



CC-78/CONF.010/3
Original: English



UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee
Second session

Washington, D.C. (USA), 5 to 8 September 1978

Report of Rapporteur on first meeting of Bureau
of Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection
of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage

(Paris, 8 and 9 June 1978)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The first meeting of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) was held in Paris on June 8 and 9 and was attended by all members of the Bureau, comprising the Chairman, Mr. Firouz Bagherzadeh (Iran), the four Vice-Presidents, Dr. Shehata Adam (Egypt), Mr. Michel Parent (France), Dr. Ekpo O. Eyo (Nigeria), Professor Krzysztof Pawlowski (Poland), and the Rapporteur, Mr. Peter H. Bennett (Canada).
2. Representatives of the International Centre for Conservation, the International Council of Monuments and Sites and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as "ICCROM", "ICOMOS" and "IUCN" respectively) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.
3. The full list of participants will be found in Annex 1 of this Report.

II. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. After welcoming members of the Bureau on behalf of the Director General, the Deputy Assistant Director General for Operations (Culture and Communications) reported on the present situation regarding the implementation of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"). Thirty-six (36) Member States of Unesco had adhered as at 31 May 1978, and Saudi Arabia was about to do so. If the number of States adhering increases to 40 by August 23, then the Committee can be enlarged to 21 members, as provided for under the Convention, when the next elections to the Committee take place on November 24 1978 at the Second General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention to be held during the next General Conference of Unesco.

5. The Secretary explained that some nominations to the World Heritage List had not been translated into both languages, due to their late arrival at Unesco. She assured the Bureau that in future, deadlines for the receipt of nominations would be strictly adhered to and that all documentation would be available in both languages.
6. There followed a considerable discussion on the methodology for evaluating nominations and the procedures to be followed by the Committee in evaluating them. It was agreed that, because some members of the Bureau had only received copies of the nominations that morning, consideration of the nominations to the World Heritage List should be put off until the following day in order to give members more time to study them. Original item 3 (Study of the terms and conditions of preparatory assistance) would be taken next, followed by original item 5 (Examination of the form and periodicity of publication of the World Heritage List, the List of World Heritage in Danger and the List of properties for which technical co-operation is granted) and original item 4 (Consideration of a draft text of a standard agreement between the World Heritage Committee and States receiving technical co-operation), with original item 2 (Review of nominations to the World Heritage List and of requests for technical co-operation received from States Parties) to be taken last.

III. ORIGINAL AGENDA ITEM 3 : STUDY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE

7. After discussion the Bureau agreed to recommend the proposal of the Secretariat for the consideration of the Committee at its second session (5 to 8 September 1978).

IV. ORIGINAL AGENDA ITEM 5 - EXAMINATION OF THE FORM AND PERIODICITY OF PUBLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST, THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE LIST OF PROPERTIES FOR WHICH TECHNICAL COOPERATION IS GRANTED

8. After considerable discussion, the Bureau agreed to recommend to the Committee the adoption in principle of the World Heritage Emblem submitted by the Secretariat. The Secretariat was, however, requested to discuss with the artist possible colours for the Emblem, the ways in which these might be used and other possible modifications, and to present a further report on these points to the next meeting of the Committee in September.
9. There followed considerable discussion on various possible methods of publishing and publicizing the World Heritage List, the World Heritage in Danger List and the List of Requests for Assistance from the World Heritage Fund, the formats to be used and the periodicity of their publication. The proposal of the Secretariat for combining the Lists was accepted. It was agreed that initially there should be one simple publication (to be available free), to be published not less frequently than every two years in accordance with the terms of Article 11 (2) of the Convention, and that more ambitious, attractive and comprehensive forms of publication, including scientific monographs, would be considered later as circumstances permitted.

10. The Rapporteur then drew attention to the desirability of a general campaign by Unesco to publicize the objectives of the Convention and the work of the Committee. It was agreed that this should be considered under "Other Business" on June 9.

V. ORIGINAL AGENDA ITEM 4 - CONSIDERATION OF A DRAFT TEXT OF A STANDARD AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND STATES RECEIVING TECHNICAL COOPERATION

11. The Unesco Legal Adviser outlined various points to be borne in mind by the Committee in considering the draft Agreement and drew attention especially to Convention Articles 8 (1), 13 (3) and 14 (2). After discussion the Bureau agreed to recommend the draft Agreement to the Committee.

