA procedures with full public involvement. The response of ZDNPWLM was included in Annex IV of the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) where the Delegate of Zimbabwe stressed that the bi-national meeting be organised within the existing framework for co-operation between the Governments of the two countries.

*New information:* The bi-national meeting is being planned to discuss the threat of inappropriate tourism development and improvement of co-ordination and consistency between site management of the two countries. A mission to review the situation at the Victoria Falls site recommended that the bilateral meeting be preceded by individual country meetings with the aim of establishing a basis for improved joint management of the site. Each country would prepare concise position statements to act as a basis for improved joint management of the site. IUCN has been requested by the two countries and the Centre to facilitate the bilateral meeting. The Centre and the IUCN Regional Office in South Africa are in contact with the Parties for the planning of the bi-national meeting.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may invite the two State Parties to fully co-operate with IUCN and the Centre to organize the bi-national meeting in the latter half of 1999 and report on the findings and recommendations of the meeting to the twenty third session of the Committee.

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

State of conservation reports of four mixed World Heritage properties are presented. All of these were considered by the Bureau and the Committee at their last sessions (November-December 1998) in Kyoto, Japan. They are reported here either because new information on follow-up activities to implement the recommendations of the Bureau and the Committee is available or is expected to be available by the time of the Bureau session in July 1999.

**Kakadu National Park (Australia)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: Stage I – 1981; Stage II – 1987; Stage III – 1992)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twentieth extraordinary session (Merida, 1996), the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee took note of information provided by IUCN on potential threats from a uranium mine in the Jabiluka Mineral Lease, one of three enclaves within the boundaries of Kakadu National Park. IUCN tabled Resolution 1.104 on “Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia”, adopted by the World Conservation Congress in Montreal, Canada in October 1996. The Resolution urged the Government of Australia to prevent the development of Jabiluka and Koongarra uranium mines should it be shown that such mining would threaten the Park’s World Heritage values. At the time, the Australian Delegation referred to a strengthening in the protection of Australian World Heritage properties that would result from restructuring of federal agencies. At the twentieth session of the Committee (Merida, 1996), IUCN stated that - due to lack of sufficient resources - it was not possible to prepare detailed reports on Kakadu National Park or other Australian World Heritage properties. The Australian Delegation informed the Committee that Australia had no essential problems with the World Conservation Congress resolution and that a number of steps and actions had been taken to mitigate described threats to Australian World Heritage properties, including Kakadu National Park.

At its twenty-first session (Paris, 1997), the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee received a written and oral report from IUCN on the state of conservation of several Australian World Heritage properties including Kakadu National Park. The Bureau was informed by the Australian Delegation that the Government would continue to maintain its commitment to respect the integrity of its World Heritage sites. The Chairperson ruled that issues raised in the IUCN report should not be further considered, 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. The twenty-first extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1997) received a report from IUCN that 77 concerns had been identified over the uranium mine proposal and the Australian Supervising Scientist had also suggested that a new EIA would be needed should the location of the mill be changed. IUCN reported that they had received reports from Australian environmental groups concerned about the potential impacts and that some of them had proposed the site should be considered for the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS noted that care needed to be taken in handling the mining operation if and when it proceeds, to protect the important sacred sites and spiritual values of the area. It also expressed concern that the traditional owners had not participated in the environmental impact statement. ICOMOS emphasized the need for continuous monitoring of the condition of the cultural sites in the close vicinity of the proposed mine.

Australia advised that the 77 "concerns" referred to by IUCN were in fact conditions that had been placed on the mining company by the Government to ensure protection of the World Heritage values. Australia stated that mining would not proceed until these conditions were met. Australia recognized the issue of Aboriginal involvement as important and stated that the Australian Government and the mining company have committed themselves to ongoing consultation with the Aboriginal people. The Bureau was informed that the Australian Government had commissioned an independent social impact study, at the request of the traditional owners, and was responding to the outcome. Australia added that there has been uranium mining in the area but outside the World Heritage site for 20 years with no significant

environmental effects, with independent supervision and monitoring by an independent scientific statutory body.

The Bureau invited the Australian authorities to provide the World Heritage Centre with any new information concerning the proposed uranium mine at Jabiluka in Kakadu National Park. The Australian authorities were requested to provide information pertaining to their efforts to ensure that the proponents of mining in the enclave, within but outside of the boundaries of the Park, address the seventy-seven environmental conditions imposed by the Government.

The twenty-first session of the Committee (Naples, 1997) noted the deliberations of the extraordinary Bureau session.

The twenty-second session of the Bureau (Paris, June 1998) noted that additional information concerning the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park had been provided by the Australian Government. The Secretariat referred to a letter received from the lawyer for the Mirrar Aboriginal people (the traditional owners of the area covered by the Jabiluka Mineral Lease) who commented that the responses by the Bureau and Committee on the state of conservation of Kakadu at its twenty-first session were "entirely unsatisfactory". The Secretariat also informed the Bureau that a submission from four scientists in Australia had been received in which they criticize the quality and process of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed Jabiluka uranium mine. The scientists stated that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) largely ignored cultural heritage and called for a new EIS to include proper assessment of the ecological and cultural impacts of the proposed mine. Furthermore, the Secretariat and the Chairperson referred to the many letters they had received which expressed concern about the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park and that called for the inclusion of Kakadu on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN presented a detailed statement concerning the state of conservation of Kakadu. In summary, IUCN suggested that Resolution 1.104 on "Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia", adopted at the World Conservation Congress in 1996 and the precautionary principle be used to guide IUCN's advice to the Committee. IUCN recommended that mining activity should be deferred until the Committee was satisfied with the implementation of the seventy-seven environmental conditions and requested the necessary information and resources for IUCN to participate in a multidisciplinary mission to the site and report to the twenty-second session of the Bureau and Committee if requested by the Bureau.

The Australian Government provided information concerning the assessment and approvals process that had been required prior to the commencement of the development of the mine. ICOMOS expressed the need to better assess the full diversity of cultural values, including spiritual values and living cultural traditions, at Kakadu and in the Jabiluka Mineral Lease. ICOMOS also commented that at the time of inclusion in the List (in three stages, 1981, 1987 and 1992), nomination as a cultural landscape had not been possible. ICOMOS raised the possibility of Kakadu being considered in the future as a cultural landscape of potential World Heritage value.

The Bureau reached consensus on the need to proceed on the basis of the precautionary principle even in the absence of complete data. The Bureau agreed that the information about the state of conservation of Kakadu presented to the Committee and Bureau required greater clarity. The Bureau therefore concluded that the multifaceted environmental, cultural and legal issues relating to the conservation of the site highlighted the need for a fact-finding mission. The Australian Observer reiterated that the record of conservation at Kakadu was very good



and that the Australian Government did not consider that the World Heritage values were threatened. She stated that, for these reasons, a mission would be welcomed.

The Bureau also noted the extent and level of representation to it concerning uranium mining in the area of Kakadu National Park. The Bureau considered that uranium mining in an area of high natural and cultural values is of sensitivity and potential concern. The Bureau noted that the Australian Observers had reported in detail on the progress to date in imposing conditions on mining such that it does not affect the World Heritage or other natural or cultural values in this area. Because of the importance, complexity and sensitivity of the issue, however, the Bureau proposed that a mission to Kakadu be undertaken by a team headed by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee with the participation of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS. This mission would examine the situation further, have discussions with relevant Aboriginal groups, officials, non-governmental organisations and the mining company, and report to the Bureau and Committee sessions in November-December 1998.

An expert mission was fielded to Kakadu National Park, Australia from 26 October to 1 November 1998. The mission report (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9A**) was subsequently presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (27-28 November 1998) and the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee (30 November –5 December 1998) in Kyoto, Japan.

The mission report focused primarily on threats from the Jabiluka mining proposal posing ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The report presents sixteen recommendations concerning mitigating measures and recommended that the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed. IUCN presented a position statement in which they expressed their belief that the conditions existed for inscribing Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS gave general support to the mission report. The Observer of Australia stated that Australia was committed to meeting its obligations under the Convention. He referred to the mission report as containing errors of law, fact and analysis, and recommendations that are flawed and unacceptable to the Australian Government. He requested that Australia be given time to respond to the mission report. The Bureau formulated a number of recommendations basing its work on the need to respect the rights and interests of the State Party and the obligations of the Committee and its Bureau to protect the outstanding cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park. IUCN and ICOMOS presented a joint statement that recognised the urgency of the issues being considered in light of the on-going construction of the Jabiluka mine. IUCN and ICOMOS again called for the mining and milling of uranium at Jabiluka to not proceed stating that failure to do so would diminish the standards, and risk the credibility of the World Heritage Convention.

Following the recommendations of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau, the twenty-second session, of the World Heritage Committee adopted the following decision:

The Committee recognised the report of the mission to Kakadu National Park as being both thorough and credible.

- (i) *The Committee expressed grave concern at the ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park which, as noted in the mission report, are posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka;*
- (ii) *noted with concern that in spite of the dangers to the World Heritage values, construction of the mine at Jabiluka began in June 1998 and is currently progressing;*
- (iii) *has been informed by the Australian authorities that construction of the mine decline and site will proceed; however in the next six months no mining of uranium will take place, the construction of the mill will not commence and an export permit for the Jabiluka uranium will not be issued. The Committee has also been informed that the Australian authorities will act to complete the cultural heritage management plan with independent public review and they will accelerate the implementation of the Kakadu Region Social Impact Study;*
- (iv) *noted that there is significant difference of opinion concerning the degree of certainty of the science used to assess the impact of the mine on the World Heritage values of Kakadu (notably hydrological modeling, prediction and impact of severe weather events, storage of uranium ore on the surface and the long-term storage of the mine tailings);*
- (v) *noted that the associative cultural values, and the archaeological and rock art sites, on the basis of which Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and the ability of affected Aboriginal communities to continue their traditional relationships to the land, are threatened by the Jabiluka mine proposal; and,*
- (vi) *emphasized the fundamental importance of ensuring thorough and continuing participation, negotiation and communication with Aboriginal traditional owners, custodians and managers in the conservation of the outstanding heritage values of Kakadu for future generations.*

*In view of the ascertained and potential dangers posed by the Jabiluka uranium mine that are noted in the report of the World Heritage mission to Kakadu, and have again been noted with concern by the Committee, IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS, the Committee decided the following:*

1. *In light of the concerns expressed by the Delegate of Australia, the Australian authorities be requested to provide, by 15 April 1999, a detailed report on their efforts to prevent further damage and to mitigate all the threats identified in the World Heritage mission report, to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park, Australia. The report should address these threats posed by the construction of the Jabiluka mine, by the mining of uranium ore at Jabiluka, and*

*the alternatives for milling the ore at Jabiluka and Ranger. The report should be prepared in accordance with the intent of (vi) above. The report submitted by the Australian authorities should include a detailed update on the implementation of the cultural heritage management plan referred to in (iii) above and in the mission report.*

2. *Immediately upon its receipt by the Secretariat, the report referred to in paragraph 1 above, be provided to ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, who will ensure that the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, be provided with a written independent expert review concerning the mitigation of threats posing ascertained and potential dangers to Kakadu National Park by the Jabiluka mine. The expert opinion of ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN will be provided to the Secretariat by 15 May 1999 for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau and the Australian authorities.*
3. *The Australian authorities be requested to direct the Australian Supervising Scientist Group to conduct a full review of the scientific issues referred to in Paragraph (iv) above, to be provided to the Secretariat by 15 April 1999. The review will be submitted to peer review by an independent scientific panel composed of scientists selected by UNESCO in consultation with the International Council of Scientific Unions and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The report of the peer review will be provided to the Secretariat by 15 May 1999 for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau, IUCN and the Australian authorities.*
4. *The reports referred to in Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 will be examined by the twenty-third session of the Bureau.*
5. *The twenty-second session of the Committee has decided that an extraordinary session of the Committee, to immediately follow the twenty third session of the Bureau in July 1999, will be convened at UNESCO Headquarters to decide whether to immediately inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.*

A joint statement by IUCN and ICOMOS was presented to the Committee. It stated that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The statement also cautioned that a failure to recognise the dangers to the property would diminish the standards of, and risk prejudicing the prestige of the Convention. ICCROM called on the Committee to give proper weight to the opinion of the advisory bodies and to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger if scientific research indicated, without any doubt, that the values of Kakadu National Park are threatened.

