Distribution limited

WHC-96/CONF.201/4
Paris, 25 September 1996
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twentieth session
Merida, Yucatan, Mexico

2-7 December 1996

Item 5 of the Provisional Agenda : Report of the Rapporteur of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (24-29 June 1996)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES

I. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The twentieth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 24 to 29 June 1996. The following members of the Bureau attended: Ambassador Horst Winkelmann (Germany), Chairperson, Representatives of Australia, Italy, Japan, Lebanon and Mexico as Vice-Presidents and H.E. Ambassador Lambert Messan (Niger) as Rapporteur.

I.2 Representatives of the following States Parties attended as observers: Argentina, Benin, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gambia, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Korea (Republic of), Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States of America.

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

I.4 The World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and the Nordic World Heritage Office were also represented. The full list of participants is given in Annex I.

I.5 The Chairperson, in warmly welcoming the members of the Bureau remarked on the large number of observers, attesting to the growing interest of the international community in the World Heritage Convention. He informed the Bureau that in his capacity as Chairperson to the Committee, he met the Director-General of UNESCO on two occasions to discuss the provision of personnel from UNESCO's Regular Programme for the World Heritage Secretariat in conformity with Article 14 of the Convention, as requested by the Committee, and also visited the Galapagos World Heritage Site.

I.6 Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, speaking on behalf of the Director-General, welcomed the members of the Bureau, the observers and the representatives of the advisory bodies. He reiterated the importance attached by the Director-General to World Heritage activities, especially in its role in promoting the culture of peace. The accession of Estonia, Iceland, and Mauritius to the Convention since the Committee last meeting, brings the total number of States Parties to 146, further enhancing its universality.

I.7 To strengthen the Secretariat, the Director-General has appointed Mr Georges Zouain, an experienced staff member of UNESCO, to the post of Deputy-Director and has also instructed the transfer of Mr N. Ishwaran to the Centre as a senior programme specialist for natural heritage.

I.8 The Director-General's appreciation for the work of the Bureau and the Committee in developing the methodology and

procedure for systematic reporting in full respect of the sovereignty of States Parties was also noted by the Director.

I.9 The Director concluded his opening remarks by wishing the Bureau every success in its deliberations.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

II.1 The Bureau adopted the agenda as proposed in Document WHC-96/CONF.202/1 Rev. without modification.

III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

III.1 Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre reported on the main activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last session of the Committee held in Berlin, Germany in December 1995. He referred to Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.4 which provides the summary of the Secretariat's activities during this reporting period. His oral presentation began with the continued concern over the tentative lists indicating that 54 States Parties had still not submitted this list and that those from 34 other States Parties were not in the required format.

III.2 With regard to the nominations of properties to be examined this year, he stressed that proposed sites from Western Europe and North America were still dominant despite the Committee's repeated call to correct the geographical imbalance. He took this opportunity to invite the States Parties from Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Asia-Pacific region to become more active in the nomination of properties. He noted in particular, the absence of any nominations of sites in the Pacific. He noted that among the nominations being examined this year are those from Armenia, Austria, Belize, Gambia, Mongolia and Sudan which were presenting properties for the first time.

III.3 The Director then reminded the Bureau of the work before the Committee this year on Monitoring and Reporting Procedures, notably the preparation of the Draft Resolution for the eleventh session of the General Assembly of States Parties as well as the Draft Resolution for the 29th session of the UNESCO General Conference.

III.4 As for the monitoring activities, he reported that state of conservation reports were continuing to be forwarded to the Centre for the attention of the Committee.

III.5 The cases of the Galapagos Islands and the Plitvice National Park were mentioned in particular, indicating that the full reports will be provided under the appropriate agenda item.

III.6 In terms of innovative action, the Director referred to the case of the Cities Cooperation Programme launched in Asia,

citing the especially successful example of the Cooperation between Luang Prabang (Laos) and Chinon (France), under which French expertise in historic cities preservation and development are being extended to Laos. Special appreciation was noted for the commitment of the Mayor of Chinon for his active mobilization as well as for the Government of France for its financial and technical input towards this cooperation programme. He mentioned that eight other local authorities in Europe had already come forward to cooperate with cities in Asia and that the activities will specifically address the issues of heritage and modernity in the context of cities for the 21st century as a follow up to the Habitat II Conference.

III.7 He also informed the Bureau of the recently concluded cooperation agreement between the World Bank and UNESCO for the preservation of six cities, Fez, Hué, Sana'a, Samarkand, St. Petersburg and Vilnius, five of which are on the World Heritage List.

III.8 On the matter of financial administration, the Director stressed that some US$ 3.8 million were still outstanding for the years prior to 1996. He took this opportunity to request once again the States Parties to settle their arrears, without which the already limited financial resources will further constrain the Committee from effective and timely intervention.

III.9 With regard to expenditures, he drew the attention of the Bureau to the Synoptic Table of the Approved Budget for 1996, indicating that obligations and disbursements to date show an above average rate of implementation.

III.10 On promotional activities, the Director reported that cooperation with the private sector continues to increase. Over 50 films on World Heritage have now been produced by the German-led consortium and under a new contract concluded with the Tokyo Broadcasting Corporation and SONY, some 100 films will be produced, all of which are being aired on nation-wide television in both these countries. As for publications, the 12-volume encyclopedia is now being published in German, Spanish and Japanese and other books are also in production under contracts with various international publishers. The Bureau was informed of the newly launched World Heritage Review, a quarterly magazine published by UNESCO in cooperation with INCAFO, a Spanish publisher.

III.11 Other public information material are also under preparation by the Centre. Of particular note is the new exhibition entitled Africa Revisited, which will highlight the diversity and fragility of African cultural heritage.

III.12 The Director also noted the progress made in the Internet-based World Heritage information service and announced that a demonstration will be made during this Bureau session. He took this opportunity to thank the Republic of Korea for the recent contribution of US$ 100,000 earmarked for further expansion of this system.

III.13 Recalling that 1997 is the 25th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, the Director sought the Bureau's opinion on whether or not a special series of anniversary events should be organized. Stating that the 20th anniversary events were focused in Headquarters, he suggested that the 25th anniversary should perhaps be field-based in cooperation with the interested States Parties. He suggested that a circular letter be forwarded to the States Parties to determine their interest and willingness to sponsor and host events. The interest of the Secretariat is to seize the opportunity of this anniversary for States Parties to review the implementation of the Convention and for an evaluation of the World Heritage Centre which would be in its fifth year of existence.

III.14 The Director reported on the continuing activities of the World Heritage Youth Forum, mentioning in particular the successful Forum held in Dubrovik in May this year thanks to the US$ 100,000 contribution from Rhone-Poulenc. He informed the Bureau that the next forum would be held in Zimbabwe and that the Nordic World Heritage Office has announced a contribution of US$ 70,000 for this event.

III.15 Progress in the work for the preparation of the World Heritage Manual and Glossary of terms was also reported on.

III.16 With reference to activities in furthering the Global Strategy, the Director referred to the successful expert meeting held in La Vanoise in France in March devoted to the issues related to natural properties. He thanked the Government of France for the generosity in financing this meeting. Mention was also made of the workshop held in Ravenshoe, Australia, for World Heritage natural site managers from South East Asia, Australia, New Zealand and the West Pacific, for which he thanked the Australian Government for funding.

III.17 The Director concluded his oral presentation with a special note of thanks to the United States Government for making available for one year, the funds necessary to second the senior advisor to the Director of the Centre. Mr Rob Milne, of the United States, known to many of us here for his vast experience in heritage management, including his qualities as Chairperson to the Committee, was chosen. He also thanked the Governments of Denmark, Japan and Sweden, for the Associated Experts serving in the Centre and Austria, Australia and Finland for financing expert secondments to the Centre. Gratitude was also recorded for the contribution of funds from the American Express, Republic of Korea as well as for the contributions in-kind of experts from France for the implementation of projects.

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

4.1 Methodology and procedures for the state of conservation

IV.1 The Secretariat introduced the working document on this agenda item, emphasizing that, following the discussions during the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, the matter of monitoring and reporting should be brought to the attention of both the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and the 29th General Conference of UNESCO.

IV.2 As to the Eleventh General Assembly, it was noted that the Committee at its nineteenth session prepared already a draft resolution and that it requested the Bureau to prepare a report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session and for subsequent submission to the General Assembly.

IV.3 The Bureau adopted the report contained in Annex I of Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/2A with the addition of an explanatory note regarding the continued importance of reactive monitoring as described in paragraph 75 of the Operational Guidelines. As to the draft resolution prepared by the Committee, the Bureau was of the opinion that it was the result of long and substantive consultations among the Committee members and a great number of observer delegations, and that, therefore, no substantial changes in its text should be considered. The Bureau adopted, however, a minor textual modification in point 7 of the draft resolution. The report as adopted by the Bureau is attached as Annex II of the report of this session of the Bureau.

IV.4 The Bureau also examined a draft resolution for inclusion in the Committee's report to the 29th General Conference of UNESCO, which was proposed by the Secretariat in Annex II of the working document. The Bureau amended this draft resolution in order to use the same terminology as in the Convention itself. The draft resolution adopted by the Bureau is attached as Annex III of this report.

IV.5 The Bureau decided that both documents should be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session for adoption and subsequent submission to the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and for inclusion in the Committee's report to the 29th General Conference of UNESCO respectively.

IV.6 As to the methodological development of systematic monitoring and reporting, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that, in accordance with the decision of the Committee at its nineteenth session, the proposed new nomination form and the format for the periodic state of conservation reports were circulated to all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention for comments. These will be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session.

4.2 Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties

IV.7 The Bureau examined a total number of forty-four reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

NATURAL HERITAGE

Natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

The Bureau recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session examined a monitoring report prepared by the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention. This report indicated that the new water control structure allowed for an inflow of water on a small scale and that a colony of the Dalmatian Pelican had been re-established. The report concluded, however, that the integrity of the site had not yet been adequately restored. The Committee, therefore, decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Bulgarian authorities to prepare a status report on their efforts to restore the site, to be presented in three year's time.

Pending the status report which the Committee requested the Bulgarian authorities to submit in 1998, the Bureau recommended the Committee to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

Following an endorsement by the last session of the World Heritage Committee, a multinational rapid assessment mission was organized by the Centre and the Croatian authorities from 5 to 9 May 1996. The mission reviewed the state of conservation of the site, identified impact and damages caused by armed conflict to park facilities infrastructure, reviewed the legislative, administrative and management frameworks, assessed the socioeconomic situation of the site with regard to tourism potential and proposed summary recommendations. The full report of the mission was presented to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.13. The Bureau took note of the report and the specific recommendation made concerning the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau commended the Croatian authorities for their initial rehabilitation activities and recommended to the Committee to maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger because, although there was no longer threat of armed conflict to World Heritage values, there were potential and ascertained threats such as visitor impacts, water contamination and other conditions identified in the mission report.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled that the site was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and the adverse impacts of unplanned road construction. It furthermore recalled that at its last session, the World Heritage Committee called for an Environmental Impact Assessment of the road construction in the Park and requested information from INEFAN, the National Park administration, on road modifications, a land tenure study and steps for an updated management plan. Meanwhile, a copy of the land tenure study which was concluded in March of this year and the terms of reference for the elaboration of a new management plan were received. IUCN provided additional information from its Quito Office that the construction company is no longer in charge of the road construction, which was taken over by the military. The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau that discussions have taken place with the Vice President of Ecuador during a recent mission to the country.

The Bureau commended INEFAN on its actions but at the same time reiterated the Committee's concerns about the road construction and its request for an Environmental Impact Assessment.

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

The Bureau recalled that the site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of negative impacts from a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighbouring countries.
The Bureau took note of a Round Table on Mount Nimba which was held in Conakry (Guinea) on 17 and 18 April 1996 organized by the Ministry for Energy and Environment in collaboration with the "Mission Française de Cooperation et d'Action Culturelle". The Round Table included representatives of the following donor countries and organizations: France, Germany, Japan, Canada, the Wallonian Region of Belgium, The World Bank, UNDP, the European Union, and USAID. The Bureau took note of the recommendation that UNESCO considers supporting the establishment of a working group to create an "International Foundation for Mount Nimba".

The Bureau commended the States Parties for their efforts. However, given the uncertainties concerning the adequate management of the site, and the shortcomings with regard to the on-site management, the Bureau recommended to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

The Bureau recalled that the site was included in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that at the nineteenth session of the Committee the Observer of India invited members of the World Heritage Committee and the Director of the Centre to visit New Delhi, Assam and Manas. IUCN informed the Bureau

that a member of the Rhino Specialist Group has recently visited the site and a full report will be available at the next session of the Bureau. The scheduling of a mission to the site is under discussion.

In the absence of any precise information, uncertainties remain concerning the state of conservation of the site, the Bureau reiterated its request to the State Party for a detailed updated report. In the meantime, the Bureau recommended to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Aïr-et-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances and that a peace agreement was signed on 9 October 1994. In 1995 a dialogue was established between the parties, which has paved the way for a return to a normal situation and may allow for a detailed evaluation of the state of conservation of the site as well as the development of an action programme for its recovery.

The Bureau was informed that an IUCN project of 1 Million US$ is underway at the site to assist in re-establishing the management regime and that a report from the project will be available in August 1996. The Delegate of Niger underlined that a mission would be necessary to evaluate the situation.

The Bureau recommended that the 20th extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996 may wish to examine the report that will be provided by IUCN on the site, and subsequently may wish to consider whether the site should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1993 and that the World Heritage Committee at its last session examined a detailed monitoring report, presented by the State Party, which outlined the long-term restoration work necessary to restore the balance of the Everglades ecosystem. The State Party presented a preliminary monitoring report dated May 1996 outlining the Government's efforts to protect the site. The report acknowledges that despite significant progress made (acquisition of additional land, improved ecological indicators), the Park remains seriously in danger.