VI. ORIGINAL AGENDA ITEM 2 - REVIEW OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION RECEIVED FROM STATES PARTIES

(i) Nominations to the World Heritage List

12. The Secretariat presented to the Bureau the nominations which had so far been received. These nominations are listed below :

<u>State</u>	<u>Name of property nominated to World Heritage List</u>
Canada	L'Anse aux Meadows National Historic Park Nahanni National Park
Ecuador	Galapagos Islands City of Quito
Ethiopia	Simien National Park Lower Valley of the Awash Adulis Tiya Melka-Kontoure Matara Aksum Yeha Lower Valley of the Omo Rock Hewn Churches, Lalibela Fasil Ghebbi, Gondar region
Federal Republic of Germany	Aachen Cathedral
Poland	Historical urban and architectural area of the city of Cracow Historic Centre of Warsaw Auschwitz - concentration camp Wieliczka - salt mine National Park of Białowieza
Senegal	Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary Island of Gorée
Tunisia	Zembra and Zembretta Islands National Park Ichkeul National Park
United States of America	Mesa Verde Yellowstone

13. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that Tunisia had requested by telegram that two of its nominations, Djebel Bou Hedma and Djebel Chambi, be withdrawn for the time being, and accordingly they were not considered by the Bureau. The Chairman then invited the representatives of ICOMOS and IUCN to report on their evaluation of all the nominations received.

14. The ICOMOS representative mentioned the Canadian cultural nomination as an example of a good nomination filled out in full accordance with the nomination form and giving clearly and comprehensively all the information and documentation requested. He then referred to the written report from ICOMOS and said that nine (9) nominations appeared to meet minimum standards of documentation and to be eligible for consideration at this time. They were :

Canada : l'Anse-aux-Meadows.
 Ecuador : City of Quito
 Ethiopia : Rock-hewn churches of Lalibela
 Fasil Ghebbi, Gondar Region
 Poland : Historic Urban and Architectural Centre of Cracow
 Historic Centre of Warsaw
 Auschwitz Concentration Camp
 Wieliczka Salt Mines
 U.S.A. : Mesa Verde

ICOMOS expressed the view that, of the above sites, Fasil Ghebbi needed further study before a final evaluation could be made, and the Historic Centre of Warsaw needed further expert study to see if it met the criterion of authenticity.

15. In addition, the following two properties were found to meet (in the opinion of ICOMOS) the criteria for cultural properties but lacked the required cartographic and photographic information.

F.R.G. : Aachen Cathedral
 Senegal : Island of Gorée

The remaining eight nominations, all from Ethiopia, were found by ICOMOS to be deficient in terms of documentation.

16. The IUCN representative referred to Nahanni National Park (Canada) Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) and Yellowstone Park (USA) as excellent examples of natural sites that meet the criteria for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

17. The IUCN representative in presenting his written evaluations referred to the problem of comparable sites and the question of how many of these should appear on the World Heritage List. For example, Lac Ichkeul, nominated by Tunisia and Djoudj, nominated by Senegal, were all outstanding migratory waterfowl sanctuaries, but there were also two other comparable ones within 1000 miles, the Camargue in France and Cota Donana in Spain; should all four sites ultimately be listed?

.../

In reviewing other natural site nominations, the IUCN representative made the following observations:

Simien (Ethiopia) : further assurances desirable re continuing integrity of site.

Białowieża (Poland) : should be referred to IUCN European Bison Group for further expert evaluation

Djoudj (Senegal) : additional information needed regarding possible dam construction which would jeopardize site's integrity

Zembra & Zembretta (Tunisia) : documentation submitted not adequate for complete evaluation

Lac Ichkeul (Tunisia) : more information needed on water quality and on assurances of continued supply.

19. A general discussion then took place prior to the consideration of individual sites. The Vice President (France) suggested that the Bureau should consider general typological and methodological issues before studying individual nominations. The Vice President (Poland) asked whether there was a need for a State to prioritise its nominations when it was making more than one nomination in each category. The ICOMOS representative drew attention to paragraph 38 of the Final Report of the first Committee meeting, in which the need for prioritising in such instances was mentioned. The Vice President (Nigeria) mentioned the possible problems for developing countries in giving assurances about the continued integrity of sites nominated to the List. The Vice President (France) urged that the Committee should not defer putting an obviously suitable site on the List just because adequate legal protection for it was not apparently at present available or because there might be an element of doubt about its continued integrity. The Committee should rather put on the List any such sites that meet the criteria, as the act of putting them on the List would almost certainly accelerate the giving of protection to the Site, and should be prepared to take reasonable risks in this regard. The Bureau agreed with this point of view.