The Delegate of Australia read a statement in which he reiterated that Australia stands by the Convention and does not intend to allow any damage to the natural and cultural values of the World Heritage area. He stated that his Government did not consider that the values are in any form of ascertained or potential danger.

The Committee adopted an additional decision by consensus:

*The Committee urged the Australian authorities and Energy Resources Australia Inc. to immediately undertake, in the context of their examination of the mission report, the*

*voluntary suspension of construction of the mine decline until the twenty-third session of the Bureau in July 1999.*

The Delegate of Australia disassociated his Government from the decision.

*New information:* The decisions of the Committee were transmitted to the Australian Government by the World Heritage Centre. In accordance with the reporting process outlined in the decisions of the twenty-second session of the Committee, a detailed report was provided to the World Heritage Centre by the Australian Government on 15 April 1999. The report is entitled “Australia’s Kakadu – Protecting World Heritage. Response by the Government of Australia to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee regarding Kakadu National Park (April 1999)” (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9B**). The report responded to the concerns and recommendations identified in the World Heritage mission report (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9A**).

A review of the scientific issues was performed by the Australian Supervising Scientist and a report entitled “Assessment of the Jabiluka Project: Report of the Supervising Scientist to the World Heritage Committee (April 1999)” was provided to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on 15 April 1999 (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9C**).

A presentation on both of the reports mentioned above took place at the Australian Embassy in Paris on 15 April 1999. Many Committee members, a representative of ICOMOS and IUCN and several staff members of the World Heritage Centre attended.

The World Heritage Centre provided copies of the report included in Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9B to ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM for their expert review. The written independent expert review of IUCN and ICOMOS was provided to the World Heritage Centre on 15 May 1999 and transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9D**).

The World Heritage Centre provided copies of the report included in Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9C to ICSU for review by an independent scientific panel. The panel’s written review was provided to the World Heritage Centre on 14 May 1999 and was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO on 17 May 1999 (see Information Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9E**).

At the time of preparation of this working document a number of additional responses to the Australian Government’s response to the mission report and the Australian Supervising Scientist Report were received by the World Heritage Centre. Each submission was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO for comment and to the Chairperson of the Committee and advisory bodies for information.

In addition, many letters calling on the Committee to inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger have been received from individuals and organisations from around the world. A Resolution was presented to the Plenary Session of the Fourth World Archaeological Congress (South Africa January 1999) and then adopted by the World Archaeological Congress. The Resolution called on the immediate halt to preparatory work on the mine and for inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A Resolution proposed by the Australian Greens and the European Federation of Green Parties was adopted by the European Parliament on the subject of the Jabiluka Uranium Mine, Australia. The

Resolution included a call on the Australian Government to abide by the decision of the World Heritage Committee to halt work on the mine immediately.

The Chairperson of the Committee wrote to the Minister for the Environment in Australia on a number of occasions, each time urging the voluntary suspension of the construction of the mine decline. The Minister replied stating that Australia did not consider that the World Heritage values of Kakadu are under any form of ascertained or potential danger. A number of his replies questioned the independence of the advice provided by IUCN and ICOMOS. His replies included assurances to the Chairperson that the Government was committed to the protection of Kakadu and would ensure that the rigorous environmental requirements and conditions imposed on the mine operator were met.

Several letters addressed to the Chairperson were received from the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation. The letters requested that Kakadu National Park be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and called for the cessation of construction of the Jabiluka underground mine shaft as they claimed the Boyweg-Almudj sacred site complex would be desecrated. The Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO, the Chairperson and the advisory bodies were informed of all of the above.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine Information Documents WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9B to 9E and other information made available at the time of its session. The Bureau may wish to transmit its findings and recommendations to the third extraordinary session of the Committee and request the Committee to decide whether or not to immediately inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Tasmanian Wilderness ( Australia )** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1982 and 1989)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau noted that the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA) signed by the Commonwealth and the Tasmanian Governments on 8 November 1997, has enabled: the establishment of a significantly increased reserve system for Tasmania's Forest Estate; participation by the signatories in further World Heritage assessment of relevant Australia-wide themes; and initiation of discussions between the signatories on possibilities for further World Heritage nominations or additions to the present World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to keep the Centre informed of any potential boundary extensions that may be foreseen for the Tasmanian Wilderness and to provide a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau learned that negotiations between the Tasmanian and the Commonwealth Governments for setting a timetable, potentially involving the extension of the boundaries of the World Heritage site, were underway and the Australian authorities had agreed to provide the timetable when the two parties reach an agreement. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contacts with the Australian authorities to obtain information on the timetable and requested the Centre to transmit a report from the Australian NGOs to the State Party concerning the Tasmanian Wilderness for review.

*New information:* IUCN has informed the Centre that the Australian Committee for IUCN (ACIUCN) proposes to complete an assessment on the state of conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness, based on inputs from NGOs and other interests in 2000. In principle, IUCN

supports the RFA process as it represents a significant step towards a comprehensive, adequate and representative reserve system. IUCN considers that elements of the dedicated RFA reserve system may be relevant to identifying suitable extensions to the World Heritage site and believes that the RFA cements relations between state and federal governments on matters affecting the World Heritage site such as policy, management and funding. However, IUCN remains concerned about the RFA possible excluding important forest areas, already identified as having World Heritage value, from the reserve system. Threats posed by logging sanctioned by the RFA to the forest catchments that may be represented within the World Heritage site, are also a matter for concern.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to request IUCN to complete its review process on the state of conservation of this site, including specific concerns it has noted, and submit an up-to-date report to the twenty fourth-session on the Bureau in 2000.

**Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1990 and 1993)

*International assistance:* Promotional assistance of US\$4,000 for a small travelling photographic exhibition in 1998.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second ordinary (June 1998) and extraordinary sessions (November 1998), the Bureau was informed of the events resulting from the eruptions of Mount Ruapehu in 1995 and 1996. The volcano's Crater Lake has been drained and a large build-up of ash has blocked the lake's outlet. When Crater Lake refills, probably within the next few years, a rapid collapse of the ash dam could occur followed by a major lahar. The Management is faced with the dilemma of either letting nature take its course, putting both human life and some natural values at risk, or taking action to open up the outlet. The option to excavate a trench through the ash at the crater outlet should not significantly affect the natural values for which the site is inscribed. But interference with the summit area has implications for the Management's recognition of the cultural values justifying the site's inscription and its respect for the spiritual, traditional and cultural values to the Maori people. The Ngati Rangi and the Ngati Tuwharetoa Maori tribes are opposed to the idea of engineering works at the Crater Lake. The Minister for Conservation had called for a comprehensive environmental and cultural assessment identifying the risks associated with and possible impacts of the mitigation options. The Bureau took note of the reports and commended the State Party for its recognition of the cultural and natural World Heritage values of Tongariro National Park. The Bureau requested that the New Zealand authorities keep the Centre informed about the outcome of decisions concerning the management of the ash build-up.

*New information:* In a letter dated 31 March from the New Zealand Department of Conservation, the Centre was provided with an update on the decisions concerning management of the ash build-up at the Crater Lake outlet on Mount Ruapehu. A draft Assessment of the Environmental Effects report was released for public comment in late October 1998 and consultations have taken place with Maori people, other agencies and the public. The report has now been sent to the Minister of Conservation who is making a decision as to what action to take. The Department of Conservation has informed the Centre that the outcome of the Minister's decision will be made available to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. Furthermore, the Department of Conservation is investigating possible components of a suitable alarm system to warn members of the public about large lahars from Crater Lake and informal discussions have begun to establish an emergency management group to address such hazards. Continuous monitoring has shown that as of 22 March 1999, the Crater Lake was

22% full and 54 meters below the old overflow level. According to current projections, the Crater Lake will not fill until the year 2003.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to request the Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS to maintain contact with the State Party to monitor the ash build-up at the Crater Lake and submit a report to its twenty-fourth session in the year 2000.

### **Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1983)**

*International assistance:* Between 1987 and 1992 an amount of approximately US\$ 50,000 was allocated to assist the Peruvian authorities in the preparation of a master plan for Machu Picchu. However, a master plan was only adopted in late 1998.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee examined the state of conservation at its sessions in 1996, 1997 and 1998. It particularly stressed the need for adequate management arrangements and comprehensive master planning. The Committee at its twenty-second session:

- requested IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth examination of the master plan adopted in October 1998 and to submit its findings to the Bureau at its twenty-third session;
- requested the Peruvian authorities to transmit all relevant documentation and provisions to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN and ICOMOS and examination by the Bureau and/or Committee;
- requested the Bureau at its twenty-third session to consider whether a second IUCN/ICOMOS mission should be undertaken to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the master plan, the project of the cable car system, the eventual hotel extension and other major works that may be planned;
- urged the Peruvian authorities not to take any decision on projects that could have a considerable impact on the World Heritage values prior to a possible IUCN/ICOMOS mission and to consult the Committee as per paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines.

*New information:* No information or documentation had been received from the Peruvian authorities at the time of preparation of this working document.

However, the Secretariat has received a great number of communications and appeals in which individuals, scientists and non-governmental organizations express concerns and opposition to the plans for the cable car system, stating that its impact would seriously affect the natural and cultural values, and could increase the level of tourists to unacceptable levels.

IUCN transmitted a report to the Secretariat that is summarised below:

Recent reports indicate that the situation in the Park continues to be of concern. There are increasing problems with the collection and disposal of garbage and waste water (a workshop to discuss possible solutions took place in the second week of April but there is little indication on how far recommendations from this meeting will be implemented). The same is valid in relation to the Master Plan for this site. The Master Plan was officially approved in October 1998; but until now it has not been published or distributed and no action is being taken to put it into practice. The proposed Management Committee has not been nominated. No actions have been taken to follow the recommendations from the Master Plan.

The construction of a cable car continues to be an issue of major concern. An EIA was conducted by the international consultant firm, Dames & Moore, but INRENA (National Institute for Natural Resources) has still a number of technical questions and the tourism sector passed the EIA document on to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, without any opinion. Both INRENA and INC (National Institute for Culture) must previously accept the EIA, prior to the approval by the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Transport. A key point of disagreement of INRENA in relation to the EIA is the lack of an analysis of different alternatives. Despite this disagreement on the EIA for the cable car project, the Government has already approved a license to privatise 7000 square meters to build up the cable car. This decision is generating additional conflicts at the local level because the local government was not consulted on this decision.

In addition, information has been received on a proposal to construct a new road between Cusco and Machu Pichu. It is important to note that the Master Plan approved by the Government clearly recommends that new access to this site is not necessary and it could create additional pressures from an increasing number of visitors.

As to the Master Plan, IUCN provided the following comments:

The approval of the Master Plan for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Pichu is a positive step towards enhancing its protection and management. IUCN welcomes this action and encourages the State Party to proceed with the implementation of the Plan. However, IUCN would like for the State Party and the World Heritage Bureau and Committee to consider the following comments:

1. The Master Plan outlines in detail the main directions and elements that should guide the protection and management of this site. In fact the document is an excellent strategic framework for future actions. However it fails to define priorities on short-term actions and a detailed plan for implementation, including responsibilities of different institutions, resources, deadlines and mechanisms to evaluate and monitor progress. From IUCN's point of view a plan lacking a programme for implementation cannot be considered adequate and probably would be of little utility.
2. The document clearly identified as a key condition of success the need for a better co-ordination between different national and local agencies involved in managing this site, as well as the need to involve all key stakeholders at the local level. While the plan proposes the creation of a Management Committee involving key stakeholders, it does not consider the process or necessary mechanisms to achieve better co-ordination. The same is valid for the recommendation concerning the creation of an Integrated Administrative Unit including staff from the Institute of Natural Resources and the Institute of Culture.
3. The document received by IUCN lacks a comprehensive map that allows a proper evaluation of the proposed zoning for the area. Furthermore, IUCN is concerned about the weak definitions and management considerations for the Special Use Zone (Zona de Uso Especial) and for the Buffer Zone (Zona de Amortiguamiento). Both areas are essential to safeguard the integrity of the core areas, so they deserve special management considerations.
4. Tourism and high levels of visitation are considered throughout the document as issues of major concern, both for the integrity of the site but also to ensure the quality experience which visitors expect to have. However, the document lacks a detailed plan for integrated



tourism development including visitor management. IUCN considers that this detailed plan should be prepared and implemented as a matter of urgency.

5. It is of concern that the Master Plan almost endorses the need for the construction of the cable car. This is a matter of concern considering the concern on the EIA prepared for this investment and the lack of an evaluation of different alternatives.
6. The Master Plan provides strong technical arguments against any further development of roads providing new access to this site. This is in total contradiction with the proposed new highway linking Cusco and Machu Picchu.
7. The Plan recognises the need to expand the current limits of this site in order to incorporate other natural areas that could complement the conservation of key species and the overall landscape of this area. In this regard IUCN would like to reiterate its recommendation to include the "Abra Malagra" region in the Vilcanota Mountains to the south of the existing World Heritage site and most of the Vilcamba Mountains to the north. However IUCN consider premature any action to extend the limits of the site before substantial progress is made to enhance its protection and management.

ICOMOS will present its observations on the Master Plan during the session of the Bureau.

On 12 May 1999, the Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO requested a visit during June of the presidents of IUCN/ICOMOS, or their representatives, to observe in situ the application of the Master Plan for Machu Picchu.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine the above report and information which may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon. Among other things, it may wish to consider if a second IUCN/ICOMOS mission is required.

In formulating its decision/recommendation, the Bureau may wish to consider the following IUCN recommendation: 'IUCN recommends that the Bureau takes note of the lack of progress in relation to solving the problem of the cable car, the new intentions of developing a highway between Cusco and this World Heritage site. The Bureau should also consider IUCN comments on the Master Plan that in general is a good strategic framework to enhance the protection of this site but lack a comprehensive programme of implementation. While the Bureau should compliment the State Party for this positive step it also should note the lack of progress from the State Party to organise and promote the work of the Management Committee as a first step to implement the Master Plan. Noting these points IUCN recommends to the Bureau to include this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.'

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

State of conservation reports of thirty-four cultural World Heritage properties are presented. Of that number, sixteen were considered by the Bureau and the Committee at their last sessions (November-December 1998) in Kyoto, Japan. They are reported here either because new information on follow-up activities to implement the recommendations of the Bureau and the Committee is available or is expected to be available by the time of the Bureau session in July

1999. In the case of the other eighteen sites new information pertaining to their state of conservation is submitted to the Bureau for review and action.

## Arab States

**Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

### 1) Rehabilitation of Islamic Cairo

*International assistance:* Preparatory assistance (US \$ 14,900), 1998, organising a two-day brainstorming session to discuss the rehabilitation of Islamic Cairo, the session formulated strategy guidelines for the rehabilitation of Historic Cairo.

Technical co-operation (US \$ 19,000), 1998, dispatching a mission of experts to follow up to the strategic guidelines, the mission together with the Egyptian authorities completed a three-year rehabilitation programme submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session

Technical co-operation (US \$ 120,000), 1999, implementation of the first-year programme, in this year, the Egyptian authorities would 1) establish a co-ordination mechanism and technical offices within the site of Islamic Cairo and 2) hold a partners' meeting in October-November and possibly execute pilot projects at Gamalia area. Furthermore, the Egyptian authorities have provided their cost-sharing contribution.

Technical co-operation for 2000 (amount to be decided) will be submitted to the Committee at its twenty-third session to continue collaboration on a cost-sharing basis.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* Based on the strategy guidelines prepared by the brainstorming session at UNESCO Headquarters in June 1998, a mission visited Cairo in October 1998 to make concrete proposals to address rehabilitation and development issues. The Egyptian authorities examined the proposals and formulated a three-year rehabilitation programme together with an international assistance request. The Bureau, at its twenty-second session took note of the report of the Secretariat and thanked the Egyptian authorities for their co-operation with the Centre and requested the Secretariat to do its utmost in the implementation of the co-operation programme in favour of Islamic Cairo.

*New information:* In May 1999, preparations were completed for the launching of pilot projects for the rehabilitation programme and for the organisation of the meeting to be held in October–November with potential partners in Cairo. The result of the mission will be presented to the Bureau at its twenty-third session. Furthermore, a junior co-ordinator was posted to the UNESCO Office in Cairo.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon

### 2) Al Azhar Mosque

*International assistance:* N.A.

Summary of previous deliberations: The Secretariat received a technical report containing the architectural standards applied for the work on the monument from the Supreme Council of Antiquities in Egypt. The Centre transmitted the report to ICOMOS and ICCROM on 23 November 1998. At its twenty-second session, after having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth evaluation of the report for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

New information: The Secretariat has received the evaluation from ICOMOS. It pointed out that:

- Documentation and diagnostic analysis of the problems are very briefly described as are some conservation practices related to them: These are difficult to comment on unless the original reports and the monuments can be seen.
- However, some conservation practice procedures are given in considerable detail, which call into question the selection criteria, side effects and long-term behaviour (e.g., marble columns and non-coloured plaster are commented).
- Otherwise, the report carries a positive concept.
- Since a databank of the project has been established, a better evaluation of the project can be carried out by comparing the data with the monument. This will also be very helpful in designing the periodical maintenance programme and monitoring studies of the monument for its long-term conservation.

**Action required :** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following :

“The Bureau, having examined the evaluation, thanks ICOMOS for its in-depth report. The Bureau appreciates the establishment of the databank of the project and recommends that the Egyptian authorities continue applying such databank methods shared by all concerned institutions to any large-scale preservation works in Cairo for its long-term conservation. The Bureau finally requests the authorities to co-operate with ICOMOS in the analysis of information in the databank.”

### **Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

International assistance: Technical Co-operation (US \$ 20,000), 1993, mission for technical advice, the mission reported to the Secretariat a state of conservation of the site.

Summary of previous deliberations: The Secretariat reported to the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session that, at the request of the Egyptian authorities, a mission from UNESCO proceeded to Cairo on 3 October 1998 and worked on the Ring-Road issue with the Supreme Council of Antiquities and the concerned ministries. A joint communiqué, signed by the Supreme Council of Antiquities, the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction and UNESCO urged for a full implementation of the Convention and reconfirmed the alternative route selected during the previous UNESCO mission in 1995 (diversion through the Maryoutiyah and Mansouriyah Canals). The Bureau examined the report and requested the Secretariat to continue co-operating with the Egyptian authorities on the issue of diversion of Ring Road as well as on the overall management of the site and to report on the progress of the work to the Bureau at its twenty-third session. The World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-second session in December 1998, noted the decision of the last Bureau.

New information: In March 1999, in response to the request of the Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Antiquities in Egypt, a monitoring mission visited the site of Memphis and its Necropolis to identify short and long term actions to enhance the integrity, protection and presentation of the site. The mission recommended following: (1) Initiate the Egyptian GIS project by using this World Heritage site (WHS) as the initial model training site to prepare the boundary and base maps necessary for decision-making and management planning; (2) Initiate an integrated interdisciplinary General Management Plan (GMP) training project for the entire WHS including Memphis, and additionally, Abu Rawash; (3) Use the GMP process to address conflict issues and community conditions at Giza and Memphis in particular; (4) Also using the GMP process, develop specific action plans and schedules to address site development, monitoring, maintenance, visitor management and an integrated presentation programme including interpretative themes at appropriate locations distributed in the WHS; (5) Consider the need for expanded on-site laboratory facilities and equipment for emergency conservation and preservation situations (6) The initiation of a site-specific WHS Friends Programme (NGO) and World Heritage Young Peoples Programme adapted for Egypt; (7) Develop a rapid and flexible means to address small scale site management requirements; and, (8) Acknowledge WHS inscription and status with appropriate plaques and information.

The Secretariat supports the above recommendations, in particular items (1) – (4), considering the urgent need to have the GMP for the site.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following :

“The Bureau, having examined the report of the Secretariat, considers that a general management plan should be established together with a complete mapping of the site. The Bureau recommends to the State Party to study the recommendations of the report and to take actions for the establishment of the integrated interdisciplinary General Management Plan. The Bureau requests the State Party to submit a progress report on the actions taken by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.”

**Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae (Egypt)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

International assistance: The International Safeguarding Campaign was launched in 1959. No World Heritage Fund assistance has been provided to the site.

Summary of previous deliberations: Not applicable except the following history of the International Safeguarding Campaign 1960’ – 1970’ for information:

The Campaign was launched to safeguard the site from the construction of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, which would flood the valley containing the Abu Simbel Temples, a treasure of ancient Egyptian civilization. In 1959, UNESCO decided to launch an international campaign after an appeal from the Governments of Egypt and Sudan. Archaeological research in the areas to be flooded was accelerated. Above all, the Abu Simbel and Philae Temples were dismantled, moved to dry ground and reassembled.

New information: In early 1999, the Centre was informed that new structures were being built in front of the Abu Simbel Temples, which would seriously affect the value of the site. Immediately upon receipt of the news, the Centre requested the UNESCO Cairo Office to investigate the situation at the site. Consequently, the Office reported to the Centre on 29 April that the Egyptian authorities had ordered the constructions to be interrupted. On 20 May, the

Office delivered further information to the Centre that the Minister of Culture had given orders to demolish the construction works of the building facing the Abu Simbel Temples. The Centre has requested the Egyptian Government to confirm the demolition of the constructions.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau having examined the state of the conservation of the property, commends the Egyptian authorities for this speedy decision and recommends that an integrated management plan of this important and monumental site be prepared.”