Due to the long-term nature of the rehabilitation activities and further to the conclusions of the Committee, the Bureau recommended that the site remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger until further rehabilitation is demonstrated.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that, at its nineteenth session, the World Heritage Committee decided that, on the basis of both ascertained dangers and potential threats, Yellowstone National Park be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the State Party should provide the Committee with reports on the results of the Environmental Impact Statement and mitigating actions. In such a report dated May 1996, the State Party advised the Centre about the different remedial actions taken. This includes long-term control programmes to counter the non-native lake trout introduction, public meetings to analyze visitor management, and the preparation of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the proposed New World Mine; the final EIS is not expected to be completed before autumn 1996.

The Bureau recommended that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger until such time as the mining-related Environmental Impact Study required under domestic law is completed and considered, and actions taken on other issues previously identified.

Virunga National Park (Zaire)

The Bureau recalled that Virunga National Park was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in December 1994, due to the tragic events in Rwanda and the subsequent massive influx of refugees from that country. Virunga National Park, situated on the border between Rwanda and Uganda, has been destabilized by the uncontrolled arrival of refugees, causing deforestation and poaching within its boundaries.

The Centre wrote to the authorities requesting that the World Heritage Committee be informed about any action to be undertaken to stop poaching operations within the site and to improve control in the Park. The Centre and IUCN are in contact with several NGOs working in the area and a mission was organized together with WWF to the site in order to evaluate its state of conservation and to strengthen cooperation between the different international assistance agencies working to protect the site. The mission was carried out from 15 to 30 April 1996 and the report indicates serious threats to the site, including impacts due to the location of refugee camps involving more than 700,000 persons in the vicinity of the Park (deforestation, poaching etc.). The report indicates detailed recommendations for an urgent safeguarding plan, collaboration between different organizations (WWF, GTZ, UNHCR, UNDP, GEF and UNESCO) as well as specific recommendations for international assistance requests to be submitted by the authorities.

Taking into account the presence of thousands of refugees, the Bureau expressed its concern about the continuing degradation of the Park and recommended to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Natural properties on the World Heritage List

Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)

The Bureau recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session discussed a report presented by IUCN, which underlined the infrastructural developments in the "Bow Corridor" and their impact on the integrity of the site. IUCN advised the Centre that it had submitted a brief to the Task Force which is due to report in September 1996.

The Bureau recommended that the Bureau at its twentieth extraordinary session in November 1996 examines the Task Force report.

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau considered the report of the mission led by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee (1-11 June 1996) to examine the situation of the Galapagos Islands and to formulate recommendations to improve the situation. The Bureau commended the Ecuador Government for its support to that mission and fully endorsed the recommendations contained in the report (see INF.12).

The Bureau concluded that serious problems exist, such that immediate remedial actions are essential to safeguard the values of the World Heritage site and the surrounding marine areas, while recognizing the considerable efforts already made.

i) Notably, the Bureau calls upon the President and the Congress of Ecuador to enact "special legislation" as an emergency measure, as discussed on the mission, most importantly to halt immigration from the mainland to the islands and to ensure the protection of the marine area surrounding the islands of the Galapagos.

ii) The Bureau requests that its Chairman transmit the mission report to the Ecuadorian authorities, outlining the threats to the site and actions necessary to redress the serious situation. The Bureau offers its continued collaboration and assistance in dealing with these problems and welcomes generous offers of assistance in training and preparing management schemes from the United States and Australia.

iii) The Bureau recommends further that the World Heritage Committee examines the measures taken by the authorities of Ecuador in the months to come on which the authorities are requested to report by 1 November 1996. The Committee will examine this information and decide whether the site should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Upon adoption of the above text by the Bureau, the Delegate of Ecuador expressed his great satisfaction about the recognition of the problems that the management of Galapagos Islands is confronted with and the cooperative spirit with which the Bureau

addressed this issue. He declared his gratitude for all international assistance provided to the Galapagos. He furthermore informed the Bureau that the President of Ecuador has received the final version of the special legislation for the Galapagos Islands and will submit it to the Congress within the shortest delay possible.

Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

The Centre and IUCN have received a report on a Field Study on the flora and fauna of the Simen Mountains prepared by the University of Berne (Switzerland). The report indicates a deterioration of the Walia ibex population and that other large mammals (such as bushbuck and bushpig) have become extremely rare. In addition, IUCN stressed the serious situation at the ite, including the loss of biodiversity, the encroachment at the borders of the site, and the impacts of the road construction. An Action Plan for the site was proposed by the University of Berne. The report of the University of Berne was made available to the Bureau members and the following three main recommendations of this report were endorsed by the Bureau:

1) Support a planning and coordination meeting at the regional level, involving major stakeholders of the Simen Park area, with the general objective to update management planning of the Park and its buffer zone.

2) Organize a technical mission by the World Heritage Centre in the near future, i.e. September/October 1996, with the objective of assisting in the formulation of a possible submission to the Centre for technical assistance for (1) above.

3) Within the World Heritage Centre's mandate for better monitoring of African conservation sites, provide financial support for the finalization of the recent Simen Mountains Baseline Studies carried out in 1994-96, in order to make available to all stakeholders the informatioon collected in the studies for the above planning meeting.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

The Bureau recalled the detailed monitoring report prepared by an IUCN mission to the site in November 1995. This report noted the threats to the site, including agricultural intrusion and the implementation of land reform programmes. IUCN informed the Bureau that the Minister of Environment is in agreement with the findings. A number of follow-up actions, including the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, was recommended. The Centre received a brief state of conservation report dated 30 April 1996 from the Honduran Minister of Environment, which indicated the actions taken by the Government and various NGOs, as well as projects submitted for technical assistance.

On the basis of the report provided by IUCN's regional office, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau recalled that the report provides eleven points of corrective actions and that the Minister of Environment has endorsed this report, including the recommendation that the site be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Government of Honduras has submitted a technical assistance request and the Bureau recalled that priority should be given to international assistance requests for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Komodo National Park (Indonesia)

The Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter of appreciation to the Indonesian authorities expressing satisfaction on the actions taken and commending them for the detailed state of conservation report received for Komodo National Park from the Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation of the Ministry of Forestry dated February 1996.

Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaino (Mexico)

The Bureau urged the State Party to keep the Committee informed about the proposed expansion of the industrial salt production project and to ensure the integrity of the site.

The Delegate of Mexico informed the Bureau that in July 1994 the ESSA Salt Mining Company submitted to the National Institute of Ecology an environmental impact study proposal to extend its installations. This proposal was refused by the National Institute of Ecology (INE) in February 1995. On 23 June 1995 the ESSA Company expressed interest in submitting a new study for evaluation by the INE.

In 26 February 1996, INE created a Committee comprising seven national and foreign experts, which held a first meeting in March 1996, participated in a public conference attended by nearly 300 persons and presented 42 documents to define aspects to be included in the new environmental impact study.

The Minister of the Environment, Natural Resources and Fish (SEMARNAP), has indicated, through the National Institute of Ecology, that the proposal could only be authorized on the understanding that it respects the legislation and the ecological standards in force.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

The Centre received a progress report, dated March 1996, on the ongoing planning activities for the site and a schedule of activities. IUCN noted several recent developments in the Sanctuary that are of concern: (1) the poaching of thirteen Oryx and (2) the construction of a reverse osmosis plant which has

resulted in significant damage to the desert habitat. The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the Omani authorities encouraging them to provide the definition of the final boundaries of the site and expressing concern over the poaching and construction activities.

Huascaran National Park (Peru)

The Bureau reiterated the request issued by the World Heritage Committee that a cultural resources inventory of the site be carried out and clarifications be provided on the road developments which may threaten the integrity of the site.

Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)

The Bureau reiterated the request issued by the World Heritage Committee to the authorities to provide a map of the revised boundaries of the site and encouraged the State Party to finalize new legislation and to prepare a management plan.

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)

The Bureau was informed that the report of IUCN will be presented to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee and examined at that time.

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

The Bureau reiterated the request issued by the World Heritage Committee for information on the potential threats and the measures being taken to ensure that they are minimized.

Garamba National Park (Zaire)

In April 1996, the Centre and IUCN received information on the poaching of two Northern white rhinos (one female, one male adult). A joint WWF-Frankfurt Zoological Society-IUCN mission to the site was carried out recently and the findings will be transmitted to twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

Given the gravity of the situation, notably concerning poaching of the white rhino population in Garamba National Park, the Bureau recommended to the Committee inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to obtain the commitment of the Zaire authorities for such listing and for submission of a plan for corrective measures in conformity with the Operational Guidelines.

Mosi-oa Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)

The Bureau took note of the report provided by IUCN on a "Sustainable Development Workshop" concerning the joint Zambia/Zimbabwe Strategic Environmental Assessment of Tourism Development in the Victoria Falls Area which was held from 25 to 29 March 1996 in Livingstone. The Bureau was informed that a joint management plan is under preparation and that the first draft has been completed.

The Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter commending both Governments for the actions undertaken, and encourage them to complete the management plan of the site, which would give focus to the growing tourism pressure at the site.

MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Mixed natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

The Bureau recalled previously discussed reports received on logging operations in adjacent areas to the site and was informed that discussions are now underway with Tasmania to develop a methodology for the proposed World Heritage assessments, involving both natural and cultural values.

The Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter to commend the State Party for its efforts to carry out the preliminary assessment of World Heritage values in areas adjacent to the World Heritage site. It requested the Australian authorities to provide a full report once the negotiations and assessment work has been completed.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)

The Bureau was informed of the decision of the National Institute for Culture to suspend the plans to construct two suspended cable car systems to facilitate access to the ruins of Machu Picchu. The Bureau suggested that the alternative means of access to Machu Picchu be studied in the context of integral planning for the whole of the area of the Sanctuary and that an assessment of its impact be undertaken. The Bureau requested the authorities of Peru to inform the Committee on the progress made in the development of an integral management mechanism as well as on the plans for the access to the ruins of Machu Picchu.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Angkor (Cambodia)

Upon hearing the report provided by the Secretariat regarding the hotel construction projects and discussions surrounding a query from a member of the Bureau on the "son et lumière" at Angkor Wat, the Bureau adopted the following decision:

The Bureau requested the Chairperson of the Committee to write to H.E. Mr Vann Molyvann, expressing on behalf of the Committee, his appreciation for the commitment of the Royal Government of Cambodia to the World Heritage Convention and to request the Government to keep the World Heritage Committee informed on developments that may be of concern to the Committee in accordance with Paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Bahla Fort (Oman)

The Bureau took note that an expert mission is scheduled for September 1996 and requested the Secretariat to report on the outcome of this mission to the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session.

Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)

The Bureau requested the Polish authorities to undertake the appropriate measures for the prompt implementation of the conservation project which involves the installation of dehumidifying equipment and requested to be kept informed of the progress made in this respect.

Cultural properties on the World Heritage List

Butrinti (Albania)

The Bureau commended the Albanian authorities for their efforts. In addition, it recommended that the Committee be kept informed about the on-going activities.

City of Potosi (Bolivia)

The Bureau was pleased to note that the Secretary for Culture of Bolivia shares the concerns about the potential degradation of the Cerro Rico and that it is collaborating with the regional authorities in the preparation of an ordinance for the use of the Cerro Rico. It requested the Secretary for Culture to keep the Committee informed on the progress made in this respect.

Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)

The Bureau took note of the report on missions undertaken in December 1995 and January 1996 by the Chairman of the Committee, UNESCO and ICOMOS regarding proposed construction developments endangering the cultural landscape of this World Heritage site.

The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the City of Potsdam had invited ICOMOS to advise on the possible extension of the site as well as on its management.

The Bureau expressed its serious concern about urban development plans in Potsdam, particularly the "Potsdam Centre" project, that could directly or indirectly affect the values of the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to transmit its concern to the German authorities. The Bureau furthermore invited the authorities to consider the extension of the World Heritage site in order to include the Russische Kolonie/ Kapellenberg/Pfingstberg and the corridor linking these sites to the already inscribed site of Sanssouci.

Roman Monuments in Trier (Germany)

The Bureau took note of the report on the joint UNESCO - ICOMOS mission to examine the impact of housing construction that might have an impact on the Roman Amphitheater in Trier. It requested the German authorities to re-consider the construction of buildings that would be visible from the Amphitheater and to involve ICOMOS in the drawing up of the terms of reference for an architectural competition for the area immediately north of the theater. The Bureau requested that a full report of the mission as well as on the progress made in undertaking the architectural competition be presented to its next session in November 1996.

Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (Ghana)

The Bureau thanked the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB) for having provided accurate information on the state of conservation of this site and congratulated the Government of Ghana for their efforts in mobilizing international assistance for the establishment of a Castles Maintenance Trust Fund. It commended the current major conservation programme in Elmina and Cape Coast which should serve as a model for the conservation of the Castle of Osu, Accra. The Bureau recommended that protective action be taken to identify the buffer zones and protect the other coastal forts most at risk and that special attention be paid to the project financed by World Heritage Fund: Fort Prinzensten at Keta.

Ashanti Traditional Buildings (Ghana)

The Bureau, concerned by the inadequate level of resources available for the conservation of the fragile Ashanti Traditional Buildings recommended that the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board,

in cooperation with the Centre, prepare comprehensive conservation and site management plans within the context of envisaged regional integrated development programmes. It requested the Ghana authorities to inform the World Heritage Committee before its twenty-first session at the latest, on the initiatives taken in this matter.

Petra (Jordan)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat concerning several problems threatening the conservation of Petra, the Bureau recommended that the authorities of the Royal Kingdom of Jordan undertake the measures necessary to ensure the long-term conservation of the World Heritage site of Petra, and more particularly that it:

- halt all projects for the construction of new tourist roads, and carefully evaluate the impacts of the road-widening project from Wadi Musa to Taybeth;
- carefully evaluate the location of the water purification station;
- prolong the interdiction of building authorizations for hotels until the zoning regulations as proposed by the UNESCO experts can be adopted;
- halt all construction of new houses, as at Um-Sayhun, or the elevation of existing houses for tourist purposes and enforce the construction regulations;
- prohibit the use of reinforced concrete in developing or repairing the site, such as for the stairway leading to Djebel al-Khubta;
- protect the juniper trees and the vegetation of the natural environment of the site.

The Bureau encouraged the national authorities to continue the implementation of effective long-term protection for the site, and the measures advocated by the Petra Management Plan of the UNESCO experts.

Baalbeck (Lebanon)

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the information provided by the Delegate of Lebanon, namely that the road construction project passing behind the site had been definitely abandoned following a Council of Ministers decree, and that the water seepage problems in the underground passages was being treated.

The Bureau thanked the Lebanese authorities for the efforts already taken for the conservation of Baalbeck. It recommended

them to also undertake emergency conservation measures to halt the degradation of the inner north-east angle of the Temple of Bacchus, protect the visitors and foresee the necessary conservation and restoration measures.

Tyr (Lebanon)

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the information provided by the Delegate of Lebanon, namely that the project to extend the northern part of the port had been completely abandoned following a Council of Ministers decree and that a joint project of the Ministry of Urbanism and the General Directorate of Antiquities was being implemented to remove the unsightly constructions from the Roman aqueduct.

The Bureau thanked the Lebanese authorities for the efforts undertaken for the conservation of Tyr. It recommended them to take all legal and financial measures to preserve the hippodrome and the aqueduct. It assured them that a request from the Lebanese Government for international assistance would be favourably considered, as soon as funds are available, in order to implement the recommendations of the UNESCO experts and to contribute towards the launching of the international safeguarding campaign.

Vilnius Old Town (Lithuania)

The Bureau commended the Lithuanian authorities for their efforts, and encouraged them to pursue the promising revitalisation programme for the Historic Centre of Vilnius.

Medina of Fez (Morocco)

After having been informed by the Secretariat of the measures undertaken by the Minister of Cultural Affairs of the Kingdom of Morocco to ensure the safeguarding of the Medina of Fez against the threatening automobile circulation project, the Bureau expressed its warm thanks to the national authorities of Morocco and to their Cultural Heritage Directorate, and recommended that they continue to be vigilant with regard to any new project of this kind, and that economic development projects envisaged with assistance from The World Bank for the rehabilitation of the Medina continue to be carefully evaluated with regard to the preservation of the cultural values of the site in all their aspects.

The City of Cusco (Peru)

The Bureau took note of information provided by the Secretariat regarding projects in the historical city of Cusco that could have a negative impact on the World Heritage values of the site. It invited the authorities to establish appropriate planning

mechanisms for the historical city of Cusco and to inform the Committee through its Secretariat, in conformity with Paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines, of major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)

The Bureau commended the Government of Poland on halting the construction works in the immediate vicinity of the Auschwitz concentration camp. It urged the authorities to devise a plan for the preservation of the site and its immediate surroundings and to keep the Committee informed on this matter.

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (Tanzania)

The Bureau thanked the Antiquities Unit of Tanzania for having provided the state of conservation report. Since it is obvious that the site lacks proper documentation and a management plan, the Bureau recommended that a management plan be prepared by the Antiquities Unit of the Republic of Tanzania.

Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)

The Bureau expressed to the authorities of the Syrian Arab Republic its grave concern with regard to the serious damage sustained to the authenticity of this exceptional monument, the Omeyyades Mosque through the inordinate use of reinforced concrete, plaster and marble, and by the demolition and reconstruction work carried out without sufficient scientific studies and without taking into account international standards for authenticity and integrity. It recalled Articles 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention ratified by the Syrian Arab Republic on 13 August 1975, whereby States Parties undertake to ensure the protection and conservation of their heritage - in accordance with international standards - and Paragraphs 24(b), 56 and 75 of the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

It requested the authorities to immediately issue the necessary instructions to suspend the work and that no further work be undertaken prior to a careful and in-depth study of the present needs, and in conformity with the standards of the international community concerning restoration work and with the advice, should they so wish, of experts that UNESCO is willing to provide.

It further recommended to avoid such work at all costs so as not to compromise the authenticity of other World Heritage sites, as for example, the monuments of the Ancient City of Aleppo. The Bureau thanked the authorities for the financial and human resources provided by Syria for the preservation of its heritage in general.

Taos Pueblo (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that the situation regarding the proposed airport extension in the vicinity of the Taos Pueblo site had been discussed by the Committee and the Bureau over the last several years.

The Bureau was informed that a preliminary monitoring report from the United States National Park Service indicated that no agreement had been reached as of yet between the Federal Aviation Administration, the Taos Pueblo and the National Park Service on the definition of the geographic area of potential impacts and on the contents of the Environmental Impact Statement. As to the recommendations made by the Committee at its nineteenth session regarding the involvement of ICOMOS and IUCN in the definition of the Impact Statement area, as well as a possible extension of the site, the report indicated that these will have to move forward in full consultation with the Pueblo, which is self-governing.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the United States National Park Service in response to the World Heritage Committee's recommendation regarding the Environmental Impact Statement that is to be undertaken in relation to the proposed extension of the Taos airport. It requested the authorities to keep the Committee informed of any progress made in these matters.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)

The Bureau informed the Yemeni authorities of its concern with regard to the work undertaken by local donors at the Grand Mosque, part of the World Heritage site of the Historic Town of Zabid, and which appears to be causing serious damage to the authenticity and integrity of the monument.

It drew their attention to Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention whereby States Parties undertake to ensure the protection and the conservation of their heritage, and that conservation must be carried out in accordance with international standards, such as the Charter of Venice, in order to ensure respect of authenticity. It also recalled Paragraphs 24(b), 56 and 75 of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Finally, it reminded the Yemeni authorities that the Committee is always willing to provide international expert advice prior to any restoration work.

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

NATURAL HERITAGE

V.1 The Bureau examined 11 new natural nominations received for review by IUCN. IUCN informed the Bureau that due to geographic and climate conditions field missions could not be carried out for all of these sites in time for the June meeting of the Bureau. The Bureau also examined one extension to a World Heritage site and two previously deferred nominations. The Secretariat furthermore informed the Bureau that one site was withdrawn.

V.2 The Bureau discussed the conceptual differences between Biosphere Reserves and World Heritage sites. The Representative of the Division of Ecological Sciences underlined that Biosphere Reserves have three functions: (1) the conservation of *representative* ecosystems; (2) the promotion of local development and (3) scientific research. They normally consist of strictly protected core area, a buffer zone and a larger transition area. The clear difference between but complementarity of both concepts was emphasized, and that given their *outstanding universal value*, a number of World Heritage sites are core areas of Biosphere Reserves.

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

Name of Property	Identification number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Okapi Wildlife Reserve	**718**	**Zaïre**	**N(iv)**

The Bureau recommended inscription of the property as one of the most important sites for conservation, including the rare okapi and rich floral diversity, under criterion (iv). The Bureau expressed its hope that the activities outlined in the new management plan would ensure the integrity of the site.

B. Properties for which the nominations were referred back

Belize Barrier Reef Complex Protected Area System	**764**	**Belize**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the Belize Barrier Reef Complex Protected Area System under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) as the largest barrier reef in the Northern hemisphere, as a serial nomination consisting of six sites. It noted, however, that the conditions of integrity are not fulfilled and referred the nomination back to the State Party in order to receive, by 1 September 1996, the following information: (1) a clarification on the boundaries of the nominated property, omitting the site of Hol Chan and adding the Blue Hole; (2) a statement on the establishment of the Coastal Management Authority and the legal status of the different parts of the nomination and (3) information on potential oil exploration activities. In this context, the Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter to the national authorities. It commended the GEF/UNDP for considerable funding for the protection of the coastal and marine resources.

Massif du Mont Perdu/ Tres Serols	**773**	**France/Spain**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that a field inspection of the site is scheduled for July 1996 and that a report will be provided to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

W National Park	**749**	**Niger**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that the nominated property would not meet natural criteria of the World Heritage Convention. It was noted that the site was recognized as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve as presently constituted at the last session of the MAB Bureau with the recommendation to extend it to include adjoining areas of the neighbouring countries.

After a considerable debate and intervention by the Delegation of Niger, the Bureau decided that the nomination of "W" National Park be referred in order to :

(a) allow trans-national discussion to be held on the possibility of including the full natural system of the region, and that the World Heritage Centre provides its assistance in this matter as far as possible;
(b) assess the broader ecological values that have been advanced as special features and the contribution of the river and aquatic systems. The Bureau took note of the proposal by the Director of the Centre regarding the

forthcoming technical meeting in Niger which could provide additional information to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996;

(c) enable the World Heritage Centre to mobilize bilateral or multilateral cooperation entities to provide assistance in the development of management plans for the contiguous W National Parks and other conservation areas in the region.

Lake Baikal **754** **Russian Federation**

The Bureau took note of the oral report provided by IUCN. The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to (1) confirm the revised boundaries of the core area proposed for inscription, and (2) provide information about the status of the special Lake Baikal Law. Furthermore, the Bureau requested IUCN to submit a written evaluation. On the condition that this information is provided by 1 September 1996, in time for the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property as the most outstanding example of a fresh water ecosystem on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).

The Volcanoes of Kamchatka **765** **Russian Federation**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that a field inspection of the site is scheduled for September 1996 and that a report will be provided to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

The Sikhote-Alin Natural Complex **766** **Russian Federation**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that a field inspection of the site is scheduled for September 1996 and that a report will be provided to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

The Ubsunuur Hollow **769** **Russian Federation/ Mongolia**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that a field inspection of the site was carried out for the Russian part and that a full report will be provided to the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

C. Deferred Properties

Neusiedlersee/Seewinkel **772** **Austria**

The Bureau took note of the information by IUCN that the nominated property is only a part of a lake ecosystem and that

the land area is one of the oldest cultivated areas in Austria. Furthermore, it was noted that Austria's tentative list includes this property as a cultural landscape.

Therefore, the Bureau deferred this nomination, recommending to the State Party to consider nominating the site jointly with Hungary as a transfrontier cultural landscape. The Observer from Austria agreed to this proposal.

Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park **716** **Chile**

The Bureau took note of IUCN's evaluation and deferred the site for five years to allow the Chilean authorities to take action to restore the natural integrity of the islands.

Galapagos Marine Reserve (Extension of the Galapagos Islands) **1bis** **Ecuador**

The Chairperson referred to the recommendations of the recent mission to the Galapagos Islands, in particular the need for adequate legal protection of the Marine Reserve. The Bureau therefore deferred the marine extension of the site.

Vodlozero National Park **767** **Russian Federation**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that a field inspection of the site has to be rescheduled for 1997 and that a report will be provided to the twenty-first session of the Bureau in 1997. It requested however, the Centre to solicit with the Russian Government to obtain its written agreement to this postponement.

The Sources of the Great Ob **768** **Russian Federation**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by IUCN that the local authorities are in the process revising the nomination and that the present nomination be deferred.

D. Nomination which was Withdrawn

Mt Soraksan Nature Reserve **771** **Republic of Korea**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Centre that the Republic of Korea has withdrawn this nomination.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

V.3 The Chairperson informed the members of the Bureau that all the proposed nominations of cultural properties for inscription submitted by the States Parties were listed on the Tentative Lists prepared in accordance with Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

V.4 The Bureau examined thirty-three new inscriptions, one extension of a cultural property, and four previously deferred or referred nominations.

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

Name of Property	Identification number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
The Monastery of Haghpat	**777**	**Armenia**	**C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the Monastery of Haghpat in accordance with criteria (ii) and (iv). The title of the nomination should therefore read "The Monastery of Haghpat". The State Party was invited to consider an eventual extension to include the Sanahin Monastery, when restoration work had been completed and a decision had been reached on the ownership of this property and the Sanahin Bridge (Alavredi) and the Kayanberd Fortress.

The Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg	**784**	**Austria**	**C(ii)(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being an important example of a European ecclesiastical city-state which preserves to a remarkable degree its dramatic townscape, its historical significant urban fabric and a large number of outstanding ecclesiastical and secular buildings from several centuries. It is also noteworthy for its associations with the arts, and in particular with music in the person of its famous son, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.

The Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn	**786**	**Austria**	**C(i)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv) considering that

the site is of outstanding universal value being an especially well preserved example of the Baroque princely residential ensemble, which constitutes an outstanding example of a *Gesamtkunstwerk*. The Palace and Gardens are exceptional by virtue of the evidence that they preserve modifications over several centuries that vividly illustrate the tastes, interests and aspirations of successive Habsburg monarchs.

Concerning the protection of the Garden and Parks of Schönbrunn, the Austrian Observer informed the Bureau that the Schönbrunn Palace, Garden and Park had equal protection since this property is considered as an ensemble.

The Lednice-Valtice Cultural Landscape **763** **Czech Republic** **C(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being a cultural landscape which is an exceptional example of the designed landscape that evolved in the Enlightenment and after under the care of a single family. It succeeds in bringing together in harmony cultural monuments from successive periods and both indigenous and exotic natural elements to create an outstanding work of human creativity.

Le Canal du Midi **770** **France** **C(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being one of the greatest engineering achievements of the Modern Age, providing the model for the flowering of technology that led directly to the Industrial Revolution and the modern technological age. Additionally, it combines with its technological innovation a concern for high aesthetic architectural and landscape design that has few parallels.

Cologne Cathedral **292Rev.** **Germany** **C(i)(ii)(iv)**

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received the exact delineation of the buffer zone and that it now recommended the inscription of this property.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) (ii) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being an exceptional work of human creative genius, constructed over more than six centuries and powerful testimony to the strength and persistence of Christian belief in medieval and modern Europe.

The Bauhaus and its sites in Weimar and Dessau **729** **Germany** **C(ii)(iv)(vi)**

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received additional information responding to all the issues mentioned in its original evaluation.

The Delegate of Japan pointed out that the Bauhaus nomination should in addition be inscribed under criterion (iv).

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value since these buildings are the seminal works of the Bauhaus architectural school, the foundation of the Modern Movement which was to revolutionize artistic and architectural thinking and practice in the twentieth century.

The Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg **783** **Germany** **C(iv)(vi)**

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, since preparing the written evaluation of this nomination, it had received additional information responding to all the issues mentioned in its original evaluation. The Bureau decided to keep the Melanchthon's House in Wittenberg in the nomination.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value bearing unique testimony to the Protestant Reformation, which was one of the most significant events in the religious and political history of the world and to which the buildings bear exceptional testimony.

The Archaeological Site of Vergina **780** **Greece** **C(iii)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (iii) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value representing an exceptional testimony to a significant development in European civilization, at the transition from classical city-state to the imperial structure of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This is vividly demonstrated in particular by the remarkable series of royal tombs and their rich contents.