20. There was then some discussion as to the desirability of limiting the number of sites that could be nominated by each country onto the World Heritage List to two on this first occasion only, in view of the fact that the total number of nominations was not large and some States had put forward several nominations. The Bureau agreed that on this first occasion in order to have a reasonably balanced List, States should be limited to two nominations each, which could either be all cultural or all natural or a combination of both, and that any sites deferred to 1979 for this reason, which otherwise clearly met the criteria, should be placed on a waiting list.

21. The only State affected in this way on this occasion was Poland, which had nominated three cultural sites which clearly qualified for inclusion : Auschwitz, Cracow and the Salt Mines. The ICOMOS representative was therefore asked to prioritise the three sites from an expert viewpoint. ICOMOS proposed, and the Bureau accepted, that the Salt Mines was the most important site, followed by Cracow and Auschwitz in that order. It was therefore agreed that the Auschwitz nomination would be deferred.

.../

22. The Bureau then reviewed the individual nominations, cultural and natural, and made the following recommendations for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting in Washington in September,

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

Recommended for List

Canada: L'Anse aux Meadows
 Ecuador: Old City of Quito
 Ethiopia: Rock Churches of Lalibela
 Federal Republic of Germany:
 Aachen Cathedral*
 Poland: Wieliczka Salt Mines
 Historic Urban and Architectural
 Centre of Cracow
 Senegal: Gorée*
 U.S.A. : Mesa Verde

* subject to required cartographic and photographic documentation being received by Unesco Secretariat not later than July 31.

Proposed to be deferred

Ethiopia: Gondar (for further information and because Ethiopia already has one cultural and one natural site to be nominated to List)
 Other eight Ethiopian Sites were deferred because of inadequate documentation.

Poland : Auschwitz
 Historic Centre of Warsaw (for further expert evaluation in regard to criterion of authenticity)

NATURAL PROPERTIES

Recommended for List

Canada: Nahanni National Park
 Ecuador: Galapagos Islands
 Ethiopia: Simien National Park
 Tunisia: Lac Ichkeul*
 U.S.A. : Yellowstone National Park

* subject to receipt of additional needed information

Proposed to be deferred

Poland: (for expert evaluation by IUCN European Bison Committee)
 Senegal: Djoudj (for more information and more complete documentation)
 Tunisia: Zembra & Zembretta (for more information and more adequate documentation).

23. In recommending the cultural and natural sites to be nominated to the World Heritage List the Bureau noted that considerable flexibility had been shown on this first occasion in regard to both the deadline for the receipt of nominations and the completeness of the information given in the nominations, and strongly urged that the Committee from now onwards should adhere strictly both to the deadlines for the receipt of nominations and to the requirement that consideration be given only to those nominations containing full information and the necessary accompanying documentation.

24. Consideration was then given to the method of announcing the Committee's decisions on the nominations submitted to it. The Bureau agreed that any public announcement should state only that: either the nomination had been accepted; or its acceptance had been postponed because of the decision that only two sites per country should be put on the List on this first occasion; or consideration had been postponed because of insufficient documentation or the need for further expert study. In this connection it was noted that there was likely to be considerable attendance by the general public at the next Committee meeting in Washington. Detailed reasons for the postponement of consideration should be given privately by the Secretariat to the State concerned. The Bureau also noted that the Committee cannot, according to Convention Article 11 (6) immediately reject a nomination and must consult with the State concerned regarding the probable reasons for rejection. The Committee should point out to that State in such instances that the reasoned arguments for World significance are insufficient and give its reasons for this.

25. In regard to the question of the deferment of consideration of natural sites for further information or documentation, the Bureau asked the Secretariat to request IUCN to supply as soon as possible detailed explanations in each instance as to why the documentation or information was insufficient.

ii) Requests for technical cooperation

26. Simien Park (Ethiopia) Request

The Bureau felt that more precise information was needed regarding the details of the project, the realism of the salary scales proposed and the likelihood of the effective implementation of the project in the near future.

27. Request regarding listing of Islamic Sites (Egypt)

The Bureau recommended approval of this request for assistance for a period of five weeks.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Booklet on how to prepare World Heritage List nominations

28. The Bureau recommended that ICOMOS and IUCN be given a small contract from the World Heritage Fund to produce a booklet for States Parties on how to prepare World Heritage List nominations.