**Baalbek (Lebanon)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984)

*International assistance:* Technical co-operation (US \$ 7,500), 1999, stone analysis of the Temple of Bacchus at Baalbek, It will provide the Lebanese authorities with a basic information about the strength of the stone which will enable the authorities to plan restoration works.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* N.A.

*New information:* In March 1999, the Centre was requested by the Lebanese Director-General of Antiquities to assist them in evaluating the restoration works of the Umayyads Mosque located in front of the Roman ruin. The Centre will organise an expert mission in June as a reactive monitoring of the site. The result will be presented to the members of the Bureau at its twenty-third session. As for the stone analysis of the Temple of Bacchus, the preliminary survey on the monument was carried out and the data was transmitted to laboratories in France. Upon receipt of the results, proposals for the protection of the Temple of Bacchus will be prepared.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon. For the Temple of Bacchus, the Bureau may wish to request the Secretariat to continue collaboration for the preservation of the monument. Finally, the Bureau may wish to remind the Lebanese authorities of the necessity of producing a management plan.

**Tyre (Lebanon)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* UNESCO’s Division of Cultural Heritage, responsible for the International Campaign launched in March 1998, has already begun to provide technical assistance with the dispatch in July 1998 of an expert in urbanism, whose report has been transmitted to the Lebanese authorities.

After having taken note of the Secretariat’s report, the Bureau welcomed the request of the Ministry of Public Works requesting UNESCO’s advice and their wish to strengthen co-operation between the Lebanese authorities and UNESCO in the preparation of a Management Plan for Tyr. The Bureau also requested:

- that the safeguarding of the archaeological and historical areas of Tyr be considered by the Lebanese authorities as of the highest priority for the preparation of the management plan, and
- that all infrastructural work within the site be suspended until the adoption of the management plan.

New information: Activities on the archaeological site of Tyre, in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign have slowed down somewhat since the last session of the World Heritage Committee, due to the change of Government of Lebanon and the nomination of a new Director-General of Antiquities.

The new Minister for Culture and Higher Education gave his agreement, by letter of 20 February 1999, to the composition of the International Scientific Committee (ISC) for Tyre. This official confirmation will make it possible to organize the first meeting of the ISC for Tyre in June.

At the request of the Minister, an information meeting on UNESCO's activities in the field of cultural heritage protection in Lebanon, and more particularly for the site of Tyre, was held on Friday, 5 March 1999 in Paris. The Minister requested that the ISC meet, as soon as possible, notably to prepare the draft management plan, which is the basis for all future activities at the site of Tyre.

A promotional and information pamphlet, intended to stimulate fund-raising in favour of the Tyre Campaign is presently being prepared.

#### **Decision required:**

The Bureau may wish to continue co-operation between the Lebanese authorities and the World Heritage Centre in the framework of the International Campaigns.

**The Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

International assistance: Technical co-operation (US \$ 18,000) 1999, monitoring structural movement of the Mosque and planning measures to reinforce the monument  
Monitoring missions, three, between 1997-1998.

Summary of previous deliberations: At the request of the Syrian authorities, a mission was organised in February 1997 to investigate the structural damages of Tekiyeh as Suleymaniyeh, a Mosque built by the famous architect Sinan. It was considered that the damage was due to the rising of the level of groundwater. The mission facilitated the provision of monitoring equipment at the site and worked with the Syrian authorities in monitoring the structural movement. In February 1998, the team planned reinforcement measures and revised the tender documents, but this did not materialise.

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau, after having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, thanked the Syrian authorities for their efforts in addressing the issue of Tekiyeh as Suleymaniyeh. It also requested the Syrian authorities to keep the Secretariat informed of the

progress of the consolidation work, and the Centre to continue this co-operation as requested by the authorities.

*New Information:* As reported to the Bureau, the Syrian authorities have been monitoring the structural condition of the Mosque of Tekiya Suleymanich since 1997. Consequently, the monument has been closed to the public. In February 1999, the Secretariat received a request from the Director –General of Antiquities and Museums to assist the authorities in reviewing the result of the monitoring. A structural engineer (President of ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Analysis and Restoration of Structures of Architectural Heritage) visited the monument in March 1999 and the preliminary assessment was positive, permitting public access following minor reinforcement measures.

**Decision required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the state of conservation of the property, took note of the assessment of the structural conditions. The Bureau recommends that the Syrian authorities examine the assessment report and undertake the minor interventions described in the report.”

**Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1980)

*International assistance:* Preparatory assistance (US \$ 15,000), 1998, to prepare a technical co-operation request for a Management Plan for Palmyra.

Technical co-operation (US \$ 20,000: approved, first phase), 1999, to complete a geographical study on the site and to detail the action plan.

Technical co-operation (US \$ 30,000) to be submitted to the Bureau at its twenty-third session for recommendation, then, to the Committee for approval, second phase), 1999, finalising the management plan and improving the documentation of the site through a national workshop.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* Following the recommendation of the mission in December 1997, the Syrian authorities requested the Secretariat to assist them in preparing an overall management plan for the site of Palmyra. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau supported the continuation of the work for the development of a full-fledged integral management plan covering the oasis, the town and the archaeological zone. It finally requested the Secretariat to continue collaboration with the Syrian authorities.

*New Information:* Early in 1999, as the first phase of the present technical co-operation project for 1999, approved under the World Heritage Fund, the Centre organised an expert mission to Palmyra in March, to assist the Department of Antiquities and Museums. The mission completed a geographical study on the site and a detailed action plan. It was also reported by the mission that, within the site, some inappropriate interventions such as the construction of new hotels were still progressing.

**Decision required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the state of conservation of the property, considers that the primary action for the site is the establishment of the necessary regulations together with an on site management office, to avoid further inappropriate interventions within the site. The Bureau recommends to the Syrian authorities to collaborate with the Secretariat in completing the draft management plan, including the proposal for the

regulations. It also recommends that in continuing its collaboration, the Syrian authorities increase their financial contribution for the co-operation programme and establish a special committee to start the implementation of the recommended actions.”

### **Old City of Sana’a (Yemen) (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1986)**

*International assistance:* Technical co-operation (US \$ 11,200), 1990, to provide technical advice for the restoration works at the Grand Mosque in Sana’a; the mission assisted the Yemeni authorities in preparing a conservation plan.

Technical co-operation (US \$ 19,000), 1998, conservation works at Al-Maiden Bath in Sana’a, for the conservation of the monument

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau noted the following. A monitoring mission visited the site in June 1998 and found that there was obvious need of co-ordination between the various governmental bodies involved in the city as well as between the World Bank project team and the General Organization for the Preservation of the Historic Cities in Yemen (GOPHCY). The responsible national authorities requested the members of the mission to assist in establishing a new scheme in order to define the roles of various international and national bodies. The mission recommended that UNESCO creates a focal point in Sana’a to co-ordinate preservation activities in Sana’a and in other historical cities of Yemen. The Bureau, after having taken note of the above report of the Secretariat, requested the Centre to assist the Yemeni authorities in establishing a focal point in Sana’a and provide technical assistance to prepare an overall management plan for the city.

#### New Information:

##### 1) Fly-over bridge

In November 1998, a monitoring mission visited the Old City of Sana’a and was informed of a plan for a fly-over bridge (approx. 1,000 m long) to be constructed near the south-west corner of the Old Walled City. In March 1999, a staff member of the UNESCO Amman Office visited the site and found that the proposed fly-over bridge had been modified and its length was shortened from 1,000 m to 400 m. Thus the impact of this construction on the Old City is now reduced, subject to verification that no new changes have been made.

##### 2) Great Mosque extension

During the mission of March 1999, the staff was informed of the project of extension of the Great Mosque, which requires the demolition of a number of old houses (approx. 80), to enlarge the entrance space and to create a parking lot. Since some of the old houses, planned for demolition, are of architectural value, the extension should be carried in a way that it respects the values of the site. Furthermore, a member of the mission of November 1998 pointed out that the creation of a parking lot might require wider access roads to the Mosque (specially through Bab el Yemen gate), adding problems to the site.

This project could seriously endanger the integrity of the Old City, by opening large free spaces inside the city, allowing car and truck traffic and destroying old houses.

Following the mission of March 1999, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the Permanent Delegation of Yemen requesting them to submit detailed reports on these issues before 15 April 1999 for presentation to the Bureau at its twenty-third session. No answer has been received so far.



**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the state of conservation of the property, requests the Yemeni authorities to collaborate with the Secretariat in studying the holistic traffic management of the site before any work starts on the fly-over bridge. The Bureau also requests the Yemeni authorities to receive at their earliest convenience a mission of specialists to study with them the possible solutions for the fly-over bridge and the Great Mosque extension. This mission should report to the forthcoming session of the World Heritage Committee.”

## Asia and the Pacific

**Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (The People’s Republic of China)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1987)

*International assistance:* The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its seventeenth session in December 1993, approved an amount of US\$ 26,000 under emergency assistance for undertaking urgent measures to prevent the collapse of some of the caves which suffered damage due to heavy rains during the 1992-1993 period. The Bureau also requested the Chinese authorities to limit the expenditures for local labour from contributions made available under the World Heritage Fund, suggesting that this be financed as part of the national input.

In March 1998, a technical co-operation request (US\$ 20,000) was received from the Chinese Permanent Delegation for purchasing computer equipment for implementing a sub-project within the Assistance-Ethno/UNESCO/Chinese Academy of Sciences (*Project for Rehabilitation, Protection and Conservation of the Peking Man Site*). The World Heritage Centre received in May 1998 from the Chinese authorities a state of conservation report, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. In transmitting the request to ICCROM and ICOMOS for evaluation, and in view of the alarming situation at the site, the World Heritage Centre recommended that an ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission be undertaken to identify the emergency conservation and site management needs. In January 1999, the Chinese authorities welcomed this suggestion for a Joint ICCROM-ICOMOS mission during a meeting with an UNESCO expert.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Bureau, at its eighteenth session in July 1994, was informed of the results of a World Heritage Centre monitoring mission to five of the World Heritage cultural sites in China, including the **Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian**. The mission was generally impressed with the standard of maintenance of Chinese World Heritage sites and the professionalism of the staff responsible for them. Nevertheless, the mission raised specific technical issues with the State Bureau of Cultural Relics and other responsible authorities in China, notably on the need for technical training in the conservation of ruined stonework, the conservation of earthen structures, the conservation of marble, new jointing techniques for timber conservation, the conservation of wall paintings, computer-assisted recording of standing monuments and geophysical archaeological recording techniques. With regard to the management of World Heritage sites in China, the report emphasized the need to better manage the construction of tourist facilities and intrusive structures in the World Heritage sites, noting that a number of them had been erected since inscription. Concern was also raised over visitor pressures and the mission recommended that a tourism management plan be elaborated for the sites.

*New information:* Following the recommendation from the Secretariat for a reactive monitoring mission to this site, ICCROM and ICOMOS were requested to nominate experts for this mission. On 5 May 1999, the Centre received a fax-letter from the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO inviting the international experts from ICCROM and ICOMOS to undertake this mission in September 1999.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be made available at the time of its twenty-third extraordinary session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

**The Potala Palace, Lhasa (The People's Republic of China)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* In approving the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List at its eighteenth session in 1994, the Committee recommended the Chinese authorities to extend the boundary to include Jokhang Temple and the surrounding historic quarters. This point was discussed at the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996 and the Delegate of China informed the Bureau that the Chinese authorities were in favour of this extension as recommended by the Committee. A report was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of China in July 1998, which indicated that the Government of the Tibetan Autonomous Region would be formally requesting the inclusion of Jokhang Temple within this site, and that the responsible Chinese authorities would proceed accordingly. On 18 August 1998, the World Heritage Centre requested the Director-General of the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of China to provide further information on the progress of the extension before 1 October 1998. No written correspondence has however been received by the Secretariat.