The Millenary Benedictine Monastery of Pannonhalma and its Natural Environment **758** **Hungary** **C(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value illustrating in an exceptional manner the structure and setting of an early Christian Monastery that has evolved over a thousand years of continuous use. Its location and the early date of its foundation bear unique witness to the propagation and continuity of Christianity in Central Europe.

Sangiran Early Man Site **593** **Indonesia** **C(iii)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site under criteria (iii) and (vi) as one of the key sites for the understanding of human evolution that admirably illustrates the development of *Homo sapiens sapiens* from the Middle Pleistocene to the present through the outstanding fossil and artefactual material that it has produced.

Skellig Michael **757** **Ireland** **C(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being an exceptional, and in many respects unique example of an early religious settlement deliberately sited on a pyramidal rock in the ocean, preserved because of a remarkable environment. It illustrates, as no other site can, the extremes of a Christian monasticism characterizing much of North Africa, the Near East and Europe.

Castel del Monte **398Rev.** **Italy** **C(i)(iii)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (iii) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as in its formal perfection and its harmonious blending of cultural elements from northern Europe, the Muslim world, and classical antiquity. Castel del Monte is a unique masterpiece of medieval military architecture, reflecting the humanism of its founder, Frederick II of Hohenstaufen.

The Bureau requested that the competent Italian authorities provide information on the car park project which would be visually obstructive and consider the suppression of the trees planted near the top of the hill where the castle is built.

The *Trulli* of Alberobello **787** **Italy** **C(iii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iii) (iv) and (v) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being an exceptional example of a form of building construction deriving from prehistoric construction techniques that have survived intact and functional into the modern world. Further the Bureau recommended that the Italian authorities consider the up-grading of the streetscape.

The Bureau decided to rename this property to "**The *Trulli* of Alberobello**"

The Early Christian Monuments and Mosaics of Ravenna **788** **Italy** **C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value being of remarkable significance by virtue of the supreme artistry of the mosaic art that the monuments contain, and also because of the crucial evidence that they provide of artistic and religious relationships and contacts at an important period of European cultural history.

The Bureau decided to rename the property to "**The Early Christian Monuments and Mosaics of Ravenna**".

The Historic Centre of the City of Pienza **789** **Italy** **C(i)(ii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as it represents the first application of the Renaissance Humanist concept of urban design, and as such occupies a seminal position in the development of the concept of the planned "ideal town" which was to play a significant role in subsequent urban development in Italy and beyond. The application of this principle in Pienza, and in particular in the group of buildings around the central square, resulted in a masterpiece of human creative genius.

Itsukushima Shinto Shrine **776** **Japan** **C(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the group of buildings under criteria (i) (ii) (iv) and (vi) as the supreme

example of this form of religious centre, setting traditional architecture of great artistic and technical merit against a dramatic natural background and thereby creating a work of art of incomparable physical beauty.

The Historic City of Meknes **793** **Morocco** **C(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Historic City of Meknes under criterion (iv) because it represents an exceptionally complete example and well preserved way the urban fabric and monumental buildings of a 17th century Maghreb capital city which combines elements of Islamic and European design and planning in a harmonious fashion.

The Defence Line of Amsterdam **759** **Netherlands** **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as it is an exceptional example of an extensive integrated defence system of the modern period which has survived intact and well conserved since it was created in the later 19th century. It is also notable for the unique way in which the Dutch genius for hydraulic engineering has been incorporated into the defences of the nation's capital city.

The Historic Centre of Oporto **755** **Portugal** **C(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as the urban fabric and its many historic buildings bears remarkable testimony to the development over the past thousand years of a European city that looks outward to the west for its cultural and commercial links.

The Historic Walled Town of Cuenca **781** **Spain** **C(ii)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (v) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as it is an exceptional example of the medieval fortress town that has preserved its original townscape remarkably intact along with many excellent examples of religious and secular architecture from the 12th and 18th centuries. It is also exceptional because the walled town blends into and enhances the fine rural and natural landscape within which it is situated.

La Lonja de la Seda de Valencia **782** **Spain** **C(i)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as it is a wholly exceptional example of a secular building in late Gothic style, which dramatically illustrates the power and wealth of one of the great Mediterranean mercantile cities.

The Church Village of Gammelstad, Lulea **762** **Sweden** **C(ii)(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as it is an remarkable example of the traditional church town or northern Scandanavïa, and admirably illustrates the adaptation of conventional urban design to the special geographical and climatic conditions of a hostile natural environment.

B. Property which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

The Legislative Palace, Montevideo **748** **Uruguay**

The Bureau recognized the national significance of the building, but felt that it did not possess the outstanding universal value necessary for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau recommended that this site not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

C. Properties for which nominations were referred back

Verla Groundwood and Board Mill **751** **Finland** **C(iv)**

ICOMOS proposed the extension of the nominated area to include significant buildings and structures relating in particular to the social unit associated with the Mill.

The Bureau recognized that this property fulfilled criterion (iv) for inscription, but however, decided to refer it back to the State Party, to await an official written confirmation regarding the extension of the site and the land planning regulations.

The Finnish Observer informed the Bureau that the Finnish authorities had agreed upon the extension of the nominated area and that land planning regulations are being prepared.

Upper Svaneti **709** **Georgia** **C(iv)(v)**

The Bureau recognized that the property fulfilled criteria (iv) and (v), but decided to refer this nomination back to the State Party to allow it to delineate a recognizable and representative area which could be effectively managed. ICOMOS stressed also that it would strongly support inscription of the Uzguli-Chazhashi Reserve under criteria (iv) and (v) in the event of this being confirmed as the nominated area by the State Party.

The Ancient *ksour* of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt, Oualata **750** **Mauritania**

After having taken note of the ICOMOS evaluation, the Bureau is convinced of the outstanding universal value of the proposed nomination. However, there were some uncertainties concerning the conservation policy adopted by the Government of Mauritania with regard to the four towns.

The Observer of Mauritania provided the Bureau with additional information on this policy and on the conservation and development programmes established, implemented or already completed. The Bureau requested the Government of Mauritania to send this information to ICOMOS to be taken into consideration and that ICOMOS provide a new evaluation in the light of this new information to the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

The Prehispanic Town of Uxmal **791** **Mexico** **C(i)(ii)(iii)**

The Bureau endorsed the recommendation made by ICOMOS and decided to refer this nomination back to the State Party, requesting that it reduces the visibility of the "*son et lumière*" installations, and also considers the possibility of extending the nomination to cover the four related sites of Kabah, Labna, Sayil and Xlapak. In the event that the State Party accedes to these requests, the Bureau, considering that the ruins of the ceremonial structures at Uxmal represent the pinnacle of late Mayan art and architecture in their design, layout and ornamentation, recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), and (iii).

The Historic Monuments Zone of Querétaro **792** **Mexico** **C(iv)**

The Bureau was of the opinion that this property meets at least one criterion for cultural properties (criterion (iv)) and possibly others. The Bureau therefore decided to refer this property back to the extraordinary session of the Bureau in Merida (Mexico) and asks ICOMOS to clarify which other criteria, if any, are met by this property.

D. Deferred cultural nominations

The Semmering Railway **785** **Austria**

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of this nomination in order to enable the completion of a comparative study carried out by TICCIH, and also for the State Party to supply more detailed maps and information regarding the cultural landscape protection legislation in Lower Austria and Styra relating to the protection of the cultural landscape. If the study is completed for the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996, this nomination shall be considered as referred and an ICOMOS recommendation will be submitted to that meeting.

Prehistoric Stone Circle Sites **760** **Gambia**

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this site be deferred so as to await the outcome of a comparative study of megalithic monuments in north-western Africa; obtain the completion of the procedures for institutional protection for the three monuments which at present are not protected. Any subsequent proposal must include provision for management plans in relation to each of the sites and the definition of buffer zones.

James Island and the Albreda/Juffure/ Santo Domingo Historic Zone **761** **Gambia**

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this nomination be deferred to await the outcome of a comparative study of pre-colonial and early colonial trading settlements in West Africa. The State Party should also consider possible extension of the nominated area, as proposed by ICOMOS. The Delegate of Niger requested that the World Heritage Centre assist, if necessary, the Gambian authorities with this possible extension, to include the historical defence works situated on the opposite bank of the Gambia River, at Banjul and Bullen.

Essaouira **753** **Morocco**

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of this proposed nomination until the twenty-first session of the Bureau in 1997, so that the Moroccan authorities may submit additional information concerning the site.

The Historic Sites of Panama Viejo and the Historic District of Panama City, with the Salon Bolivar **790** **Panama**

The Bureau endorsed the recommendation made by ICOMOS and decided to defer this nomination to await the provision by the State Party of plans showing the exact delineation of the areas proposed for inscription, and also of the respective buffer zones, supported by evidence of statutory controls within both zones. Full details of the plan for the revitalization of the Historic District of Panama City should also be supplied, once this plan has received official approval and is being implemented.

The Kysuce-Orava Switchback Railroad **756** **Slovak Republic**

Given that this type of property has not previously been inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Bureau decided to defer this proposed nomination and to await the completion of a comparative study carried out by TICCIH. If the study is completed for the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996, this nomination shall be considered as referred and an ICOMOS recommendation will be submitted to that meeting.

Suakin: The Island of Suakin, the Old Town of Suakin, and the Coral Town Suakin **752** **Sudan**

The Bureau decided to defer the examination of the proposed nomination in order to await the completion of the systematic inventory and the evaluation programmes as well as the preparation and implementation of an overall management plan.

E. Property for which the discussion was adjourned to the next extraordinary session of the Bureau

Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) **775** **Japan**

The Bureau took note of ICOMOS recommendation concerning the Hiroshima Peace Memorial, Genbaku Dome, Japan (775) in its written report (1996) and decided to adjourn the discussion of this matter to the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1996.

F. Extension of a World Heritage site

The City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto	**712bis**	**Italy**	**C(i)(ii)**

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (ii).

With the proposed extension the Bureau further recommended that the name be changed to "**The City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto.**"

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had received a letter in May 1996 from the Italian Delegation concerning the withdrawal of the Villa Thiene in Cicogna di Villafranca Padovana from the proposed extension.

MIXED PROPERTIES

V.5 The Bureau examined three nominations for inscription of mixed sites which had been sent to ICOMOS and IUCN for review.

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

Name of Property	Identification number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Mt. Emei and Leshan Giant Buddha	**779**	**China**	**C(iv)(vi) N(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the site under cultural criteria (iv) and (vi) as an area of exceptional cultural significance related to Buddhism and of natural beauty into which the human element has been integrated, and natural criterion (iv) for its high plant species diversity with a high number of endemic species. The Bureau furthermore recommended that the Chinese authorities carefully control tourism development at the site and encourage involvement of the Buddhist Monasteries in conservation activities on the mountain.

The Lapponian Area Precious Nature - Saami Culture	**774**	**Sweden**	**C(iii)(v) N(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of natural criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). The Bureau considered that the site is of outstanding universal value as it contains examples of ongoing geological, biological and ecological processes, a great variety of natural phenomena of exceptional beauty and contains significant biological diversity including a population of brown bear and alpine flora. It was noted that the site meets all conditions of integrity.

The Bureau also recommended inscription under cultural criteria (iii) and (v) as the site is one of the last and largest examples of pastoralism with transhumance.

The Bureau encouraged the Swedish authorities (a) to continue to work with the Saami people on the environmental impact of reindeer herding, (b) to extend the inventory of species and (c) to consolidate management planning for a single World Heritage area. The Bureau would welcome consideration being given to the possibility of a transboundary site with Norway.

B. Properties for which the nominations were referred back

Lushan National Park	**778**	**China**	**C(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)**

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the site under cultural criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) as a cultural landscape of outstanding aesthetic value and its powerful associations with Chinese spiritual and cultural life. The Bureau however, requested the State Party to provide further clarifications on the boundaries of the site. The Bureau also requested that additional comments on the site as a cultural landscape be provided by IUCN in time for the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Bureau decided not to recommend the inscription of the property under natural criteria.

V.6 At the end of the discussions, the Chairperson read the Paragraphs 57, 61 and 62 of the Guidelines concerning the evaluation and examination of nominations for inscription which prescribe the role of the advisory bodies, the representatives of States Parties, member or not of the Committee, and requested that these directives be strictly adhered to.

VI. PROGRESS REPORT ON THEMATIC AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES

A) Thematic Studies

VI.1 The Bureau took note of the Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/4 on the "Progress Report on Thematic and Comparative Studies", the Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.6 on the "Comparative and Related Studies carried out by ICOMOS, 1992-1996", Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9 on the "Report of the Expert Meeting on Evaluation of General Principles and Criteria for Nominations of Natural World Heritage Sites (Parc national de la Vanoise, France, 22 to 24 March 1996)" and Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.10 on the "Regional Thematic Study Meeting: European Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value (Vienna, Austria, 21 April 1996)".

VI.2 A general debate took place as to whether the Bureau had the mandate to discuss and decide upon substantive issues such as those raised in Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/4 and Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/9. The Bureau recalled the discussions held at the eighteenth and nineteenth sessions of the World Heritage Committee and thanked the French Government for hosting the expert meeting in the Parc de la Vanoise. It was decided that the Secretariat transmit the recommendations of the expert group (Documents WHC-96/CONF.202/4 and WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9) to all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention and request their comments by 1 November 1996 at the latest. It was furthermore noted that the recommendations of the expert group and the comments by States Parties be presented to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. It was suggested that consideration be given to the creation of a special group at the time of the twentieth session of the Committee to help structure this important debate.

VI.3 A number of delegates expressed their view that the expert meeting held in at the Park de la Vanoise brought up important questions concerning the spirit of the Convention and the unique links it makes between nature and culture and their protection.

VI.4 The Observer of France recalled the background to the expert meeting and its reflections on the notions of integrity, representivity and universality of the World Heritage List. He underlined that the recommendations made by the experts are a basis for further deliberations and can in no way be interpreted as suggesting the removal of sites from the World Heritage List. The full report of the Vanoise Meeting (Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9) discusses general principles and interpretations of natural heritage as well as the interface between nature and culture, recalling the unique approach of linking both in the World Heritage Convention. He welcomed the proposal that the full report be transmitted to all States Parties for comments as well as to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau took up this discussion under Agenda item 11 (see Chapter XI of this Report).