(b) Possible World Heritage Exhibit for Washington meeting

29. The Bureau recommended that every effort be made by the Secretariat, in cooperation with the U.S. Departments of State and Interior, to produce some form of Exhibit on the work of the Committee and on the Convention and the World Heritage List for use in Washington at the time of the Committee meeting in September. The Secretariat stated that every effort would be made to comply with this suggestion but that, in view of the limited period of time available, no commitment could be made.

(c) Campaign to publicize World Heritage Convention

30. The Bureau agreed that consideration should be given urgently to a general on-going publicity campaign to promote the objectives of the Convention and the work of the Committee. Such a campaign could help to inform the public of the importance of conserving the world heritage: accelerate adherences by Member States to the Convention; stimulate contributions to the Fund from foundations and commercial firms; and generally start fulfilling the educational mandate outlined in the Convention. The campaign should use various media, such as "PARKS" Magazine. The Bureau accordingly decided that this should be a separate item on the agenda for the Washington meeting.

(d) Agenda for Washington Committee meeting

31. The Bureau approved in principle the agenda for the Washington meeting of the Committee as proposed by the Secretariat but requested that the consideration of nominations to the World Heritage List be deferred until late in the Agenda, in order to ensure that all Committee members had ample time to review the documentation.

(e) Need for additional Secretariat support for the Committee

32. Finally, the Bureau noted with pleasure the capability and dedication of the Unesco Secretariat staff members but felt that additional staff support was essential in the fields of administration and publicity if the Committee was to be in a position to discharge its important responsibilities effectively and in good time. It was also aware that funds would be required to enable ICOMOS and IUCN to undertake proper evaluation of cultural and natural nominations to the World Heritage List. The Bureau further noted that in connection with other programmes financed by extra-budgetary sources, overhead costs were normally provided to Unesco to defray related administrative expenses. Such overhead costs were determined in accordance with the type of the activities and could amount to a maximum of 14% of total project funds.

33. The Bureau therefore decided to recommend strongly to the Committee that it give urgent consideration at its next meeting in September to the allocation of up to a maximum of 10% annually of the funds available in the World Heritage Fund to be used for three main purposes :

- (a) the hiring of additional Unesco administrative Staff support, whether on a contract basis or otherwise, within the Division of Cultural Heritage to be devoted wholly to the Work of the Committee

- (b) the development and implementation of an appropriate publicity campaign for the Convention and the work of the Committee
- (c) the provision of funds to ICOMOS and IUCN for the purpose of consulting such experts as may be required for the proper evaluation of all World Heritage List cultural and natural nominations, on the basis of an acceptable budget proposal to be submitted jointly by those two organizations.

VIII. CLOSING OF BUREAU MEETING

34. In closing the meeting the Chairman paid tribute to all members of the Bureau for their effective participation in ensuring the successful outcome of the meeting; the Unesco Staff members for their excellent support; and the interpreters for their invaluable and indispensable contribution.

(signed) Peter H. BENNETT (Canada)
Rapporteur
Paris, June 10, 1978

List of Participants

I Members of the Bureau

Canada

Mr. Peter H. Bennett
Coordinator, Liaison and Consultation
Parks Canada
Department of Indian Affairs and
Northern Development

Rapporteur

Arab Republic of Egypt

Dr. Shehata Adam
Director General of the Centre of Documentation
and Study on Ancient Egypt

Vice-Chairman

France

Mr. Michel Parent
Inspecteur général des monuments
historiques et des sites

Vice-Chairman

Mr. Jean-Pierre Bady
Directeur de la Caisse nationale
des monuments historiques

Iran

Mr. Firouz Bagherzadeh
Director General, Iranian Centre for
Archaeological Research

Chairman

Nigeria

Dr. Ekpo O. Eyo
Director
Department of Antiquities

Vice-Chairman

Poland

Professor Krzysztof Pawlowski
Conservateur général adjoint des
Monuments historiques de Pologne
Ministère de la culture et des arts

Vice-Chairman

.../

II Organizations attending in an advisory capacityInternational Centre for Conservation (ICCROM)

Mr. Giorgio Torraca
Deputy Director

International Council for Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

Dr. Ernest A. Connally
Secretary General

Mrs. Ann Webster Smith
Deputy to the Secretary General

International Union for Conservation of Nature and
Natural Resources (IUCN)

Mr. Harold K. Eidsvik
Deputy Chairman
Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas