

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
Ninth Session
Paris, June 3-5, 1985

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I INTRODUCTION

1. The ninth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco headquarters in Paris from June 3 to 5, 1985, and was attended by Mr. J. Gazaneo (Argentina), Chairman, Mr. L. Chabason (France), rapporteur, and the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Norway, Pakistan and Senegal, vice-Chairmen. Seven other States Parties to the Convention were represented by observers. Representatives of IUCN, ICOMOS, and of ICCROM attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants is found in Annex 1 to this report.

2. Mr. J. Gazaneo, Chairman of the Committee opened the session and Mr. M. Makagiansar, Assistant Director-General for Culture welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director-General. After briefly indicating the progress made in the implementation of the Convention and the efforts made by the Secretariat to make the World Heritage List as representative as possible of the world's cultural and natural heritage, Mr. Makagiansar referred to the important task awaiting the Bureau, which in particular had to examine 36 new nominations and 2 nominations which had been deferred by the Committee and for which additional information was available. He finally drew the Bureau's attention to the situation of the World Heritage Fund which despite the announcement of the United States' contribution and the payment of a certain number of arrears, remained at a level insufficient to meet the conservation requirements of a great number of world heritage sites.

3. The Bureau then adopted the agenda for the session.

4. Mr. B. von Droste, Director of the Division of Ecological Sciences, reported on the activities undertaken since the 8th session of the Committee held in Buenos-Aires from 29th October to 2nd November, 1984. He first made a general assessment of the implementation of the Convention and announced that 3 new States, i.e. the Dominican Republic, New Zealand and Sweden had ratified the Convention since that date, bringing to 86 the number of States Parties to the Convention. Furthermore, the procedure for adhering to the Convention was underway in Uganda, Kenya and the Congo, as well as in China. The Convention thus continued to arouse the growing interest of States. It was necessary to note, however, that the geographical representation was still very uneven, parts of Asia and Eastern Europe being scarcely represented. He also made the remark that whilst the number of nominations to the World Heritage List increased regularly, there were still too few States who had furnished the tentative lists necessary for the evaluation of nominations. It was equally advisable to maintain a certain balance between cultural properties and natural properties, so as to respect the spirit of the Convention; he indicated that the present proportion was two thirds to one third. The state of the World Heritage Fund remained a major preoccupation despite the announcement of the payment in 1985 of the voluntary contribution of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. The fund's resources had remained nearly stationary while the number of States Parties and of inscriptions on the World Heritage List had greatly increased. This situation was partly due to delays in the payment of contributions.

5. Mr. von Droste then reviewed the activities conducted since the 8th session of the Committee, including projects for preparatory assistance, technical cooperation, training and emergency assistance. On the subject of promotional activities, Mr. von Droste announced a World Heritage exhibit had been produced with the support of the Spanish Ministry of Cultural Properties. This exhibit was being shown in Madrid, would soon be shown in Toronto, and a duplicate had been acquired by Unesco for wide distribution.

6. Finally, Mr. von Droste stressed the fact that the Secretariat's work had increased considerably while the number of personnel working for the implementation of the Convention had remained the same since it had become operational.

II REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE TO THE 123rd SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

7. A draft of the World Heritage Committee's report to the General Conference (Document SC-85/CONF.007/02) was presented to the Bureau for examination and approval. The Bureau was of the opinion that the General Conference should be informed of the situation of the World Heritage Fund and of the Secretariat's difficulties. In particular, the Bureau recalled the moral obligation of the States which had opted for voluntary contributions to pay at least that which they should have paid in mandatory contributions i.e. 1 % of their annual contribution to the Unesco budget. The draft report thus modified to take into account these considerations was approved by the Bureau.

III TENTATIVE LISTS

8. The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the progress made in the elaboration of tentative lists; to those lists submitted before the 8th session of the World Heritage Committee were added new or revised lists from Algeria, Cyprus, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guyana, Morocco, Norway, Peru, Portugal and Tunisia. Benin indicated that it would not present any properties in the coming years other than the Royal Palaces of Abomey, at present nominated for inscription. The number of States which have provided tentative lists or equivalent information is therefore 23.

9. The Secretariat indicated that a meeting had been organised by ICOMOS bringing together Algeria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco and Tunisia, to harmonize their respective tentative lists; these countries were to hold a second meeting in September 1985, before submitting subsequently revised tentative lists.

IV ELABORATION OF GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF MIXED CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES AND OF RURAL LANDSCAPES

10. The Secretariat recalled that, at the 8th session of the Committee, the question arose concerning mixed cultural/natural sites and particularly rural landscapes which meet criterion (iii) for natural properties as "exceptional combinations of natural and cultural elements". The Committee had requested IUCN to consult with ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) to elaborate guidelines for the identification and nomination of mixed cultural/natural properties or rural landscapes to be presented to the Bureau and the Committee. IUCN reported that correspondance on this subject had already been exchanged between the relevant non-governmental organizations and interested specialists. Due to the heavy workload of all concerned however, it had not yet been possible to arrange a meeting, which was now planned for 11 October 1985. The representative of ICOMOS added the clarification that the "mixed" sites to be considered were specifically natural areas modified to a greater or lesser degree by human activities. They did not include the properties where intrinsic cultural World Heritage values were enhanced by their natural surroundings, such as Mont St. Michel (France) within the natural setting of its bay. The Bureau thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for their preliminary work on this question and hoped that draft guidelines would be prepared in time for the next session of the Committee.

V NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

A. Analysis of the evolution of nominations

11. The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee constituted a working group made up of Mr. J. Gazaneo (Argentina), Mr. L. Chabason (France), Mr. S. Baghli (Algeria), and Mr. S. Tschudi-Madsen (Norway) to look into the problem raised by the ever-increasing number of nominations for inscriptions submitted to the

Committee and its consequences for the implementation of the Convention. At the stage reached in the application of the Convention, it was essential to ensure on the one hand the coherence of actions to be undertaken with respect to inscriptions secured and on the other hand the effective protection and management of properties inscribed. It is indispensable that henceforth the Committee spend a substantial part of its time in ensuring that the inscribed properties are effectively protected and managed.

12. At this stage, the Secretariat and the NGOs concerned should concentrate their efforts on regularly monitoring the conservation status of properties already inscribed. Priority would be given to those properties inscribed longest on the List as well as to those whose inscription was accompanied by specific recommendations for protection and management.

13. As to the coherence of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, a suggestion was made that ICOMOS should make a systematic study by categories of properties already inscribed on the list or appearing on the tentative lists available at present. Such a study would determine which category of property, which cultures, which major currents of civilization were well represented and which on the contrary were under-represented. By means of such a study, a dialogue with the States Parties could be established, in order to advise them on future nominations and if necessary to stimulate nominations from under-represented categories of properties. With this in mind, it was suggested that ICOMOS pursue its thematic studies. For each of these categories ICOMOS could eventually draw up prospective lists of sites (even those absent from the tentative lists or situated in the territory of States not yet parties to the Convention) to be used as an ordinary means for reflection and comparison.

14. As for natural properties, the problem arises in a rather different fashion, considering that there are fewer sites inscribed or nominated; IUCN, nevertheless, also should try to maintain the necessary coherence.

15. Moreover, the NGOs concerned should communicate to the Secretariat their opinions and comments on the tentative lists already received; this could help States Parties to concentrate their efforts on the elaboration of those nominations which would appear to be the most admissible. Finally, it is advisable to take into account the actual means of the Secretariat and the NGOs who cannot deal simultaneously with the follow-up of sites already inscribed and the preliminary study of an important number of new nominations.

16. If these considerations are taken into account, it would be advisable in consequence to reduce the number of nominations examined each year, according to the following suggestions:

- (i) a limitation by the Bureau of the overall number of properties examined each year (a maximum figure of 20 or 25 was put forward during the discussion)
- (ii) a limitation of the number of properties that each State Party would be authorised to present (2 properties for example)

(iii) a temporary and a voluntarily agreed halt in presenting new nominations by countries already having a high number of properties inscribed on the list.

B. Examination of nominations for inscription presented to the Bureau

17. The Bureau examined 38 nominations, of which 7 concerned natural properties and another a mixed natural/cultural property. Twenty-nine were recommended to the Committee for inscription on the World Heritage List : the properties concerned are listed in Section A below; the Bureau recommended that the decision concerning 6 other nominations be deferred (they are listed in Section B) and that 4 other properties should not be inscribed on the world Heritage List (they are listed in Section C). Moreover, the Bureau was requested to re-examine a nomination from the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; this matter is considered in paragraphs 30 onwards.

18. The Bureau made the following recommendations to the Committee :

A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Cathedral and Church of Saint Michael of Hildesheim</u>	187 Rev.	Germany (Federal Republic of	C (i)(ii)(iii)
<u>Rock Drawings of Tadrart Acacus</u>	287	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C (iii)

The Bureau noted the declarations of the representative of Algeria who indicated that the Algerian and Libyan authorities were coordinating their efforts to protect Tassili N'Ajjer and Tadrart Acacus.