VI.5 It was suggested that the Operational Guidelines be reorganized by the Secretariat in the form of a Manual to be presented at the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee.

VI.6 The Bureau furthermore took note of the report of the Regional Thematic Study Meeting on European Cultural Landscapes of Outstanding Universal Value held in Vienna, Austria, on 21 April 1996 (Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.10).

B) Comparative studies

VI.7 The Chairperson gave the floor to the Director of the Centre who recalled that information on this subject had been requested by the Bureau during its nineteenth session in July 1995, then ICOMOS took the floor.

VI.8 The Representative of ICOMOS gave information on the comparatives studies that had already been completed, those underway or foreseen in Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.6. He suggested that several of them concern questions which arise frequently during the examination of nominations for inscription and informed the Bureau that a more methodological document would be presented to the Committee at its next session.

VI.9 The Delegate of Lebanon regretted that this document was not available in English, as were other information documents. The Director of the Centre agreed but it had not been possible to translate this document due to lack of resources.

VI.10 The Delegate of Germany was very satisfied with the level of work already achieved by ICOMOS, in particular for their assistance to the Committee in the choice of new categories of properties. He hoped that the members of the Committee would be able to consult and receive some of these studies. The Representative of ICOMOS indicated that this had already been done in some cases and that an illustrated publication on the canals and bridges of worldwide interest will be made available at Merida.

VI.11 The Representative of ICCROM underlined that his Organization would be happy to participate with ICOMOS in all thematic meetings, and in particular in those concerning such themes as authenticity, conservation and the links between nature and culture. The Representative of ICOMOS warmly accepted this proposal, particularly with regard to the studies which will be carried out next year at the occasion of twenty-fifth anniversary of the Convention.

VI.12 The Delegate of Mexico requested that experts for the South and particularly from Latin America be closely associated with future meetings, for example on the theme of authenticity.

VII. SYNOPTIC PRESENTATION OF THE BUDGET, INCLUDING FULL INFORMATION ON WORLD HERITAGE ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE UNESCO SECRETARIAT

VII.1 On Agenda item 7, the Chairman began by reporting on his two meetings with the Director-General which had been requested by the Committee at its nineteenth session.

VII.2 On the question of staff, the Chairman stated that after the January meeting, the Director-General agreed to absorb under the UNESCO staff costs from 1997, the costs for the seven General Service staff and the documentalist post which are exceptionally met this year from the World Heritage Fund. He reported that the Director-General had also agreed to appoint immediately, a P-5 natural heritage specialist and a high-level administrator for the Centre. He drew the attention of the Bureau to the letter dated 2 February 1996 addressed to the Chairman by the Director-General reiterating these commitments, which had been copied to all members of the Committee.

VII.3 In view of the delayed implementation of these decisions by the Director-General and further departure of staff from the Centre, the Chairman reported that another meeting with the Director-General took place in June. He regretted to inform the Bureau that due to the Organization's financial difficulties, the Director-General was obliged to make a new proposal in which four posts will be met under the UNESCO staff cost and two posts from Regular Programme project costs. For the two remaining posts, the Director-General expressed his hope for the Committee to continue meeting the costs.

VII.4 The members of the Bureau thanked the Chairman for his intervention with the Director-General on their behalf. The Delegate of Italy recalled the Committee's decision in Berlin to support the costs of these posts only on an exceptional basis and therefore stated that the Committee's prolongation for the funding of any of these posts should be avoided. Germany supported this position also shared by the French Observer.

VII.5 The French Observer also reminded the Secretariat that the Committee had requested at its nineteenth session, an organizational chart of the Centre, clearly demonstrating the ratio between professional and secretarial staff as compared to the other units of UNESCO Secretariat. This organizational chart should be annotated with information regarding the functional responsibilities of the staff with the date of their appointment and duration of their assignment.

VII.6 Several members of the Bureau requested a clearer presentation of the relations between the Centre and the advisory bodies, both in financial terms and for their respective activities to ensure that there is no overlap or duplication. The Representative of ICOMOS welcomed this suggestion stating that this will provide an opportunity for the Bureau and Committee to appreciate the extent of their input which is not limited to the evaluation of nominations but to potentially extend to all the

actions linked to the Convention, as for example technical assistance and monitoring.

VII.7 The Bureau requested the Chairman to see the Director-General with regard to these outstanding problems and on the matter of strengthening the administrative unit of the Centre.

VII.8 On the question of the budget presentation, as requested by the Committee at its nineteenth session, an illustrative example of a synoptic presentation of the budget, including information on World Heritage activities within the UNESCO Secretariat was submitted in Document WHC-96/CONF.202/5/Rev. This document contained two parts, the sample presentation of budgetary details by budgetline with detailed annotations and the synoptic overview table and the second part being the Draft Matrix Report on 1996 UNESCO Activities for World Heritage Cultural Properties and Natural Properties.

VII.9 The Representative of the UNESCO Bureau of the Comptroller explained that the first part of this Document contained the sample budget presentation information, while the World Heritage Fund financial accounts for 1995 and implementation of the 1996 approved budget were contained in WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.7. He stated that in view of the fact that the financial accounts have to be submitted to the Committee, then to the General Assembly of States Parties, the Bureau of the Comptroller recommended the budget document should be distinct from the financial accounts document.

VII.10 The Italian Delegate considered that the synoptic presentation of the budget as contained in the first part of this Document was exactly the same as that provided to the Committee and does not conform to what was requested and still remains confusing. At the request of the Observer of France, the Secretariat confirmed that if the draft Resolution 3 in Document WHC-96/CONF.202/5.Rev. was to be presented to the next Committee meeting, it would be in accordance with paragraph XII.4 of the Cartagena Report which authorizes the Chairman of the Committee and not the Director of the Centre to approve part of the provisional budget, subject to the conditions therein mentioned.

VII.11 The German Delegate stated that he found the information contained in the Draft Matrix Report on UNESCO activities for World Heritage of interest. While welcoming information contained in the Explanatory Notes in the budget, he felt that the format should be improved. He also requested a more comprehensive explanation on the reasons determining the budget ceiling, notably in relation to the revenue and the reserve. He also stated that in assisting the Committee to establish the 1997 budget, information on the Regular Programme activities related to World Heritage foreseen in other units of UNESCO, notably in the Culture and the Science Sectors would be useful.

VII.12 The Observer of France stated preference for a single document including both the budget and expenditures, together

with a table providing information on the prior year's approved budget, actual expenditure and the proposed budget for the next year so as to have an overview of trends in one table. She suggested that each budgetline be annotated, providing explanations as necessary. She noted furthermore, that in view of the Centre being protected from financial cuts, details on appropriation and expenditure under the Regular Programme budget should not be difficult to provide. The Secretariat undertook to provide this information and added that for the other Sectors of UNESCO, where the budgets could be subjected to cuts, the activities foreseen would only be indicative.

VII.13 Some members considered that the amount in the Contingency Reserve was too high and that it should perhaps be reduced to increase funding for the much needed activities for the large number of sites on the List. The Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller referred to the decision of the Committee at its seventeenth session in Cartegena which established the Contingency Reserve at US$ 2 million and that it was open to the Committee to change this amount if it so wished.

VII.14 The Delegate of Niger, supported by the Observer of Canada, suggested that, for the next session of the Committee, an annex document to the budget report be prepared. The analytical document will comprise the columns "proposed" and "actual" expenditure and would permit statistical overview of the main trends of the different budget chapters, to better comprehend the directions for the safeguarding of world heritage.

VII.15 The Delegate of Lebanon suggested that a working group be established for budgetary and financial matters before the next Committee meeting. The German Delegate reminded the Bureau that working groups can only be established by the Committee.

VII.16 Further to the suggestion of the Observer of the United States, it was agreed that the members of the Bureau, as well as the observers, if they so wish, provide the Secretariat in writing with the budgetary format and information they would like to see in the document for the next Committee meeting. The Secretariat will in any case act upon the recommendations of the Bureau and the Observers.

VII.17 The Bureau also expressed its wish to have an evaluation conducted on the activities financed from the Fund which they deemed was essential in determining the future orientation of projects, as well as their sustainability.

VII.18 The Director noting the comments of the Bureau, stated that the Secretariat will make its best efforts to present the budget and financial account documents for the next Committee meeting in Merida, containing the information requested by the Bureau, notably:

(a) the synoptic table to include prior year approved budget, actual expenditures and proposed budget with annotations by budgetline as annex, including information on the budget

ceiling, with each page and paragraph numbered for ease of reference;

(b) a separate document on the financial account of the previous biennium;

(c) the organizational chart of the Centre with annotations on the main responsibilities of each unit or staff and date of appointment to the post and duration of the assignment;

(d) a synoptic report on the budget relations between the Centre and the rest of the UNESCO units with regard to World Heritage activities;

(e) a synoptic report on the budget relations between the Centre and the advisory bodies, together with a draft contract for the following year to be approved by the Committee.

VIII. DECENTRALIZATION OF WORLD HERITAGE ACTIVITIES

VIII.1 The Chairman, having reminded the Bureau that this item will be discussed on the basis of Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/6, recalled also that this item was inscribed on the agenda by the Committee at its nineteenth session in Berlin. (As indicated on page 69 of the Berlin Report, English and French versions). He then invited the Secretariat to introduce the item on behalf of the Centre.

VIII.2 Having explained the structure of the working document, the Secretariat underlined that it was meant to be a factual presentation of the actual situation, based on existing documents. The text had been previously approved also by the Director of UNESCO's Division for Decentralization and Relations with Field Offices who, unfortunately, could not be present as he was on mission. The part dealing with the Nordic World Heritage Office in Oslo was prepared on the basis of the written information provided by the Office. In addition to this, the Office made available a more detailed paper, "Strategy 1996-98", which had been distributed to the Bureau members during the session. The Secretariat furthermore informed the Bureau that the Oslo Office would submit a detailed report on its activities of the first nine months at the next session of the Committee. In conclusion, the Secretariat ventured to underline that the setting up of the Oslo Office was a three-year pilot project, created on an experimental basis; that the office was fully financed by the Government of Norway; and that UNESCO contributed US$ 20,000 from the Regular Programme for projects to be implemented jointly with the World Heritage Centre in the 1996-97 period. The Secretariat finally suggested that the debate on decentralization could perhaps be more productive if it focused on possible forms of (sub)regional support mechanisms in favour of World Heritage rather than decentralization as a somewhat abused notion.

VIII.3 The Delegate of Italy insisted that the debate be on decentralization, as requested by the Committee, and in line with UNESCO's documents. He quoted in this respect the Director-General's statement in 1995 regarding the setting up of the Office.

VIII.4. Having reminded that the Convention is served by the Secretariat of UNESCO, but that it is the World Heritage Committee that decides on policy matters, the Delegate of Italy underlined that the real issue is the attitude and the way in which the establishment of this new office (or possibly offices), was handled. In this sense he disagreed with the Director's statement regarding the World Heritage logo (referred later in this Chapter), emphasizing that the logo belongs to all States Parties collectively. Therefore it is not for the Director-General of UNESCO, or anyone else, to decide on its use. He deplored the fact that copies of the agreement regarding the Oslo Office had never been officially distributed to the members of the Committee, not even in Berlin, when it was made available thanks to one of the delegations. He concluded by stating that his Delegation has nothing against the Oslo Office working on promoting the Convention among the Nordic countries. However, it is the international dimension of their envisaged activities which gives rise to concern. In this regard he wished to know whether any specific contracts had been signed between the Oslo Office and the Centre for activities to be carried out in Asia and southern Africa.

VIII.5. In a later intervention, the Delegate of Italy underlined that questions regarding the use of the logo are only a part of the problem. The central issue remains that of priorities, and he quoted in this context Article 13, paragraph 4 of the Convention, notably the part which states: "The Committee shall determine an order of priorities for its operations." He therefore reiterated that the Committee must have the possibility to approve such actions, no matter how worthwhile these may be, and he wanted to know in what way and when the Committee would be seized to do so.

VIII.6 The Delegate of Germany wished to know more about the legal aspects of the agreement, signed between the Government of Norway and UNESCO, regarding the creation of the Oslo Office. He furthermore wished to know whether specific contracts had been made with the Office and what amount from the World Heritage Fund had been decentralized. Finally, while stating that the Office could perhaps serve as an example of a useful complementary structure, the Committee was entitled to be informed in advance of such actions, i.e., before any agreements are signed. Referring to the "Strategy" paper of the Oslo Office, he said it was important to distinguish the part regarding the Nordic countries, which he found acceptable, from the part dealing with the international dimension of the Office activities. These, he said, would need the approval of the Committee. The Delegate of Germany also wished to know whether the funds provided by the Office, coming for instance from one of the Nordic development

agencies, would be given to the World Heritage Fund, and would therefore be subject to the Committee's decision on how it is to be used.

VIII.7. Having stated that the Working Document fails to respond to any of the concerns raised regarding this matter at the Berlin session, the Delegate of Lebanon deplored that it did not outline any strategy, or any new developments. It likewise did not mention previous decentralization efforts, such as the UNDP in Latin America. As regards the international dimension of the "Strategy" paper distributed by the Oslo Office, he wished to know why it deals with only two regions (southern Africa and South-east Asia). He also wished to know who this Office will be accountable to and within what legal framework. Was this going to incite the creation of other similar offices, thereby creating "clubs of well-off countries" which would replace existing forms of multilateral cooperation? He also wished to know whether paragraph 124 of the Operational Guidelines on the use of the World Heritage logo had been respected.

VIII.8 At a later stage of the debate, the Delegate of Lebanon recalled Article 15.4 of the Convention, notably the part which states that "Contributions to the Fund and other forms of assistance made available to the Committee may be used only for such purposes as the Committee shall define". He asked in this context whether this should not apply also to funds received under the Regular Programme.