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

The Bureau, at its twenty-second extraordinary session in November 1998, took note of the concerns raised in press reports and by international experts on the demolition of historic buildings and new construction activities in the Barkhor historic area encircling the Jokhang Temple which is part of the proposed extension area, and requested the Chinese authorities for information in this regard

The World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-second session held in December 1998, noted the Bureau's request to the State Party.

*New information:* On 10 December 1998, the World Heritage Centre transmitted the request of the Bureau to the Chinese authorities for follow-up action. On 28 April 1999, the Centre once

again requested the Chinese authorities for information concerning the possible extension of this site. To date, no additional information has been received by the Secretariat.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine further information that may be made available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon. The Secretariat may briefly report to the Bureau the progress made in the extension of this property, if the nomination is submitted by 1 July 1999.

### **Groups of Monuments at Hampi (India)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1986)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* N/A

*New information:* On 25 January 1999 an independent expert informed the Secretariat that a highway and bridge over Tungabhadra River cutting across the World Heritage protected area of the site of Hampi were under construction. On 8 February 1999 during a brief mission to New Delhi, a staff member of the World Heritage Centre called on the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and the Indian National Commission for UNESCO. Photographs of the construction works were provided and UNESCO's concern over the negative impact these public works may have on the integrity of this World Heritage Site was expressed. Moreover, it was suggested that the Indian authorities consider halting the on-going works until evidence is established on the non-obtrusive nature of the works and that a report be submitted by the State Party for consideration by the World Heritage Bureau at its twenty-third session. To date, the Secretariat has not received this report.

According to an independent expert report received by the Centre, other obtrusive buildings are being constructed, allegedly without permission from the national authorities, in addition to this bridge over the Tungabhadra River being constructed beside the Virupaksha Temple as an extension of the road up-grading works.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having been informed of the on-going public and private works within the World Heritage Site of the Groups of Monuments at Hampi, expresses deep concern over the declared threat on the integrity of the site. The Bureau recommends the Secretariat: (a) to organize urgently, a reactive monitoring mission to the site to assess the situation in close co-operation with the State Party and independent experts, and, (b) to submit a report by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau with a view to recommend the possible inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee at its twenty-third session.”

### **Churches and Convents of Goa (India)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1986)

*International Assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* N/A

*New information:* The World Heritage Centre undertook a mission to Goa in January 1999 to develop a project proposal based on co-operation between the local authorities of Old Goa (India), Guimareas (Portugal) and Brighton & Hove (UK) for submission to the European Union Asia Urbs Programme. During this mission, it was noted that while there is an important effort being made to conserve the individual monuments, the overall site is not cohesive, both visually and spatially. Widening of the roads, neglect of archaeological ruins and new spatial organization and landscaping have enclosed the individual monuments in garden squares which have no relation to the historic urban form, thereby making the site into a collection of monuments undermining the integrity of the site as a former port town.

Urgent conservation needs for Se' Cathedral, Basilica of Bom Jesus and Church of St Francis of Assisi visited during the mission were noted, particularly the repair of moisture damaged wooden panels in order not to lose the art work (paintings and wood carving) on the panels.

An independent expert report subsequently received by the Centre noted grave concern over damages caused to some of the monuments due to the poor restoration work carried out with inappropriate material (concrete, synthetic paint, etc) in earlier years. While noting improvements in the more recent conservation work undertaken, the independent expert report stressed the need to enhance specialised training in material and architectural conservation, as well as the need to elaborate a comprehensive site management plan which would take into account a better presentation of the historic urban form of the site. Moreover, the report noted that the integrity and authenticity of the site would be seriously undermined if the planned project for the upgrading and extension of National Road No. 4 is implemented.

The Centre, upon consultations with the authorities of Old Goa, the State of Goa and locally-based experts of the Orient Foundation, among other institutions and non-governmental organizations, and in close collaboration with the local branch of the Archaeological Survey of India, prepared a project proposal for urban conservation and presentation. This proposal is now pending approval by the central government authorities prior to submission to donors. Subsequent discussions with the Portuguese Direction-General for National Monuments and Edifices (DGEMN) have resulted in a commitment of collaboration between the Centre and DGEMN to carry out an inventory of the site as the first step in elaborating a more coherent conservation management plan.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having been informed of the state of conservation of the property and efforts undertaken by the Secretariat in mobilizing financial and technical support, requests the State Party in collaboration with UNESCO and international conservation experts to: (a) make a thorough evaluation of the conservation needs of each monument, including conservation training requirements, (b) review the existing site development plan with a view of enhancing the coherence in the relationship between the monuments and its historic urban context, (c) develop an integrated and multi-sectoral approach in the safeguarding and development of the site to ensure that public works to improve the network of necessary roads and utilities do not undermine the integrity of this World Heritage site. The Bureau requests the State Party to submit a report on the actions taken by 15 April 2000 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth session.”

**Sun Temple of Konarak (India)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984)

*International assistance:* Emergency Assistance 1997: US\$ 39,000: Thorough structural study to determine the most appropriate emergency measures to be undertaken, following the serious land subsidence due to unusually heavy monsoon rain. At the time of submission of the Emergency Assistance Request, the Government of India indicated that it intended to nominate this site for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Archaeological Survey of India commenced this activity in February 1998, and it is on-going.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee, at its twenty-first session in 1997, requested the Government of India to report on the findings of the structural studies to be undertaken with the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance grant at its twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998. The Government of India was also requested to keep the Secretariat informed in the meantime, to enable UNESCO to mobilize additional international co-operation to undertake corrective measures, as required. Although the Observer of India assured the Committee that the report on the structural studies would be submitted, as requested, the study has not been received as of 4 May 1999. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre has not received sufficient justification for the continuation of financial support for this study.

*New information:* Since May 1998, the World Heritage Centre received information concerning the continued deterioration of the stone structures at the Sun Temple of Konarak. To cite but one example, a stone at the north-east side of the Jagamohan porch, weighing 2 tons, reportedly fell on the Pidha ledge of the Sun Temple on 19 September 1998.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the new developments at the Sun Temple of Konarak, expresses serious concern over its state of conservation, and requests the Government of India to take urgent measures to halt the deterioration of the stone structures at this site. The Bureau requests the World Heritage Centre to urgently field a mission to (a) prepare a report on the state of conservation of the site and the adequacy of conservation measures in place; (b) recommend, if necessary, additional measures that may be needed for the conservation of the site; and (c) assist the Government of India in submitting information concerning the structural study, implemented with financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance Reserve made available in 1998. The Bureau requests the World Heritage Centre to submit a report of the mission for review by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session, and invites the Government of India to clarify whether or not it intends to nominate this site for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

**The Sokkuram Grotto Temple (Republic of Korea)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1995)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* N/A

*New information:* In April 1999, the Secretariat received a report from a university-based scientific research institute in Korea, indicating that an out-dated incinerator banned in many

countries is being installed in a location 6.6 km from the Pulgulksa Temple. According to this report, the average emission rate of 0.92 ng per cubic metre of dioxin produced by this type of incinerator will have a negative impact on the Temple.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having been informed of a report from an independent source of the potential negative environmental impact the installation of the incinerator may have on the Pulgulksa Temple, requests the State Party to provide a scientific report to the Secretariat by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.”

### **Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

International assistance: A total of US\$ 240,374 has been provided as assistance from the World Heritage Fund for safeguarding this site since its inscription in 1979.

Preparatory Assistance: 1997 US\$ 7,510: Formulation of the nomination form of Khokana Village as an additional Monument Zone to Kathmandu Valley site.

Training Assistance: 1997 US\$ 14,000: Training of Development Control Unit staff of the Department of Archaeology for enhanced management of Kathmandu Valley site.

Technical Co-operation: 1995 US\$ 52,000: UNESCO International Technical Advisor for a 6-month period in view of the serious and urgent need to strengthen measures to redress the present state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley site.

1998 US\$ 35,000: UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Joint Mission for reporting on the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley site and to elaborate a plan of corrective measures.

1998 US\$ 28,000: Studies on traditional architecture, construction, and conservation techniques, and documentation of Bhaktapur Monument Zone buildings.

1998 US\$ 19,800: Thorough structural survey of the 55 Windows Palace in Bhaktapur Monument Zone and studies on traditional building material.

1999 US\$ 20,000: Documentation of 120 historical buildings composing the Bauddhanath Monument Zone.

Emergency Assistance: 1995 US\$ 24,310: Restoration of the tower roof of Taleju Mandir, Patan Palace, Patan Monument Zone, Kathmandu Valley site.

1997 US\$ 19,969: Restoration of the roof and upper floors of the Ritual Kitchen of Taleju Mandir, Patan Palace, Patan Monument Zone, Kathmandu Valley site.

Promotional Assistance: 1998 US\$ 5,000: Promotion of the World Heritage Convention at the Monument Zones composing the Kathmandu Valley site.

Monitoring: 1994 US\$ 3,356: Monitoring mission and attendance to a Strategy Meeting on Kathmandu Valley site.

1996 US\$ 3,000: Preparation of Kathmandu Valley Donors' Meeting.

1996 US\$ 6,129: Mission to assist the preparation of a state of conservation report for submission to the World Heritage Committee.

1996 US\$ 2,300: Expert participation at the International Technical Meeting on the Conservation of the 55 Windows Palace, Bhaktapur Monument Zone, Kathmandu Valley site.

In addition to these contributions, there have been UNESCO Funds-in-Trust projects funded by the Government of Japan and activities supported by the UNESCO Division of Cultural Heritage within the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign (see Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.13). Other ear-marked voluntary contributions to the

UNESCO World Heritage Fund from NGOs (US\$ 90,000) and private sector donors (US\$ 20,000) for pilot project implementation have been mobilized by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for enhanced management of the Kathmandu Valley site.

Summary of previous deliberations: The Committee, at its seventeenth session, expressed deep concern over the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley site and considered the possibility of placing it on the List of World Heritage in Danger, following discussions on the findings of the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission.

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

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

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

The Committee decided to defer consideration of the inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its twenty-third session. However, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission and to respect the deadlines of the Time-Bound Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal. In addition, the Committee recommended that HMG of Nepal adopts the three additional ICOMOS recommendations annexed to the 55 recommendations already adopted by HMG of Nepal. Moreover, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to submit a report on the progress made in implementing the 55 recommendations before 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June 1999.

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

New information: HMG of Nepal submitted a progress report on the implementation of the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission on 13 April 1999 to the World Heritage Centre. This

new information is presented in Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.12. HMG of Nepal has completed eight out of 11 Time-Bound Actions, which were to be completed before 30 November 1998.

However, important actions such as Actions 2 and 7, which relate to the approval of the Ancient Monument Preservation Rules, including the establishment of the classification criteria of monuments into international, national and local importance, have not been completed. The delay in the establishment of the Rules, originally expected to have been approved by the Cabinet by 30 June 1998, is of serious concern, as they are essential tools for the relevant authorities in implementing the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act. They will also enable a Monuments Conservation Fund to be established. Action 8, which is the approval of the Master Plan of Bauddhanath Monument Zone, is still pending although the original date of implementation was 30 November 1998.

In view of the serious concern expressed by the Committee at its twenty-first session concerning alarming and flagrant building violations surrounding the Bauddhanath stupa, a feasibility study for correcting illegal buildings at Bauddhanath Monument Zone was being undertaken by HMG of Nepal, following the detailed recommendations of ICOMOS during the Joint Mission. Although a preliminary progress report on the feasibility study was submitted by HMG of Nepal in June 1998, no further information has been presented concerning the technical and financial feasibility for correcting the illegal buildings immediately surrounding the stupa, nor for enforcing building regulations within Bauddhanath Monument Zone.

**Action by the Bureau:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following decision:

“The Bureau examined the progress report submitted by HMG of Nepal in implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission and the report of the Secretariat. The Bureau requests HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission and urges HMG of Nepal to respect the deadlines for the implementation of the Time-Bound Action Plan of Corrective Measures, especially in relation to the establishment of the essential Ancient Monuments Preservation Rules which should increase the capacity of the relevant authorities in implementing the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act and in establishing a Monuments Conservation Fund for safeguarding the Kathmandu Valley site.

The Bureau requests HMG of Nepal to report on the progress made in enforcing existing building regulations at Bauddhanath Monument Zone, and on the technical and financial plan for correcting the illegal buildings immediately surrounding the stupa, following the detailed recommendations of ICOMOS during the Joint Mission, before 15 September 1999.

Finally, the Bureau requests HMG of Nepal to submit a report on the further progress made in implementing the 55 recommendations before 15 September 1999 for examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.”

**Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1997)

*International assistance:* N/A



Summary of previous deliberations: N/A

New information: The Secretariat received a request from the Japanese Buddhist Federation (JBF) to urgently organize an international technical meeting to discuss the proposal prepared by JBF, which has been providing financial and technical assistance for the conservation, restoration and presentation of the Maya Devi Temple within the archaeological zone of the World Heritage site. JBF informed the World Heritage Centre that it wishes to proceed with its restoration proposal (already submitted to the Lumbini Development Trust), only after examining the proposal with the national authorities concerned and international experts recommended by UNESCO.

The Maya Devi Temple is the most important archaeological vestige at this World Heritage site, which is exposed to natural elements and visitors. It is temporarily protected with a corrugated roof at the present time. In view of the growing number of visitors and the religious significance of this pilgrimage site, both the Lumbini Development Trust and JBF wish to adequately protect and present the Maya Devi Temple site as a matter of urgency. However, to ensure that the restoration and presentation of the Temple follows international conservation norms, UNESCO recommended that an international technical meeting be organized. The World Heritage Centre provided assistance to the authorities of Nepal in preparing a technical co-operation request to co-finance this meeting, scheduled to take place in September 1999. However, the request has not been officially submitted to date.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the report of the Secretariat, and having noted the fragility of this important pilgrimage site, recommends the authorities of Nepal to make the necessary arrangements to organize an international technical meeting to examine the proposal for the conservation, restoration and presentation of the Maya Devi Temple. The Bureau requests the World Heritage Centre to assist the authorities of Nepal in the organization of the meeting, and report on the developments and action taken by the State Party for examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999”

**Taxila (Pakistan)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1980)

International Assistance: Technical co-operation 1995: US\$ 28,000: Vegetation control of the “*daub*” weed throughout the archaeological remains of Taxila. Due to administrative reasons, this activity was delayed until March 1999. It is being implemented by UNESCO Bangkok Office in co-operation with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Promotional assistance 1999: US\$ 5,000: On-site promotion of the World Heritage Convention – the purpose of this activity is to increase awareness of the Convention at 10 of the 55 archaeological remains composing the Taxila World Heritage site. The national authorities are simultaneously disseminating information on the national legislation, and the world heritage values of Taxila.

Summary of previous deliberations: Upon examination of an expert mission report, the Bureau, at its nineteenth session in July 1995, recommended that the authorities of Pakistan, in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre, (i) carry out the required scientific studies on vegetation control to minimize the damage to the masonry and structure of the monuments and;

(ii) to appraise the impact of the heavy industry and the stone quarrying in the Taxila Valley areas. Since then, studies and training for vegetation control has been initiated. In 1996, a stone quarry was closed to reduce its negative impact on the archaeological remains of the Jaulian site, Dharmajika Temple site and the Bhir Mound. However, a report on the impact of the heavy industry, particularly that of the military, has not been submitted by the authorities of Pakistan to the World Heritage Committee.

*New information:* During a mission undertaken in February 1999, a World Heritage Centre staff witnessed the alarming construction of a football stadium on an unexcavated area on the Bhir Mound site, the earliest historical citadel site within Taxila World Heritage site. The stadium was being built directly on an archaeological area, which the Government of Pakistan had purchased in 1954. At the time of the mission, construction workers had already finished digging the dredges for the rectangular outer brick wall of the stadium, exposing the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD strata stone walls and pottery shards. A well had been dug and workers had exposed all four strata of the Taxila Ancient City at Bhir Mound, including the earliest dating to the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC Achaemenian period. The construction is on an archaeological area as yet unexcavated and no documentation of this area has been undertaken. The construction of the stadium would irreversibly damage the site, preventing archaeological and scientific research of one fifth of the most ancient part of the Taxila World Heritage site. A stadium will imply the installation of new drainage and water supply systems at the site to meet the needs of the stadium users, which could damage the archaeological remains. Furthermore, this stadium is bound to lead to an increase in visitors to a site that is not adequately prepared for mass tourism. In March 1999, the Director of the World Heritage Centre addressed a letter to the Minister of Culture of Pakistan requesting that urgent measures be taken to ensure the protection and preservation of Bhir Mound. However, no response has been received, as of 4 May 1999.

The mission also expressed deep concern over evidences of illegal excavations at two of the archaeological remains in the Taxila World Heritage site which were examined. The representatives of the Government of Pakistan confirmed that large-scale illegal excavation by looters in search of sculptures within Buddhist monastery sites had increased in the past two years.

Finally, the mission, informed of the construction of a second heavy industry complex and military base within Taxila Valley, and expressed concern over the continuing expansion of the industrial estates. Despite their location outside the very limited buffer zone surrounding the registered archaeological sites, these industrial complexes nonetheless risk impacting upon the overall integrity of the Taxila World Heritage site in its ensemble.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the state of conservation of Taxila, requests the Government of Pakistan to take urgent measures to halt the construction of the stadium being built on Bhir Mound. Furthermore, the Bureau requests the Government of Pakistan to urgently undertake archaeological research at unexcavated sites at Taxila, and adequately protect the sites from illegal looters. In view of Pakistan’s adherence to the UNESCO 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the Bureau recommends that the authorities of Pakistan urgently strengthen security at the archaeological remains of Taxila and the customs control at the borders of the North-Western Frontier Province. Finally, the Bureau requests the Government of Pakistan to

undertake an impact study of the heavy industries in the Taxila Valley areas, and to submit a report on the actions taken by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.”

**Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1981)

*International assistance:* Emergency Assistance: 1981

*Summary of previous deliberations:* N/A

*New information:* In 1997, a request for Technical Co-operation was submitted by the Pakistan authorities for the “development of Shalamar Gardens”, which aimed at restoring the gardens to the original Mughal pattern by removing the plantations and additions of the latest period. However, as the request did not address urgent conservation problems of the gardens and its monuments, a mission by an ICOMOS expert was organized by the World Heritage Centre in October-November 1998 to assess repair needs, to report on the state of conservation of the gardens and landscape, and to make recommendations for future action following international conservation norms. An evaluation of the Master Plan for the Preservation and Restoration of Shalamar Gardens Lahore (April 1998) was also undertaken.

Despite the commendable efforts made by the responsible authorities within their limited financial resources, the ICOMOS expert reported on the general state of disrepair of the structural components and buildings of the Shalamar Gardens. The expert noted with concern that due to the recent development around the gardens, inner and outer ground levels differ, resulting in damage to the peripheral walls caused by moisture and efflorescence. The deterioration of the water channels of the fountains is leading to water leakage, and the Gardens on the three terraces no longer have the historical layout nor the greenery of the Mughal period. The mission made 17 recommendations, which were presented to the authorities of Pakistan in February 1999.

A follow-up mission was undertaken by a World Heritage Centre staff member in March 1999, to assist the authorities of Pakistan in submitting a request for international assistance to address recommendations made by the ICOMOS expert. During the mission, the authorities of Pakistan adopted all 17 recommendations and a request for preparatory assistance was formulated addressing five of the 17 recommendations. However, this request has not been officially submitted by the authorities of Pakistan to date.

During the World Heritage Centre staff mission, the state of conservation of the Fort of Lahore was also examined. The mission expressed concern about the lack of an overall Management Plan and the use of non-traditional building material for the restoration of the various monuments composing Lahore Fort. In view of the large number of visitors to the site, an urgent need for a Master Plan for enhanced management was identified.

The Pakistan authorities brought the attention of the mission to the alarming deterioration of the Shish Mahal Pavilion’s Mirror Hall ceiling, where the convex mirror glass is cracking away from the carved stucco ceiling, and urgently requested international expert advice. An ICCROM reactive monitoring mission is expected to take place in May 1999 to assist the authorities in addressing the problems of structural stability of Shish Mahal and for appropriate

conservation methodology for the ceiling. A report will be presented by ICCROM during the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to consider the additional information provided by ICCROM at its session and adopt the following:

“The Bureau, upon examining the report of the ICOMOS expert and the World Heritage Centre, recommends the authorities of Pakistan to submit a request for international assistance for adequate protection of the Shalamar Gardens without further delay. The Bureau requests the relevant authorities of Pakistan to examine the possibility of formulating a plan for lowering the ground level immediately surrounding the peripheral walls of the Shalamar Gardens to its original level before recent additions.

The Bureau requests the World Heritage Centre to assist the authorities of Pakistan in requesting international assistance for formulating a Master Plan for enhanced management of Lahore Fort.”

**Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras (Philippines)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1995)

*International Assistance:* Preparatory Assistance: 1994 US\$ 13,200: Formulation of the nomination form.

Preparatory Assistance: 1997 US\$ 15,000: Preparation of a Technical Co-operation Request for mapping the Rice Terraces.

Technical Co-operation: 1999 US\$ 50,000: GIS for mapping the Rice Terraces and for strengthening enhanced management.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session, the Committee approved a technical co-operation request for purchasing computer equipment and for partially funding the international experts' fees, for producing new maps for efficient and adequate management of this cultural landscape site, which is very vulnerable to a variety of adverse impacts. The Regional Advisor for Culture in the Asia-Pacific is assisting the authorities of the Philippines in implementing this activity.

*New information:* ICOMOS Germany expressed serious concern on the state of conservation and management of the Rice Terraces Philippines Cordilleras in December 1998, following an expert mission undertaken at the invitation of the Culture Committee of the Philippines within the Philippines National Commission to UNESCO. In January 1999, the Director of the World Heritage Centre recommended that the Government of the Philippines appoint a special team of experts, composed of various national and local authorities responsible for this site, in order to prepare a realistic plan of corrective measures upon technical evaluation of the conservation needs. No response concerning this recommendation has been received by the World Heritage Centre. Meanwhile, the Ifugao Terraces Commission responded in March 1999 informing the World Heritage Centre that it has taken into consideration for future action, the recommendations made by the expert concerning the creation of a buffer zone around the rice plantation areas, the restoration of the watersheds of Batad and the promotion of traditional houses in Batad.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, upon examining the report of the World Heritage Centre, requests the authorities of the Philippines to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Technical Co-operation project for GIS mapping, and to report on the actions taken in addressing the concerns raised by ICOMOS experts, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session. Furthermore, it reiterates the recommendation of the Director of the World Heritage Centre that a team of experts, composed of various national and local authorities responsible for this site, be urgently appointed in order to prepare a realistic plan of corrective measures upon technical evaluation of the conservation needs of this site.”

**Sacred City of Kandy (Sri Lanka)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988)  
**Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988)  
**Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991)

*International Assistance:* Technical Co-operation: 1998 US\$ 25,000: In view of the fact that the Emergency Assistance Reserve of the World Heritage Fund for 1998 was exhausted at the time the request was considered, US\$ 25,000 was granted under the Technical Co-operation budget to carry out the initial emergency measures for Dalada Maligawa, including a provision for an ICOMOS or ICCROM expert mission. The Bureau recommended the State Party to request further funding under the 1999 budget. However, no further request has been made to date. The Ministry of Cultural and Religious Affairs commenced this technical co-operation activity in August 1998, and it is believed to be on-going.

Promotional Assistance: 1998 US\$ 5,000: On-site signage concerning the World Heritage Convention.

Training: 1989 US\$ 9,171: Fellowship for wall painting conservation.

Training: 1989 US\$ 35,000: Cultural Triangle.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second session, the Bureau examined the reports from ICOMOS, the Secretariat and the Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka, concerning the damage at the Temple of the Tooth, Kandy, following the terrorist bombing in January 1998. The authorities of Sri Lanka were requested to submit a report concerning the progress made in the restoration work undertaken, for presentation to the twenty-second session of the Committee. To date, this report has not been received by the Secretariat. However, ICOMOS experts found during a monitoring mission in December 1998, that conservation and restoration works are progressing steadily. On the other hand, the World Heritage Centre has not received sufficient justification for the 1998 financial support for technical co-operation and promotional assistance for the Sacred City of Kandy site.

*New information:* ICOMOS monitoring missions to these three World Heritage sites were undertaken in December 1998:

**Sacred City of Kandy:**

ICOMOS experts reported that conservation and restoration works are progressing steadily at the Temple of the Tooth. In particular, the high level of management of the site by both conservation and administration teams was noted. Given the strong public support for the conservation policy including development control of the whole city, ICOMOS experts noted

that the systematic approach applied to urban conservation in Kandy could serve as a model for other relevant areas in Sri Lanka.

Seventeen recommendations were made by the ICOMOS experts for enhancing the conservation and management of the site. These recommendations address: (a) the need to consult stakeholders and experts before the finalization and implementation of the comprehensive Master Plan; (b) the need to improve traffic and parking systems immediately surrounding the World Heritage site; (c) the need for better information dissemination concerning development guidelines by the local authorities; and (d) the need to redefine the core zone to include the Kandy Lake and Udawattakele which form an integral part of the site, and the buffer zone to include the mountain range of Walker Estate to preserve the skyline of the site.

#### **Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications:**

ICOMOS experts reported on the need for a clear demarcation of the World Heritage site and its buffer zone, and strongly recommended that the core zone should include the ancient harbour of Galle.

Eleven recommendations were made by the ICOMOS experts which address (a) the need to increase the standards of conservation of the monuments and historic buildings within the site; (b) the need to carry out scientific research of urban development of the historic town and the architectural details and; (c) the need to prepare and implement, with adequate technical staff, an overall Development Plan, for guiding development within the living historic town as well as for proper conservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings, following international conservation norms.

#### **Golden Temple of Dambulla:**

ICOMOS experts reported on the state of conservation of the site and its buffer zone, including information on the improved infrastructure around the site. However, ICOMOS experts expressed concern that no conservation work has been carried out at the Golden Temple since the site's inscription on the World Heritage List, which has resulted in the general deterioration of the monument.

ICOMOS experts recommended that immediate intervention be arranged. ICOMOS experts made eight recommendations for improved conservation and management of the site, including the removal of the newly constructed temple that is alien to the World Heritage complex.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau, having examined the reports of ICOMOS, expresses concern over the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications, and the Golden Temple of Dambulla. The Bureau requests the Government of Sri Lanka to take urgent measures for enhanced conservation, presentation and management of these two sites, and to halt new construction which could undermine the integrity of the sites. In particular, the Bureau requests the Authorities of Sri Lanka to submit a technical co-operation request, with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre, to formulate a Development Plan for the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications. The Bureau, while commending the relevant authorities on the high level of management at the Sacred City of Kandy, requests that they continue their efforts to enhance the management of the site. The Bureau recommends that the

authorities of Sri Lanka consider extending the core zone of the Sacred City of Kandy site to include the Kandy Lake and Udawattakele, and the buffer zone to include the mountain range of Walker Estate. Extension of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications to include the ancient harbour is also recommended.

The Bureau encourages the relevant authorities to consider the ICOMOS recommendations following its mission in December 1998. The Bureau requests the State Party to submit a report on the progress made in the restoration works at the Temple of the Tooth at Kandy by 15 September 1999, to enable reporting to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999. Finally, the Bureau requests the State Party to submit a report on the progress made in improving the general management of all three sites, before 1 May 2000 for consideration by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau in June/July 2000.”

## **Latin America and the Caribbean**

### **Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis (Argentina and Brazil)**

#### **The Jesuit Mission of Santa Ana (Argentina)**

(Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1983-1984)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* A report on the state of conservation of the Jesuit Missions was examined by the Committee at its seventeenth session (paragraph X.4 of the report).

*New information:* In January 1999, the World Heritage Centre received information about the construction of an industrial plant close to the Jesuit Mission of Santa Ana. In response, the National Commission for Museums, Monuments and Historical Sites informed that: (1) the industrial plant is at 700 meters from the central square of the Mission and that both are separated by a protective zone of 170 hectares and dense vegetation and that it does not affect the values of the Mission, and (2) the construction of the industrial plant has led to developing a plan for a new and more appropriate access to the Mission.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the State Party and requests the authorities to submit by 15 September 1999, for further study and possible examination by the World Heritage Committee, a detailed plan and photographic documentation of the Mission of Santa Ana and its surroundings, including the location of the industrial plant as well as the actual and planned access.”

**Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1990)

*International assistance:* Emergency assistance: 1998: US\$ 50,000 has been provided for rehabilitation works at the Palacio de Borgella.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee at its twenty-second session requested the authorities to submit a progress report on the actions taken in response to the report of a

monitoring mission (undertaken in August 1998) and the damage caused by Hurricane Georges (September 1998).

*New information:* A report prepared by the Office for Cultural Heritage of the Dominican Republic has been received. The report addresses exclusively the damages caused by Hurricane Georges. It is reported that, although the hurricane was extremely strong, damage to the cultural heritage of Santo Domingo was limited, with the exception of the Palacio de Borgella the portico of which collapsed. At the same time, however, it is reported that the hurricane aggravated the already precarious conditions of a great number of privately owned historical residences (appr. 50) and that the problems identified are not responded to by any institution. The report concludes by identifying factors that hinder a structural approach to the rehabilitation and preservation of the city, such as lack of financial and human resources, low participation of the private sector in restoration and rehabilitation, weak legal framework, high level of sub-tenancy.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau takes note of the report submitted by the authorities of the Dominican Republic on the damage caused by Hurricane Georges and requests the authorities to keep the Committee informed of further actions taken in response to the 1998 monitoring mission and towards the integrated rehabilitation of the historical centre of the city.”

**City of Cusco (Peru)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1983)

*International assistance:* Technical co-operation 1997: US\$ 20,000 for the preparation of a Master Plan. This assistance could not be implemented due to the lack of appropriate co-ordination between the Institute for Culture and the Municipality of Cusco.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session reiterated concerns about the state of conservation of the City of Cusco and urged the national and local authorities to make adequate arrangements for the preparation and application of a Master Plan for the City. It also urged to consider interventions in public spaces as well as new construction and rehabilitation works in full respect of the urban, architectural and historic values that are represented in the City as well as international standards of intervention in historic urban areas. The Bureau requested the Peruvian authorities to inform the Secretariat of the actions taken in response to the above by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

*New information:* At the date of the preparation of this document no report had been received from the Peruvian authorities.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.



## Europe and North America

### **Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1991)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee at its twenty-second session noted information provided by ICOMOS and the French Delegate with regard to the proposed construction of a media library (mediateque) in the vicinity of the cathedral of Reims. As to the invitation of the French authorities for ICOMOS to participate in the commission that will study the preservation and planing of the ‘Parvis’ of the cathedral, the Committee encouraged both parties to continue the dialogue on the planning for the surroundings of the cathedral and to keep the Committee informed on the progress made in this respect.

*New information:* By letter dated 7 May 1999, the Permanent Delegation of France informed that agreement has been reached to establish a precisely defined protection zone around the Cathedral (Zone de protection du patrimoine architectural, urbain et paysager ZPPAUP), the exact limits of which remained to be defined. At the same time, a project for the surroundings of the Cathedral (le Parvis) will be subject of a competition. The ICOMOS designated expert will be invited to participate in this process.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following:

“The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the French authorities and requests them to keep the Committee informed on further developments regarding the protection and planning for the surroundings of the Cathedral.”

### **Roman Monuments, Cathedral and Liebfrauen Church in Trier (Germany)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1986)

*International assistance:* N/A.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee and its Bureau examined the state of conservation of this site on several occasions, particularly in reference to new constructions in the vicinity of the Roman amphitheatre. The Bureau at its twenty-second session (June 1998) expressed satisfaction that the main requirements to protect its integrity and authenticity had been met. It stressed that further attention was required for the integration of recently discovered archaeological remains and reiterated that an extension of the protected area to include the adjacent vineyards was highly desirable. It requested the German authorities to submit a report by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

*New information:* A report prepared by the Ministry of Culture, Youth, Family and Women’s Affairs of Rheinland-Pfalz was received on 7 May 1999 stating that the building permit for the new constructions north of the amphitheatre was issued on 23 December 1998 with the following characteristics: removal of one building in order to ensure sufficient distance from the theatre; use of the western half of the site for green areas and access to the theatre; height limitation to the building closest to the theatre. The report also states that the recently discovered archaeological remains are incorporated in the plans. Consultations are taking place

between the Regional Office for the Preservation of Monuments and the city authorities with regard to the possible extension of the World Heritage site. This report was transmitted to ICOMOS for advice.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine the above report from the German authorities and the advice of ICOMOS that will be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Historic Centre of Florence (Italy)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1982)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session requested the Italian authorities to consider the matter of the construction of a high tension power line through the landscape surrounding Florence and to submit a report by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session. The Delegate of Italy informed the Committee at its twenty-second session that consultations were underway between the Ministry for Cultural Properties and Activities, the Ministry of Industry and the electricity company to mitigate its impact.

*New information:* At the time of preparation of this document, no report had been received from the Italian authorities.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided/ may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

### **Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1979)

*International Assistance:* Technical Co-operation 1998: US\$ 20,000 for the organization of an International Expert Meeting on the Planning and Protection of the Surroundings of the World Heritage site Auschwitz Concentration Camp that was held on 2 and 3 June 1998 in Oswiecim and Bielsko-Biala, Poland.