<u>Royal Palaces of Abomey</u>	323	Benin	C (iii)(v)
--------------------------------	-----	-------	------------

The Bureau brought the Beninese authorities' attention to the need for a careful and strict restoration and for taking account of the considerable damage caused by the 1984 tornado. The Bureau recommended that Benin present a request for inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Salvador de Bahia (Historic Centre)</u>	309	Brazil	C (iv)(vi)
<u>Sanctuary of Bom Jesus do Congonhas</u>	334	Brazil	C (i)(iv)
<u>Iguaçu National Park</u>	355	Brazil	N (iii)(iv)
<p>(1) The Bureau expressed satisfaction that a study of regional repercussions of deforestation and other developments on the natural integrity of the park was envisaged. (2) The Bureau asked the Secretariat to obtain more details about the possibility mentioned by IUCN of a hydro-electric project inside or near the park. (3) The Bureau recommended the Secretariat to seek an agreement between the Brazilian and Argentine authorities to envisage considering the National Parks of Iguazu and Iguazu (situated respectively in Argentina and Brazil) as a single trans-frontier World Heritage site in order to encourage cooperative efforts in the management of these two contiguous parks.</p>			
<u>Thracian Tomb of Svezhari</u>	359	Bulgaria	C (i)(iii)
<u>Quebec (Historic Area)</u>	300	Canada	C (iv)(vi)
<u>Painted Churches in the Trados Region</u>	351	Cyprus	C (ii)(iii)(iv)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Pont du Gard (Roman Aqueduct)</u> The Bureau drew the attention of the French authorities to the importance of strictly protecting the site's surroundings.	344	France	C (i)(iii)(iv)
<u>Kaziranga National Park</u> The Bureau encouraged the Indian authorities to provide the legal basis to protect the buffer zone south of the park (Mikir Hills and the Karbi Plateau). The Bureau also expressed concern over with the impact of the planned construction of a railway line along the southern boundary of the Park and asked the Secretariat to obtain more information about this from the Indian authorities.	337	India	N (ii)(iv)
<u>Manas Wildlife Sanctuary</u> The Bureau noted with satisfaction the plans for extending the Sanctuary's north-west boundary and to strengthen protection by upgrading the area to national park status. The Bureau also expressed its concern at the possibility of a hydro-electric dam being constructed in the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Bhutan.	338	India	N (ii)(iii)(iv)
<u>Keoladeo National Park</u> The Bureau commended the Indian authorities on their recent efforts to strengthen the protection of this park and encouraged them to finish the Park Management plan which is currently being drawn up.	340	India	N (iv)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Jerash</u> The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that the Jordanian government states precisely what its boundaries are, provides a management plan for the sites, and gives assurances that future restoration would be conducted with the strictest respect for the authenticity of the property.	324	Jordan	C
<u>Fu'a (Archaeological site)</u> The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that the Jordanian government states precisely what its boundaries are.	326	Jordan	C
<u>Qusair Amra</u>	327	Jordan	C (i)(iii)(iv)
<u>The Medina of Marrakesh</u> The Bureau called the attention of the Moroccan authorities to the need to ensure that Marrakesh conserve its exceptional character of a completely preserved historic town; in this connection it would be advisable to avoid any breaching of the ramparts, to protect carefully the Medina and in particular its gardens, and also to ensure the protection of the surroundings of Marrakesh, in particular the palm grove, the Menara, and the gardens of Bab Djedid, by strictly enforcing the management plan adopted in 1981.	331	Morocco	C (i)(ii)(iv)(v)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with the</u> <u>Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Rock Drawings of Alta</u>	352	Norway	C (iii)
<u>Chavin (Archaeological Site)</u>	330	Peru	C (iii)
<u>Huascarán National Park</u>	333	Peru	N (ii)(iii)
<p>The Bureau asked the Secretariat to inform the Peruvian authorities that the recommendation for inscription concerned only the Huascarán National Park (and not the Callejon de Huaylas and the Cordillera Blanca). Moreover, the Bureau encouraged the Peruvian authorities to intensify their efforts in the management of the Park.</p>			
<u>Altamira Cave</u>	310	Spain	C (i)(iii)
<u>Roman Aqueduct, Segovia</u>	311	Spain	C
<p>The Bureau recommended the property for inscription on condition that it be redefined so as to include at the same time the old town which forms with the aqueduct an inseparable whole.</p>			
<u>Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias</u> <u>(Sta. Maria del Naranco,</u> <u>San Miguel de Lillo,</u> <u>Sta. Cristina de Lena)</u>	312	Spain	C (i)(ii)(iv)
<u>Santiago de Compostela</u> <u>(Old town)</u>	347	Spain	C (i)(ii)(vi)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>The Walls of Avila</u>	348	Spain	C
<u>Punic Town of Kerkouane</u>	332	Tunisia	C (iii)
<u>Historic zones of Istanbul</u>	356	Turkey	C(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)
<u>Göreme Valley</u>	357	Turkey	C(i)(iii)(v) N (iii)

In the light of the evaluations by IUCN and ICOMOS, the Bureau was of the opinion that the outstanding universal value of this property justified without a doubt its inscription on the World Heritage List. However, the present delimitation of the site nominated appeared to be rather restricted since it encompassed neither the national park in its entirety (which would be desirable according to IUCN), nor the sites of Karain, Karlik-Yesilöz and Soganli, and the subterranean cities of Kaymakli and Derinkuyu (which ICOMOS recommends for inclusion). The Bureau therefore decided that additional information should be requested of the Turkish government before the 9th session of the World Heritage Committee, to permit the latter to make a decision about the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N°</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with the</u> <u>Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Great Mosque and Hospital</u> <u>of Divrigi</u>	358	Turkey	C(i) (iv)

B. Nominations to be deferred

<u>Two Neolithic Dwellings in</u> <u>Stara Zagora</u>	360	Bulgaria	
--	-----	----------	--

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until the site was excavated to a greater extent and until a comparative study of the numerous known neolithic sites worldwide had been carried out.

<u>Archaeological site of Kourion</u>	350	Cyprus	
---------------------------------------	-----	--------	--

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred given that the World Heritage List already comprises numerous archaeological sites of the Mediterranean Basin and that new inscriptions of properties of this category were less urgent than those of properties that reflected other cultures less well represented on the list.

<u>The Town of Carcassonne</u>	345	France	
--------------------------------	-----	--------	--

The Bureau recommended that this inscription be deferred, because first the World Heritage List already comprises other examples of fortified towns of the Middle Ages, and secondly the ramparts of Carcassonne have undergone important modifications in the 19th Century which impinge upon the authenticity of the site. This nomination nevertheless could be reviewed by the Committee at a later stage if a request for the examination of Viollet-le-Duc's restoration work was submitted to the Committee.

Name of Property

Identification

Contracting State
having submitted
the nomination of
the property in
accordance with the
Convention

PARIS
Bureau
June 3-5 '85

N°

Chaco Canyon Historic National Park

353

United States of America

The Bureau examined this nomination in the light of the ICOMOS evaluation. The originality of the Chaco group with regard to the Anasazi culture (already represented on the World Heritage List by the site of Mesa Verde) resides mainly in the importance given to the road system. The Bureau regretted that the present boundaries of the site nominated for inscription did not include the major roadways and therefore was of the opinion that it would be premature to take a decision on the inscription of this site, before having received from the American government precise details about the possibility of enlarging the area to be inscribed.

Glacier National Park

354

United States of America

The Bureau noted that this national park possessed a certain number of important natural features but that similar features were already well represented in other parks already inscribed on the list. The Bureau felt, however, that joint nomination with the contiguous Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada would give an added dimension to this nomination, on the precedent set by the Kluane National Park and Wrangell/St. Elias National Monument. This park does not appear on Canada's tentative list, but the Canadian authorities informed the Secretariat that they would be prepared to add it to the list with a view to a joint nomination.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification N°</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>
-------------------------	------------------------------	--

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be re-examined in the framework of a possible common nomination.

C. Properties not to be considered for inscription on the List

<u>Coco Island National Park</u>	329	Costa Rica
----------------------------------	-----	------------

The Bureau recognized the interest of this property for its flora, and its importance in the Costa Rican context, but felt that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value'.

<u>Abbey of St. Nicolas de Tolentin</u>	346	France
---	-----	--------

While recognizing the great importance of this site for the French national heritage, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee, considering the existence in Europe of other more representative examples of late Gothic architecture.

<u>Karak Castle</u>	325	Jordan
---------------------	-----	--------

While recognising the value of this site, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not constitute the most representative example of Frankish fortifications.

<u>Tabaqat Fahl (Pella)</u>	328	Jordan
-----------------------------	-----	--------

While recognizing the great interest of this site, the Bureau was of the opinion that it did not fulfill the criterion of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee.

VI REPORT ON THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF NATURAL WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

19. In accordance with paragraph 34 of the Operational Guidelines, IUCN is requested to report on the preservation of natural heritage properties. This was further endorsed at the 7th session of the Committee. IUCN reported to the Bureau on the following properties.