VIII.9 Speaking again, later in the debate regarding the World Heritage emblem, the Delegate of Lebanon reminded that while paragraph 123 of the Operational Guidelines stipulates that "properties included in the World Heritage List should be marked with the World Heritage emblem jointly with the UNESCO logo", this does not mean that the emblem is the property of UNESCO. Regarding the emblem, he also reminded the Committee that any modifications regarding its use will have to be reflected in the relevant paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines.

VIII.10 The Delegate of Mexico deplored that the distribution of the Oslo Office "Strategy" paper was only made during the Bureau session, when it was dated "March 1996". He agreed with the statement of the Delegate of Italy concerning the ambiguity of this document and that apart from financial matters and the question of the logo, it should be reformulated to avoid confusion, as for instance on page 5, under the title International Strategy: "NWHO's International Strategy will be implemented in cooperation with our Nordic Partners and WHC, Paris".

VIII.11 The Delegate of Australia stated that his understanding was that States Parties were encouraged to use the logo and Australia therefore prominently featured the logo in publications of the Ravenshoe Workshop and others. He shared the view expressed by others that this matter needed to be discussed in more detail. To ensure the proper use of the logo in an efficient way, it was proposed that requests for its use could

be submitted by correspondence via the Centre to the Chairman and the members of the Bureau for approval.

VIII.12 Speaking about the agreement by which the Oslo Office was created, the Delegate of Australia indicated that it speaks (in the opening paragraph) of an "international network of World Heritage offices", while in Article 6, it speaks of "obligations of UNESCO". These parts of the agreement are indeed likely to raise suspicion and damage confidence. It is therefore important to have more detailed information on this matter.

VIII.13 The Delegate of Niger also queried the Oslo Office "Strategy" paper, asking specifically what partnerships have been envisaged in Africa and Asia, and whether such activities would be first discussed by the Committee. Having heard the reply provided by the Director of the Oslo Office, Ms Kris Endresen, he then expressed his concern regarding such a decentralization of World Heritage activities which would use bilateral as well as multilateral forms of cooperation. Having endorsed the concerns expressed by previous speakers, he underlined that multilateral cooperation normally means that funds are given into a common kitty, the use of which is decided by an international body, in this case the World Heritage Committee.

VIII.14 Regarding the World Heritage logo, the Delegate of Niger felt that this was not an urgent matter, and that therefore a proposal for eventual modifications regarding its use could be prepared by the Secretariat for the Committee's session in Merida.

VIII.15 The Delegate of Japan stated that the setting up of the Oslo Office was a useful pilot project, but that its legal aspects and role in international projects required further clarification. He insisted on the importance of clarifying particularly the relationship between this new type of office or organization and the World Heritage Committee.

VIII.16 The Observer of Malta emphasized the general concerns expressed by the Bureau for not having been given officially copies of the agreement regarding the Oslo Office, or any other possible contracts related to it. She said that while no-one could be against the principle of regional initiatives undertaken by States Parties to strengthen the implementation of the Convention in their respective regions, it was the manner in which this particular office was set up that was unacceptable. She requested the Secretariat to ensure that the necessary control mechanisms be applied by UNESCO in any future undertaking to avoid a repetition of what occurred in the creation of the Nordic agreement.

VIII.17 The Observer of France, having endorsed the statements made by the Delegates of Germany, Italy, Lebanon, Mexico, Niger and the Observer of Malta, summarized the key problems identified under this item. The use of the logo clearly requires to be managed in a legally sound way, and it therefore needs to be

examined at the next meeting of the Committee. Regarding the financing of the Oslo Office, she requested the Director of the Centre whether he could confirm that no contract had been concluded between the Centre and the Oslo Office which implied the use of funds from the World Heritage Fund or Regular Programme funds. She also wished to have precise information concerning the possible creation of three other World Heritage offices and whether official negotiations were in progress. In the event that other offices were created, would they be auto-financed or would UNESCO funds be required?

VIII.18 The Observer of Benin suggested that a written proposal regarding the use of the logo be adopted at this session of Bureau, so that it could be submitted to the Committee at its session in Merida.

VIII.19 The Observer of the United States of America endorsed the proposal made by the Observer of Benin. Having emphasized the growing threats to the World Heritage sites on the one hand, and the rapidly decreasing financial means for their preservation, on the other, he felt that the Centre and the Oslo Office should be praised for finding additional funds for World Heritage projects. However, while sharing the view of preceding speakers who requested further clarifications regarding the Oslo Office, he invited these speakers to state more clearly the motives for their reservations regarding such new offices. He concluded by stating that his country will continue to support such initiatives, particularly in view of the fact that the Nordic countries sought close cooperation with the World Heritage network when in fact nothing would have prevented them from doing the same without the Committee's endorsement.

VIII.20 The Observer of Thailand reminded the Bureau that the questions regarding the logo have remained in suspense since the Committee's eighteenth session, held in Phuket in 1994. It was important to keep in mind that paragraph 125 of the Operational Guidelines (the need for written authorization), evoked in the debate at this session, speaks of the restrictions regarding the use of the logo for <u>commercial</u> purposes. Nonetheless, he agreed that the entire matter should be brought again to the attention of the Committee.

VIII.21 Both the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Representative of the Legal Adviser provided clarifications to some of the questions raised in the debate. The Director of the Centre notably emphasized the complementarity of the Oslo Office with the work of the Centre. The Office helps identify World Heritage projects for which funds can be made available from major funding agencies of the Nordic Countries. He cited the example of the World Heritage Education project for young people, endorsed by the Committee as well as UNESCO's General Conference, and for which additional funds have been received from NORAD. While emphasizing that the Oslo Office is indeed a "learning experience", he stated his readiness to prepare a detailed report on the Oslo Office and its activities, which would be ready for the Committee's meeting in Merida, in December 1996.

VIII.22 The Legal Adviser on his part provided clarifications regarding the use of the World Heritage logo, as defined in the Operational Guidelines, emphasizing that it was for the Committee to decide on its logo, as it is not mentioned in the text of the Convention. Specifically regarding the use of the logo by the Oslo Office, he said that this authorization seems to have been given by the Centre while in fact, officially, it could have been given only by the Committee. As for the relationship between the Oslo Office and the Committee, he drew the Bureau's attention to Article 9 of the agreement signed between UNESCO and the Government of Norway, which states that "the Office shall prepare an annual report on its activities which will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The Centre shall inform the World Heritage Committee on the operation and the activities of the Office and shall subsequently communicate to the Office any decisions and recommendations of the Committee relevant to the activities of the Office."

VIII.23 The Chairman of the World Heritage Committee thereupon summarized the debate on this item by underlining the following:

(a) While it is true that the World Heritage sites are in danger and all efforts must be made to save them, greater transparency is necessary when undertaking such initiatives as the setting up of the Oslo Office, to avoid confusion and mistrust.

(b) While everyone commends the contribution of the Nordic countries, and particularly the Government of Norway, to World Heritage, there is nontheless a concern, expressed by the majority of the speakers, that the responsibilities regarding the World Heritage Convention could eventually slip away from its Committee. This was expressed particularly in regard to the international dimension of the Oslo Office's proposed activities.

(c) The present difficulties may perhaps be overcome if the Centre provides more information on the Oslo Office and all other similar initiatives to the Committee. To do so, the Chairman invites all members of the Committee to address in writing their questions to the Centre, so that a full written reply can be prepared for the Committee's session in Merida. The Secretariat will in any case act upon the recommendations of the Bureau and the Observers.

(d) Regarding the use of the logo (emblem), he agrees with the proposal that the countries wishing to use it address their request to the Chairman, who will consult by correspondence the members of the Bureau. Furthermore, the Chairman requested the Legal Adviser to prepare for the Committee's meeting in Merida a written document on the use of the logo, including proposals on how to assure its appropriate use.

IX. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

IX.1 The Bureau recalled the discussion held at nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Berlin (see Chapter XIII of the Committee Report, page 59) that one third of the budget for technical cooperation (total of US$ 685,000) and half of the budget for training (US$ 550,000) is reserved for natural heritage. It was also noted that no funds remain for these two budget items for cultural heritage and that the remaining balance for technical cooperation for natural heritage is US$ 121,234.

NATURAL HERITAGE

A. Technical Cooperation

Requests approved by the Bureau

Conservation Strategy and Preparation of a Management Plan for the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

In the light of the state of conservation report presented on this site, the Bureau approved an amount of **US$ 30,000** for the elaboration of a management plan for the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) subject to the submission of a detailed budget outline for this request.

Requests not approved by the Bureau

Architectural Design of the Interpretation Centre at the Galapagos National Park (Ecuador) (US$ 25,900)

The Bureau recalled the recent mission to the Galapagos Islands and recommended that the Galapagos National Park authorities submit a request to the next Bureau session in line with the orientations identified by the fact-finding mission to the Galapagos Islands led by the Chairperson.

Technical Assistance for Virunga National Park (Zaire) (US$100,000)

The Bureau did not recommend this request to be approved by the Committee in the light of the findings of the recent mission to this site, which is on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to submit a revised request in particular for a safeguarding plan for Virunga National Park as recommended by the expert mission.

B. Request concerning Promotional Activities

Preparation of Interpretation Materials for the Galapagos National Park (Ecuador) (US$29,900)

The Bureau recalled that the total amount for promotion has already been fully committed and that no further funds are available.

X. DRAFT AGENDA FOR THE TWENTIETH EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (29-30 NOVEMBER 1996)

X.1 The Chairperson recalled that at the kind invitation of the Government of Mexico, the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee will be held in Mexico, Merida (Yucatan). He thanked the Government of Mexico for this generous offer.

X.2 Upon the proposal of the Chairperson, the Bureau decided that its twentieth extraordinary session will be held in Merida, Yucatan on 29 and 30 November 1996. The Bureau adopted the Provisional Agenda for this session as proposed by the Secretariat in Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/8 with a change in the order of the items. The Provisional Agenda as adopted by the Bureau is attached as Annex IV of this report.

XI. PREPARATION OF THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, INCLUDING THE DRAFT AGENDA (2-7 DECEMBER 1996)

XI.1 The Chairperson recalled that the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee will be held in Mexico, Merida (Yucatan) from 2 to 7 December 1996. The Bureau examined the draft agenda for this session as proposed by the Secretariat in Working Document WHC-96/CONF.202/9.

XI.2 Further to discussions regarding the collaboration between the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre, the Bureau adopted the following text submitted by the Delegate of Australia:

> "At this meeting, we have witnessed the growth in evaluations, monitoring and technical assistance tasks under the Convention and the range of approaches to field missions. We note Information Document INF.5 and the points raised within it at points 3 and 4.
>
> It appears that the collaborative distribution of work between the Centre and the Committee's three advisory bodies identified in Article 14 of the Convention has become critical. That article specifies "utilizing to the fullest extent possible the services of ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN in their respective areas of competence and capability". How this is done must be clear to all parties

(i.e. the Committee and Bureau, the Centre and the advisory bodies). Information Document INF.5 suggests some procedural changes including those related to contractual arrangements.

To encourage the effectiveness of collaboration, it is proposed that the Centre and the three advisory bodies prepare, for the next Committee meeting, a memorandum of understanding to achieve complementarity and consistency of work between the Centre and the Committee's advisors in implementing the Convention."

XI.3 Following the discussions on the thematic and comparative studies reported in Chapter VI above, the Chairperson requested the Delegate of Australia to propose a text concerning the follow-up that could be given to the Expert Meeting on "Evaluation of General Principles and Criteria for Nominations of Natural World Heritage Sites" (Parc National de la Vanoise, France, March 1996). After considerable discussion on this text, the Chairperson proposed the Bureau to adopt the following:

"In connection with item 9 of the draft agenda, the Bureau suggests to the Committee that, in view of the Vanoise conclusions on strengthening the links between cultural and natural values, and in the spirit of the Global Strategy adopted at the eighteenth session of the Committee in Phuket, it consider holding a regionally balanced workshop of experts from both cultural and natural fields to review the specific question of revising the evaluation criteria in the Operational Guidelines."

XI.4 This text was adopted by vote with a majority of four members of the Bureau (Australia, Germany, Japan and Lebanon).

XI.5 The Delegate of Italy requested that sufficient time be allocated during the next Committee session for an in-depth discussion on the global strategy, and thematic and comparative studies. The Observer of Canada proposed that the report of the 'Expert Meeting on the Global Strategy and Thematic Studies for a Representative World Heritage List' that was adopted by the Committee at its eighteenth session in Phuket, be made available to the members of the Committee as an information document.

XI.6 As to the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Convention in 1997, the Bureau decided that this should be considered under the agenda item on promotional and educational activities that should now read as follows: 'Promotional and educational activities, highlighting particularly the twenty-fifth anniversary events'.

XI.7 The Bureau also decided that the issue of decentralization of World Heritage activities should be dealt with under the agenda item 'Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1997, and presentation of a provisional budget for 1998'.

XI.8 The Bureau decided furthermore to add the following agenda items:

- Cooperation between the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre;
- Implementation of the Convention in the light of twenty-five years' practice;
- Use of the World Heritage Emblem;
- Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

XI.9 The Provisional Agenda for the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee is attached as Annex V of this report.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

XII.1 The Director-General of ICCROM, Mr Marc Laenen, referred to the Information Document WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.8 and stated that ICCROM was involved in the World Heritage Convention as an advisory body and an operational partner in its implementation following Article 14 of the Convention which stresses the need to organize the maximal use of the capacities offered by the advisory bodies. He made the following statement.

XII.2 "ICCROM's specific nature and competence are in its intergovernmental status and its statutory mandate. There are common issues and differences between the World Heritage Convention and ICCROM allowing complementarity, synergy and functional partnership. Our aim should be to avoid duplications. In fact, the States that are members of ICCROM, are also Parties to the Convention. Our organization has an intergovernmental status and many of the fields of application are similar, e.g. archaeological sites, historic buildings and areas, cultural landscapes. ICCROM's aim is to coordinate resources to change i.e. improve conditions for conservation practice. Its activities focus on professional capacity development and the establishment of a favourable climate for conservation activities. This is done in a strategic way identifying the problems, setting targets and objectives and measurables, and selecting methodologies and the target audiences (key people, trainers). Capacity-building and social environment development should address not only technicians, but also decision-makers, administrators, site managers and the general public. It includes development of scientific, educational and training facilities, through projects combining research, training, publications, and cooperation. Currently, ICCROM is preparing projects for the conservation of historic cities, such as World Heritage cities, in Lithuania, Hungary, Brazil, Mali. The purpose is to develop also training programmes in archaeological site conservation and management, such as Chan Chan in Latin America and a similar project in the

Middle East. Future cooperation between ICCROM and the World Heritage Convention can focus on a global approach in professional capacity development and a favourable environment in shared critical problem areas."

XII.3 The Delegate of Italy reiterated his Government's invitation made during the nineteenth session of the Committee in Berlin, to hold the twenty-first session in Naples in 1997. The Chairperson thanked the Delegate of Italy for this invitation.

XIII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE BUREAU AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

XIII.1 After having examined the draft report presented by the Rapporteur, the Bureau adopted the Report with the amendments requested by the delegates, observers and representatives of the adivsory bodies. These have been incorporated into the present final version of the Report.

XIII.2 Referring to the debate noted in Paragraph VIII.22 of this Report, the Director of the Centre clarified that the Centre did not give any specific authorization to the Nordic World Heritage Office (Oslo) for the use of the World Heritage emblem given the fact that the use of this emblem, as well as that of UNESCO, are embodied in the overall agreement signed between UNESCO and the Government of Norway.

XIII.3 The Observer of Mexico, Ms Maria Teresa Franco, expressed her Government's pleasure and privilege to welcome the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee to Merida this December and gave assurances that every effort would be undertaken to make this meeting a successful one.

XIII.4 Upon the proposal of the Delegate of Australia, the Bureau asked the Chairman to express to the Director and the staff of the Centre its appreciation for organizing the meeting and for its hard work and continuing dedication to the causes of World Heritage. The Bureau also expressed deep respect for the high professionalism of the advisory bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, which maintain the international standards of heritage listing; and it thanked the Chairman for his firm leadership of the meeting, the Rapporteur and the interpreters for their consummate skill.

XIII.5 The Chairman then declared the twentieth session of the Bureau meeting closed.

ANNEX/ANNEXE I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Mr Colin GRIFFITHS
Deputy Executive Director
Environment Strategies Directorate
Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories

Dr Ian Mc. PHAIL
Chairperson
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

Ms Joan DOMICELJ
Director
Domicelj Consultants

The Hon. Barry JONES
Member of Parliament
Parliament House
CANBERRA

Ms Roni ELLIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO

Ms Anne SIWICKI
Attaché
Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Ambassador Dr. Horst WINKELMANN
Chairman of the World Heritage Committee

H. Exc. Mr Christoph DERIX
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate
of Germany to UNESCO

Dr Hans CASPARY
Conservator of Historical Monuments
Office for the Conservation of Historic Monuments
of the Land Rhineland-Palatinate

Dr Harald PLACHTER
University of Marburg
Faculty of Biology
Department of Nature Conservation

Mr Thilo KOHLER
Second Secretary
Federal Foreign Office

ITALY/ITALIE

S. Exc. M. Giancarlo LEO
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Francesco FRANCIONI
Professeur à la faculté de Droit
Université de Sienne
Expert des questions juridiques auprès du
Ministère italien des Affaires Etrangères

Mme Margherita SABATINI
Direction générale des Relations culturelles
du Ministère des Affaires étrangères

M. Pasquale Lino MALARA
Surintendant aux Biens environnementaux
et architecturaux du Piemonte

M. Luciano MARCHETTI
Conservateur des Biens architecturaux
et de l'environnement de Florence

JAPAN/JAPON

Mr Azusa HAYASHI
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO

Mr Joji HISAEDA
Director, Cultural Affairs
Second Cultural Affairs Division,
Cultural Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ms Tokuko NABESHIMA
Third Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO

Mr Shinichiro MURAKAMI
Official, Second Cultural Affairs Division,
Cultural Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr Tetsuro UESUGI
Assistant Director
Planning Division
Nature Conservation Bureau
Environment Agency

Prof. Dr. Nobuo ITO
Professor Emeritus
Kobe Design University

Mr Shinichi YAMANAKA
Director of Monuments and Sites Division,Cultural Properties
Protection Department, Agency for Cultural Affairs

Dr. Makoto MOTONAKA
Senior Specialist, Monuments and Sites Division,
Cultural Properties Protection Department,
Agency for Cultural Properties

Dr. Nobuko INABA
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties, Architecture Division,
Cultural Properties Protection Department,
Agency for Cultural Affairs

LEBANON/LIBAN

S. Exc. M. Sami KRONFOL
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent du Liban
auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Camille ASMAR
Directeur général des Antiquités
Musée national

M. Noël FATTAL
Conseiller, Délégué permanent adjoint du Liban
auprès de l'UNESCO

Maître Abdallah ZAKHIA
Avocat spécialisé dans la législation de l'environnement

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Mme Maria Teresa FRANCO
Directeur général,
INAH

Dr. Salvador DIAZ BERRIO
Directeur adjoint
"Apoyo Técnico y Docente
del Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia (INAH)

M. Salvador ACEVES
Coordinateur National des Monuments Historiques (INAH)

M. Francisco Javier LOPEZ MORALES
Subdirector catalogo Donas
Institut National d'Antropologie et d'Histoire
(INAH)

NIGER/NIGER

S. Exc. M. Lambert MESSAN
Rapporteur du Comité
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent du Niger
auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Michel LE BERRE
Conseiller scientifique de la Délégation
permanente du Niger auprès de l'UNESCO

M. André ZODI
Expert,
Secrétaire général du Ministère de la Culture
et de la Communication à Niamey

M. Seydou SEYNI
Expert
Conservateur du Parc National du W
Ministère du Développement Rural
et de l'Environnement, Niamey

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

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

Mr Marc LAENEN
Director General

Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO
Assistant to the Director General

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES/CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS) *

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN
Secretary General, ICOMOS Paris

Mr Henry CLEERE
World Heritage Coordinator, ICOMOS Paris

Ms Carole ALEXANDRE
Director, ICOMOS Paris

Ms Carmen AÑON FELIU
President of the Executive Committee, ICOMOS Madrid

M. Daniel DROCOURT
Coordinateur Programme
100 Sites Historiques/PAM/PNUE

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO
Assistant to the World Heritage Coordinator, ICOMOS Paris

* **New address from 15 July 1996/Nouvelle adresse à partir du 15 juillet 1996 :**
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS
FRANCE

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

Dr. James THORSELL
Head, Natural Heritage Programme

Mr Percy.H.C.("Bing") LUCAS
Vice-Chair, World Heritage
IUCN Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA)
1/268 Main Road, Tawa, Wellington
New Zealand 6006
Tel: 64 4 232 55 81
Fax: 64 4 232 91 29

Mr James PAINE
Senior Research Officer
World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)
Cambridge, U-K

M. Gérard SOURNIA
IUCN France

III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

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

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Mr Ernst BACHER
General Conservator
Bundesdenkmalamt

Mr Hans HORCICKA
Director
Minoritenplatz 5
Federal Ministry for Education
and Cultural Affairs

BENIN/BENIN

M. Isidore MONSI
Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Bénin
auprès de l'UNESCO

BOLIVIA/BOLIVIE

Mme Silvia ROCA
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente de Bolivie
auprès de l'UNESCO

BURKINA FASO/BURKINA FASO

M. Jean-Baptiste KIETHEGA
Maître-Assistant d'Histoire et Archéologie
Université de Ouagadougou

CANADA/CANADA

Ms Christina CAMERON
Director General, Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage

M. Murray McCOMB
Chief of Strategic Studies
National Parks Directorate
Parks Canada

Mme Gisèle CANTIN
Chef des Affaires internationales
Parks Canada, Ministère du patrimoine canadien

CHINA/CHINE

Mr Kuangren ZHANG
Director
Administative Bureau of Lushan National Park, JIANGXI Province

Mr Yuan Zhu MA
Director, Administration of Mount E'mei and
Leshan Giant Buddha Scenic Area, SICHUAN Province

Mr Feng JING
Programme Officer, Chinese National Commission for UNESCO

M. Jian Ping TIAN
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente de Chine auprès de l'UNESCO

COSTA RICA/COSTA RICA

Mme Iris LEIVA DE BILLAUT
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation du Costa Rica
auprès de l'UNESCO

Mme Gabriela CASTILLO
Ministre Conseiller
Délégation du Costa Rica
auprès de l'UNESCO

CROATIA/CROATIE

Mr Drazen KARAMAN
Deputy Permanent Delegate to UNESCO

CUBA/CUBA

Mme Marta ARJONA PEREZ
Président du Conseil du Patrimoine Culturel
Ministère de la Culture

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

M. Michal BENES
Secrétaire pour les Affaires culturelles de l'UNESCO
auprès du Ministère de la Culture

Mr Josef STULC
Director, State Institute for the Protection of Monuments

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

S. Exc. M. Santiago MASPONS
Ambassadeur Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur
auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Mauricio MONTALVO
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur
auprès de l'UNESCO

Mme Patricia VEDOVA
Assesseur
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur
auprès de l'UNESCO

FINLAND/FINLANDE

Ms Anne LAMMILA
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO

Mr Henrik LILIUS
Director General, State Archaeologist
National Board of Antiquities

FRANCE/FRANCE

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE
Vice-President
Université de Paris I

Mme Françoise BERCE
Inspecteur général du Patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture et de la Francophonie

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC
Conseiller technique
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO

M. Jean-Louis PONS
Chargé de mission
Ministère de l'environnement

GAMBIA/GAMBIE

Mr E. SEY
Délégation permanente de la Gambie
auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr K. SIDIBE
Executive Secretary
National Council of Arts and Culture (NCAC)

GREECE/GRECE

Mme Hélène METHODIOU
Conseiller culturel à la Délégation permanente de la Grèce
auprès de l'UNESCO

Mr Nicolaos GALANOPOULOS
Permanent Delegation of Greece to UNESCO

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Le Pére Titusz HARDI
Professeur
Représentant de l'Abbaye bénédictine de Pannonhalma

Mme Katalin SZILAS-MARTON
Architecte principal

M. Béla KOVACSI
Secrétaire du Comité national Hongrois pour le Patrimoine mondial

INDONESIA/INDONESIE

M. Kria Fahmi PASARIBU
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Indonesia to UNESCO

M. A. M. ZAINI
Assistant,
Permanent Delegation of Indonesia to UNESCO

IRAN/IRAN

Dr S. P. BINDRA
Professor Charif University of Technology
in charge of ESCAP Region,
Office of Scientific & International Co-operation
Tehran, IRAN

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE

M.Paulius KULIKAUSKAS
Conseiller du Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de Lithuanie
pour les questions du patrimoine mondial

MALTA/MALTE

Mme Tanya VELLA
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de Malte

NETHERLANDS/PAYS BAS

S. Exc. J.J de VISSER
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente des Pays-Bas
auprès de l'UNESCO

Dr. Robert DE JONG
State Department for Conservation
President ICOMOS-IFLH Committee of
Historic Gardens and Sites

PANAMA/PANAMA

Mme Maria Elena DE AGUILAR
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Panama
auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Jorge PATINO
Chargé des négociations
Délégation permanente du Panama
auprès de l'UNESCO

POLAND/POLOGNE

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

PORTUGAL/PORTUGAL

Mme Maria Isabel PEREIRA DA SILVA
Technicien supérieur,
Institut Portugais du patrimoine culturel

Mr Rui LOZA
Technicien de la Mirite de Porto

REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIQUE DE COREE

H.E. Mr Hyun-Gon KIM
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Korea to UNESCO

Mr Jung-Hee YOO
Counsellor, Permanent Delegation

RUSSIAN FEDERATION/FEDERATION RUSSIE

Mr Valeri NERONOV
Deputy Chairman
Russian MAB Committee

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

Mr Vladimir KOROTKOV
Conseiller de la Délégation permanente de la Russie
auprès de l'UNESCO

SLOVAKIA/SLOVAQUIE

Ms Viera POLAKOVICOVA
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Slovakia to UNESCO

Ms Viera DVORAKOVA
Institute of Monuments

Dr. Jozef KLINDA
Head of the Environmental Conception,
Law and Organisation Division
Ministry of the Environment

Mr Pavel TOMA
Head of Environmental Planning and Conception Department
Ministry of the Environment

SWEDEN/SUEDE

Ms Birgitta HOBERG
International Secretary
Central Board of National Antiquities

Mr Rolf LÖFGREN
Conservator Officer
National Environmental Protection Agency

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE

Mme Majeda HANA
Assistante
Délégation permanente

THAILAND/THAILANDE

Dr Adul WICHIENCHAROEN
Chairman,
National Committee for Protection of the
World Cultural & Natural Heritage
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment

Ms Srinoi POVATONG
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO
UNESCO House, Paris

M. L. Chiranand HASDINTRA
Director of Economic Projects Division IV
Bureau of the Budget
Office of the Prime Minister

Mr Tawee NOOTONG
Forest Technical Officer
Royal Forest Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives

Mrs Tuenchai SONGSAPAT
Secretary, Office of the Secretary
Department of Environmental Quality Promotion
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment

Mrs Usa KIATCHAIPIPAT
Environmental Officer
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment

Ms Malee SRIRATANATUM
Forest Technical Officer
Royal Forest Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

Ms Hilary IZON
Deputy UNESCO Observer

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr John J. REYNOLDS
Deputy Director
National Park Service
Department of the Interior

Mr William McILHENNY
Permanent Observer of the United States to UNESCO

Ms Katherine STEVENSON
Associate Director
Cultural Resource
Stewardship and Partnership
National Park Service
Department of the Interior

Mr James H. CHARLETON
International Cooperation Specialist
Office of International Affairs
National Park Service
Department of the Interior

V. NORDIC WORLD HERITAGE OFFICE/BUREAU NORDIQUE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Ms Anne Kristin ENDRESEN
Nordic World Heritage Office

Ms Astrid OPSAL
Nordic World Heritage Office

VI. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION/ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES

M. Daniel DROCOURT
Coordinateur du Programme 100 sites historiques
PAM/PNUE

VII. SECRETARIAT

World Heritage Centre/Centre du Patrimoine mondial

Mr Bernd von DROSTE
Director/Directeur

Mr George ZOUAIN
Deputy Director/Directeur adjoint

Mr Robert MILNE

Ms Breda PAVLIC

Ms Minja YANG

Mr Makhily GASSAMA

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO

Mr Herman van HOOFF

Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER

Mr Gernot BRODNIG

Ms Vesna VUJICIC

Mr Michel LINCOURT, Consultant

Mr Peter STOTT, Consultant

Ms Sarah TITCHEN, Consultant

Ms Beatrice KALDUN, Associated Expert/Expert associé
UNESCO/Bangkok Office

Ms Kumiko KURIBAYASHI, Associated Expert/Expert associé

Ms Maria PERERS, Associated Expert/Expert associé

Mr Carlos ROMERO

Ms Jane DEGEORGES

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU

Ms Marianne RAABE

Mr David MARTEL

Ms Réjane HERVE

Ms Claire SERVOZ

Division of Cultural Heritage/Division du Patrimoine physique

M. Mounir Bouchenaki
Directeur, Division du patrimoine culturel

Mme Emiko de Marmier-Murai

Mme Ana DUMITRESCU

Dr Khin MYAKYA

Division of Ecological Sciences/Division des Sciences écologiques

Ms Mireille JARDIN

M. Ma Mbaelele MANKOTO

Ms Jane ROBERTSON

Mr Thomas SCHAAF

Mr Mohamed SKOURI

Division of Earth Sciences/Division des Sciences de la Terre

M. F. EDER
Directeur, Division des Sciences de la Terre

Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs/Office des Normes internationales et des Affaires juridiques

Mr Daniel de SAN
Legal Advisor

Bureau of the Comptroller - Accounts Division/Bureau du Contrôleur financier - Division de la comptabilité

M. Mark WARREN
Contrôleur financier

ANNEX II

Draft report on monitoring and reporting to be submitted by the World Heritage Committee to the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties (Oct./Nov. 1997)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

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

Item xx of the provisional agenda: monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

In accordance with the decision of the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties (paragraph 31 of the Summary Record of the Tenth General Assembly), the World Heritage Committee submits herewith a report and a draft resolution on the monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Decision required: The General Assembly may wish to adopt the draft resolution on monitoring and reporting submitted in paragraph 16 of this document.

Background*

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

2. Discussions on the most appropriate means to establish up-to-date information on World Heritage properties were initiated in 1982 and have continued since then at the sessions of the World Heritage Committee, the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention and the General Conference of UNESCO. Numerous States Parties and experts, as well as the advisory bodies, were involved in this process. The work undertaken by the Working Group of States Parties on Monitoring and Reporting in 1987 and by the Strategic Planning Meetings held in 1992 constitute the main stages of it.

3. This process is described in detail in the report that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee submitted to the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention which was held in Paris on 2 and 3 November 1995.

4. Practical experiences in monitoring and reporting benefitted to the process, particularly those gained in the implementation of regional and national monitoring and reporting programmes and the different models that had been applied. In some cases for example the preparation of state of conservation reports was undertaken through United Nations activities such as the Regional Project for Cultural Heritage of UNDP and UNESCO for Latin America and the Caribbean, and a UNEP project for the Mediterranean. In other cases, the States Parties undertook the reporting by themselves or in collaboration with non-governmental organizations such as ICOMOS and IUCN or ICCROM. The World Heritage Committee examined at various occasions the results of these monitoring and reporting activities and concluded that they all resulted in credible state of conservation reports.

* This report addresses the concept of systematic monitoring and reporting described in paragraph 69 to 74 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. At the same time, the World Heritage Committee recognizes the important and continuing role of reactive monitoring as described in paragraph 75 of the Operational Guidelines.

5. As a result of the above process and practical experiences, the World Heritage Committee reconfirmed at its eighteenth session in December 1994 the responsibility of the States Parties to monitor on a day-to-day basis the conditions of the properties and invited all States Parties to present periodic state of conservation reports to the World Heritage Committee.

6. The Tenth General Assembly examined the matter of monitoring and reporting under its agenda item 'New monitoring activities

related to World Heritage sites' against the background of the report and a draft resolution presented by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee as well as a number of draft resolutions that were submitted by States Parties. The report of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and the draft resolutions are included in Annex II of the Summary Record of the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

7. The debate at the Tenth General Assembly is reflected in paragraphs 15 to 31 of the Summary Record of the Tenth General Assembly. As a conclusion, the Tenth General Assembly decided the following:

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

8. In compliance with this decision, the matter of monitoring and reporting was again examined by the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth and twentieth sessions. At these sessions, the World Heritage Committee studied the reporting procedures foreseen under the World Heritage Convention, defined the main principles of monitoring and reporting and prepared a draft resolution for submission to the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties.

The reporting under Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention

9. The World Heritage Convention does not foresee any other reporting by States Parties than to the General Conference of UNESCO. Article 29 of the Convention states that "The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference (...) on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and

administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field."

10. It is the view of the Committee that the periodic reporting by the States Parties on the state of conservation of the properties on their territories would fall within the terms of Article 29 and that the General Conference could determine that 'the manner' of the reporting would be through the World Heritage Committee. The General Conference could be asked, therefore, to activate Article 29 and to determine that reports should be submitted through the World Heritage Committee, requesting the Committee at the same time to define the periodicity, the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting, i.e. to establish a format for the periodic reporting by the States Parties on the application of the Convention.

11. In this case, this reporting would include information on the general application of the Convention, particularly the stipulations in Articles 4, 5 and 6, Article 11.1, Article 17 and 18 and Article 27, as well as information on the state of conservation of specific properties on the World Heritage List.

12. If the General Conference of UNESCO would delegate to the World Heritage Committee the examination and responding to the States Parties' reports, this activity would automatically be included in the report which the Committee is required to submit to the General Conference under the terms of Article 29.3.

Principles of monitoring and reporting

13. On the basis of past experiences, consultations with States Parties and experts and, above all, the debate at the Tenth General Assembly and the nineteenth session of the Committee, the World Heritage Committee concludes that there is a general recognition among the States Parties of the need for them to monitor, as an integral part of their management efforts, the conditions of the World Heritage properties on their territories and to report its results to the bodies that are involved in the implementation of the Convention. In this sense, the Committee considers that there is a need to interpret the Convention in the light of twenty-five years of experience in its implementation while recognizing the sovereign rights of the States Parties. The Committee, furthermore, considers that the General Assembly and the World Heritage Committee have a role to play as standard setting organizations.

14. In this context, the Committee proposes that the following principles govern the methodology and procedures of monitoring and reporting:

i) monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and is part of the site management;

ii) the commitment of the States Parties to provide regular reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties is consistent with the principles of the World Heritage Convention and should be part of a continuous process of collaboration between the States Parties and the World Heritage Committee;

iii) regular reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention. The General Conference of UNESCO should be asked to activate Article 29 of the Convention and to entrust the World Heritage Committee with the responsibility to respond to these reports;

iv) the World Heritage Committee should define the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting in respect of the principles of State sovereignty.

15. The World Heritage Committee considers that these principles would provide the appropriate framework for the management of the World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves and for the enhanced cooperation between the States Parties, the World Heritage Committee and the international community for their preservation. Their introduction would also facilitate the World Heritage Committee to perform its functions effectively, particularly in providing and generating international assistance and in maintaining a credible World Heritage List.

Decision required

16. The General Assembly may wish to adopt the following draft resolution:

The General Assembly,

1. Noting that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage has recognized that the cultural and natural heritage 'are increasingly threatened with destruction, not only by traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction';

2. Reaffirms that 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world';

3. Considers that the Convention should be interpreted in the light of twenty-five years of experience in its implementation;

4. Considers that such interpretation recognizes the sovereign right of the State Party concerned over the World Heritage sites situated on its territory;

5. Considers that a well-reflected and formulated common policy for the protection of cultural and natural heritage is likely to create a continuing interaction between States Parties;

6. Emphasizes the interest of each State Party to be informed of the experience of others with regard to conservation methods and the possibilities so offered, through voluntary international cooperation, for the general improvement of all actions undertaken;

7. Reaffirms the standard setting role of the General Assembly as well as of the World Heritage Committee;

8. Concludes that monitoring is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and that the commitment to provide regular reports on the state of the site is consistent with the principles set out in the Convention in

(i) the first, second, sixth, seventh and eighth preambular clauses,
(ii) Art. 4
(iii) Art. 6.1. and 6.2.
(iv) Art. 7
(v) Art. 10
(vi) Art. 11
(vii) Art. 13
(viii) Art. 15
(ix) Art. 21.3
(x) Art. 29;

9. Emphasizes that monitoring by the State Party is part of the site management which remains the responsibility of the States Parties where the site is located, and that regular reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention;

10. Recalls that Article 4 of the Convention provides that 'Each State Party....recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage...situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State';

11. Recalls that Article 6 lays down the concept of world heritage 'for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate', and that Article 7 requires the establishment of a 'system of international co-operation' and assistance 'designed to support States Parties' efforts to conserve and identify that heritage;

12. Emphasizes that regular reporting should be part of a consultative process and not treated as a sanction or a coercive mechanism;

13. Notes that within the broad responsibility of the World Heritage Committee in standards setting, the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting must respect the principles of State sovereignty;

The involvement of the Committee, through its Secretariat or advisory bodies, in the preparation of the regular reports would be with the agreement of the State Party concerned. The States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies. The Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties;

14. Suggests the General Conference of UNESCO to activate the procedures in Art. 29 of the Convention and to refer to the World Heritage Committee the responsibility to respond to the reports;

15. Encourages States Parties to take advantage of shared information and experience on World Heritage matters;

16. Invites other States to become States Parties to the Convention.

ANNEX III

Draft resolution for inclusion in the 'Report by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage on its Activities (1996-1997)' to be submitted to the 29th General Conference of UNESCO.

The General Conference,

1. *Noting that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage has recognized that the cultural and natural heritage 'are increasingly threatened with destruction, not only by traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction';*

2. *Reaffirms that 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world';*

3. *Considers that the Convention should be interpreted in the light of twenty-five years of experience in its implementation;*

4. *Considers that such interpretation recognizes the sovereign right of the State Party concerned over the World Heritage sites situated on its territory;*

5. *Considers that a well-reflected and formulated common policy for the protection of cultural and natural heritage is likely to create a continuing interaction between States Parties;*

6. *Emphasizes the interest of each State Party to be informed of the experience of others with regard to conservation methods and the possibilities so offered, through voluntary international cooperation, for the general improvement of all actions undertaken;*

7. *Reaffirms the standard setting role of the General Assembly as well as of the World Heritage Committee;*

8. *Concludes that monitoring is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and that the commitment to provide regular reports on the state of the site is consistent with the principles set out in the Convention in*

(i)	*the first, second, sixth, seventh and eighth preambular clauses,*
(ii)	*Art. 4*
(iii)	*Art. 6.1. and 6.2.*
(iv)	*Art. 7*
(v)	*Art. 10*
(vi)	*Art. 11*
(vii)	*Art. 13*
(viii)	*Art. 15*
(ix)	*Art. 21.3*
(x)	*Art. 29;*

9. *Emphasizes that monitoring by the State Party is part of the site management which remains the responsibility of the States Parties where the site is located, and that regular reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention;*

10. *Recalls that Article 4 of the Convention provides that 'Each State Party....recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage...situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State';*

11. *Recalls that Article 6 lays down the concept of world heritage 'for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate', and that Article 7 requires the establishment of a 'system of international co-operation' and assistance 'designed to support States Parties' efforts to conserve and identify that heritage;*

12. *Emphasizes that regular reporting should be part of a consultative process and not treated as a sanction or a coercive mechanism;*

13. *Notes that within the broad responsibility of the World Heritage Committee in standards setting, the form, nature and extent of the regular reporting must respect the principles of State sovereignty;*

The involvement of the Committee, through its Secretariat or advisory bodies, in the preparation of the regular reports would be with the agreement of the State Party concerned. The States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies. The Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties;

14. *Invites the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to submit in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, through the World Heritage Committee, via its secretariat the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, reports on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories;*

15. *Requests the World Heritage Committee to define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the regular reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports while respecting the principle of State sovereignty;*

16. *Requests the World Heritage Committee to include in its reports to the General Conference, presented in accordance with article 29.3 of the Convention, its findings as regard to the application of the Convention by the States Parties;*

17. *Encourages States Parties to take advantage of shared information and experience on World Heritage matters and to contribute to the conservation of World Heritage properties, including through voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund;*

18. *Invites other States to become States Parties to the Convention.*

ANNEX IV

Distribution Limited

WHC-96/CONF.202/8.Rev.
Paris, 28 June 1996
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twentieth session
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

24-29 June 1996

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Provisional agenda for the extraordinary twentieth session of the Bureau (29-30 November 1996)

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
4. Examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger
5. Requests for International Assistance
6. Other business
7. Closure of the session

ANNEX V

Distribution Limited

WHC-96/CONF.202/9.Rev.
Paris, 28 June 1996
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Twentieth session
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

24-29 June 1996

Item 11 of the Provisional Agenda: Provisional agenda for the twentith session of the World Heritage Committee (2-7 December 1996)

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative

2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable

3. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur

4. Report on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the nineteenth session of the Committee

5. Report of the Rapporteur of the sessions held in 1996 by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

6. Constitution of working groups to examine specific items on the Committee's agenda

7. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

   7.1. Methodology and procedures for reporting on the state of conservation

   7.2. Reports on the state of conservation of specific properties

8. Information on Tentative Lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger

9. Progress report on the global strategy, and thematic and comparative studies

10. Cooperation between the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre

11. Progress report on the training strategy

12. Requests for International Assistance

13. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1997, and presentation of a provisional budget for 1998

14. Implementation of the Convention in the light of twenty-five years practice

15. Promotional and educational activities, highlighting particularly the twenty-fifth anniversary events

16. Use of the World Heritage emblem

17. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

18. Date and place of the twenty-first session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

19. Date and place of the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee

20. Other business

21. Closure of the session