*Summary of previous deliberations:* On 5 March 1997 a *Declaration Concerning Principles for Implementation of Program Oswiecimski* was initiated by the Polish Government Plenipotentiary for the Government Strategic Plan for Oswiecim, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, the International Council of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau and the Mayor of Oswiecim in the presence of the President of Poland. Progress on the implementation of the Declaration was made particularly through an expert meeting that was held on 2 and 3 June 1998 on the spatial management of the area around the two Concentration Camps, the presentation of a progress report in autumn 1998 and through the expert meeting which took place on 11 and 12 March 1999 in Poland. The World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session held in Kyoto, 30 November – 5 December 1998, requested the Polish authorities to submit a progress report by 15 April 1999 (deadline extended to 1 June 1999) for examination by the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Bureau. The Committee confirmed its support for the principles laid out in the Declaration of March 1997 and also its support that this process continues in a consensual manner among all parties involved. It expressed the belief that no steps should be made unless consensus is reached.

New information: The Government of Poland will submit a progress report by 1 June 1999.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided/ may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

**Angra do Heroísmo (Portugal)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1983)

International assistance: N/A

Summary of previous deliberations: The Committee at its twenty-second session expressed concerns and preoccupation about the location and impact of a marina that was planned for construction in the Bay of Angra do Heroísmo. While recognizing the economic need for a marina, it was of the opinion that this should be considered in the context of an overall conservation plan for the site. It encouraged the State Party to continue its dialogue with ICOMOS and the Committee in order to find the best solution.

New information: On the request of the Portuguese authorities, a joint WHC-ICOMOS mission was undertaken to Angra do Heroísmo from 28 to 31 January 1999. The mission examined the progress made in the preparation and adoption of the protective measures planning mechanisms for the city and its surroundings and noted the need for these to be further integrated.

The mission requested the authorities to submit by 1 May 1999: (1) a detailed report about the measures taken for the protection of the World Heritage site and the insertion of the marina in the overall development and preservation of the city, as well as a timeframe and coordination mechanisms for the preparation and adoption of different planning and regulatory instruments; and (2) a substantive report on the marina, including justification for its proposed location (alternative locations; historical, cultural, urbanistic and technical considerations; analysis of impact of the marina including traffic flow, infrastructure); proposals for the improvement of the plan for the marina (separation of the dam from the waterfront; revitalisation and restoration of the contact area between city and bay; location of services away from the old quay – preferably to the Pipas harbour).

At the time of preparation of this document, no reports had been received from the Portuguese authorities. The Secretariat was informed, however, that a meeting was scheduled for 17 and 18 May 1999 at the National Laboratory for Civil Engineering in Lisbon with an invitation for the participation of an ICOMOS expert.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided/ may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

**Alhambra, Generalife and Albaicín, Granada. (Spain)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1984, 1994 (ext. Albaicín).

International assistance: N/A

Summary of previous deliberations: The work on the Rey Chico festivities hall situated between the Alhambra and the Albaicín on the left bank of the Rio Darro had been halted and a UNESCO-ICOMOS mission was undertaken in November 1997.

In 1998, the Bureau thanked the national, regional and local authorities for the efforts and the results achieved in the conclusion of the matter concerning the new construction of the Rey Chico. However, the Bureau reminded the authorities of the need to apply the Convention and the Guidelines with regard to the management plan and the unicity of the site. Consequently, the Bureau forthwith requested the Spanish national authorities to establish without delay the Spain-UNESCO Scientific Committee and to convene it as soon as possible so that the measures necessary for the appropriate management of the site be identified and programmed.

*New information:* To date, the Secretariat has not received any positive information on the creation of the Spain-UNESCO Scientific Committee.

By letter dated 18 May 1999 the Patronato de la Alhambra y Generalife de la Junta de Andalucía called attention to the fact that various projects proposed in the foreseen revision of the General Urban Plan for Granada would have a negative impact on the site. Particular mention is made of a project of the Municipality of Granada to expand considerably the cemetery that is located near to the Alhambra.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine additional information that may be provided/available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

#### **Rock Carvings in Tanum (Sweden)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1994)

*International assistance:* N/A

*Summary of previous deliberations:* The Committee at its twenty-second session expressed its appreciation of the fact that it was consulted by the Government of Sweden on the project for the upgrading of a road that would have a possible impact on the World Heritage site. It recommended the State Party to study specific alternative solutions for the road and requested the State Party to present a progress report by 15 April 1999, to be examined by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

*New information:* On 13 April 1999, the Ministry of Culture of Sweden informed the Secretariat that environmental impact studies for the different alternatives for the road upgrading have been completed as well as a specific study on the possible impact on the cultural values of the World Heritage site of Tanum. These studies will go through a consultative process before any decision is taken about the choice of the routing of the road. It is stated that the opinions expressed by the WHC-ICOMOS mission and the World Heritage Committee are valuable contributions to the process to determine the location for the new E6 road in the Tanum area.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following;

“The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the Ministry of Culture of Sweden on the process of studies and decision making on the road upgrading in the Tanum area. It requests the Government to keep the Committee and its Bureau informed on further developments in this matter.”

## **Historical Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1985)

*International Assistance:* Technical Co-operation: 1983: Conservation of the mosaics of Saint-Sophia, Historical areas of Istanbul (US 30,000); 1987: Photogrammetric equipment, Historical Areas of Istanbul (US 31,247); 1988: Equipment, Historical Areas of Istanbul (US 29,902); 1991: Conservation of the mosaics of Saint Sophia, Historical Areas of Istanbul (US 20,000); 1994: Saint Sophia, Historical Areas of Istanbul (US 20,000); 1994: Restoration of the mosaics of Saint Sophia, Historical Areas of Istanbul (US 80,000); 1999: Conservation work on the mosaics of Saint Sophia, Historical areas of Istanbul (US 50,000); 1999: Creation of the «House of the Inhabitants of the Fatih», Historical areas of Istanbul (US 30,000).

Training: 1987: Stone conservation training (US 12,000).

Assistance for Educational, Information and promotional activities: 1999: Promotion of the World Heritage Convention (US 5,000).

### **1) The Monument of Hagia Sophia of the Archaeological Park**

*Summary of previous deliberations:* At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau noted the following history of the co-operation and state of conservation of mosaics at Hagia Sophia. In 1993, an expert mission visited Hagia Sophia, one of the main monuments of the World Heritage Historic Areas of Istanbul. A series of recommendations for its rehabilitation elaborated by the UNESCO mission in 1993 was approved by the Government of Turkey, who subsequently increased its budgetary allocation for their implementation. In March 1998, another mission visited the monument and stressed the need for an advisory body of international and national experts who can meet regularly to advise the national team composed of the Hagia Sophia Museum and the Central Conservation and Restoration Laboratory, in charge of the restoration of this monument. It also noted that the restoration of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia for which the World Heritage Fund has contributed between 1983 and 1994 (in particular, US \$ 80,000 in 1994), was progressing satisfactorily. To increase the rhythm of the work, the Central Laboratory has requested additional human and financial resources. The Committee at its twenty-second session approved US \$ 50,000 out of the requested amount US \$ 100,000.

*New Information:* As a preliminary mission within the framework of the approved technical co-operation for the restoration of the mosaics at Hagia Sophia, an expert mission was sent in March 1999. The main objective of the mission was to prepare a preliminary assessment of the structural condition of the monument and to assist the Turkish authorities to draw up the detailed schedule for the restoration of mosaics. In its report, the mission concluded that there was no remarkable evidence showing rapid structural deformation and that the multidisciplinary experts' team should be organised to review the present situation and make decisions for the future interventions for both mosaics and structures. The mission also pointed out that numerous studies or investigations were undertaken by several national and international institutions, but, because of the complexity of problems, no decisions was made toward the sound mid-term restoration plan. During the mission, concerned bodies have agreed to form this multidisciplinary team this year and hold a workshop in June 1999 prior to its actual first session. The result of the workshop will be presented by the Secretariat to the members of the Bureau at the session.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine the information about the workshop that will be provided at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.

## 2) Historic Areas of Istanbul

*Summary of previous deliberations:* After having taken note of the Secretariat's report on the safeguarding of the urban heritage of the Historic Centre of Istanbul and following discussions on the degree of progress in the restoration of the mosaics of Saint Sophia, the Bureau, during its twenty-second extraordinary session, approved a request for technical co-operation for US 30,000 to create a « House for the Inhabitants of the Fatih », an advisory service for the inhabitants of Fatih; the elaboration of a detailed technical evaluation and the preparation of a programme for the repair of the historic wooden buildings. It was concerned with the state of conservation of the wooden buildings of the Ottoman Empire of Zeyrek and requested the State Party to inform the Secretariat before 15 April 1999 of the conservation measures for this site, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third ordinary session. The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to maintain close co-operation with the European Commission and the Municipality of the Fatih in the implementation of the rehabilitation project of the historic buildings of the protected areas of the World Heritage site.

Furthermore, in connection with the restoration of the mosaics of Saint Sophia, the Bureau recommended that the Government organise, in close collaboration with the Secretariat, a meeting of international experts to evaluate the progress made, establish a medium-term plan of action for the continuation of the work and elaborate specifications for the international experts required by the Central Laboratory.

*New information:* In response to the Bureau's request, made during its twenty-second extraordinary session, an international technical expertise was launched to assist the Turkish authorities in the preparation of a periodic report on the state of conservation of the sites located in the Fatih District and protected by the World Heritage Convention - notably the Zeyrek District and the Byzantine ramparts. This expertise will provide: (a) an analysis of the buildings existing in the Fatih District, with the identification of the historical structures and noteworthy architectural buildings; (b) an analysis of the laws and procedures protecting the world heritage sites and their buffer zone, in the Fatih District, © a list of national and international experts who may be consulted by the Municipality of Fatih in co-operation with UNESCO.

In addition, to assist the local inhabitants included in the zone of protection of the World Heritage Convention, to understand and support the protection of these World Heritage sites, a map, in the form of a hoarding, has been created indicating the boundaries of this area.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to adopt the following text:

«The Bureau commends the Turkish authorities and notably the Municipality of Fatih, for the establishment of the « Inhabitants House of Fatih » and the continued efforts undertaken by the Municipality of Fatih to encourage the inhabitants to restore the historical buildings in the protected areas of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau reiterates its concern with regard to the state of conservation of the buildings of the Ottoman Empire of Zeyrek and wishes to be informed at its twenty-third extraordinary session of the periodic report on the state of conservation of sites

located in the Fatih District and protected by the World Heritage Convention - the Zeyrek District and the Byzantine ramparts - and the measures that the State Party will undertake to preserve this site, which is an integral part of the rehabilitation project of the historical buildings of the Fatih District ».

**Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)** (Inscribed on the World Heritage List: 1990)

*International assistance:* Technical Co-operation 1999: US\$ 19,750 (purchase and installation of a monitoring system) for the preservation of the wall paintings, mosaics and frescos of the *Saint Sophia Cathedral*.

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

*New information:* ICOMOS will present the results of an expert mission to Kiev during the session.

**Action required:** The Bureau may wish to examine information that will be provided/ may be available at the time of its session and take the appropriate decision thereupon.