- a) **Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary, Senegal, inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, November 1984**

Longer term solutions are currently being investigated by IUCN, Unesco, the Senegalese and Mauritanian authorities as well as the OMVS (Organisation de Mise en Valeur du fleuve Sénégal/River Senegal Development Organization) at a special workshop held in late June 1985.

- b) **Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania: inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, November 1984**

A commission of inquiry on the management of wildlife and protected areas in Tanzania has been concluded but formal results have yet to be communicated.

- c) **Garamba National Park, Zaire: inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, November 1984**

The Bureau was informed that an IUCN/WWF mission to Kinshasa in January 1985 brought the issue to the personal attention of President Mobutu. A press release on the outcome of this meeting was being forwarded to the Secretariat. According to field reports from project staff no further rhinos have been poached, although the situation is still critical. Another mission to Zaire will take place in August 1985 by IUCN's Tropical Forest Officer (who will also review the situation in Salonga National Park, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1984).

- d) **Tai National Park, Ivory Coast**

The Bureau was informed that the situation previously described in 1982 and 1984 has continued to deteriorate and recommended that the Secretariat should initiate the process for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

- e) **Ichkeul National Park, Tunisia**

The Bureau was informed that this internationally important wetland site is subject to a number of threats, including air and water pollution, grazing by domestic stock and hunting, but a large water resource development project may result in very significant impacts on the integrity of the area. The scheme calls for the construction of dams on all six rivers that feed the Ichkeul wetland. The plan is now underway with one dam completed and another in the process of filling. This diversion of freshwater will take about 75% of the inflow to the park which will lose its ability to support the vast numbers of wintering waterfowl for which it is now famous. Compensatory management schemes include

a sluice but costs are very high and no formal decisions have been made. To exacerbate the problem, it has been reported that the budget for the park has been reduced from \$18,000 in 1984 to \$ 7,000 in 1985. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Tunisian authorities to initiate the process for inscription on the list of World Heritage in Danger.

f) **Galapagos National Park, Ecuador**

The Bureau was informed that a man-caused fire on Isabella Island resulted in an international appeal to aid the efforts of the Ecuador Government in extinguishing the blaze which burnt over 30,000 ha. The fire began in early March and was still burning in late May, though under control at the time of the Bureau meeting. No serious species losses had occurred though the subspecies of tortoise endemic to Isabella has been threatened at one stage. A contribution from the World Heritage Fund of \$ 10,500 has acted to mobilize other support from WWF-FRG (\$ 52,000) and the United Kingdom through the Disaster Relief Fund (\$ 13,000).

g) **Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Australia**

The Bureau was informed by IUCN of new reports on the effects of road construction and a subsequent siltation on the fringing reef of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park adjacent to Cape Tribulation National Park. The Bureau furthermore noted that the severity of the problem is a matter of some debate within Australia and that a scientific evaluation of the impacts was required. The representative of Australia confirmed these reports and indicated that the problem also concerned areas of tropical rainforest in Queensland. The Bureau asked the Secretariat to request more information on the impact of the contribution of the road in Cape Tribulation National Park on the fringing reef of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park.

VII SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

20. The Secretariat presented the Bureau with financial statements for mandatory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund as at 31 January 1985, a list of contributions received between 1 February and 30 May 1985 and the state of the budget adopted for 1985 by the Committee at its eighth session as at 30 May 1985. The Secretariat furthermore indicated that the expected budget for 1986 would probably be of the order of \$ 1,200,000 considering that a few States Parties who make significant contributions to the Fund (e.g. Federal Republic of Germany for approximately \$ 145,000 for 1985; United States of America for \$ 248,000 for 1985) had indicated that their payments would be made in the very near future. The Secretariat nevertheless advised that the Committee should be prudent and should consider a budget for 1986 which was of the same order of magnitude as for that of 1985. In the event that States Parties paid up in full their contributions for 1985 and thereby augmented the budget possibilities for 1986, the Bureau recommended that an increase be made in the allocations for technical cooperation and training.

21. In this respect, the Bureau appealed to all States Parties which had not already done so to make their 1985 contributions to the World Heritage Fund and pay up any amounts in arrears from previous years.

VIII REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

22. The Secretariat presented the requests for technical cooperation which had been received for two natural properties, Talamanca-La Amistad (Costa Rica) for \$ 20,000 and Darien National Park (Panama) for \$ 40,000. IUCN confirmed that these were both excellent projects for which the contribution from the World Heritage Fund would be used in a catalytic manner to draw in other international or bi-lateral support. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve these two requests, respectively n^os. 205.1(3) for Costa Rica and 159.1(3) for Panama.

23. The Bureau further noted that, since a total amount of \$ 200,000 was envisaged for technical cooperation for 1986, a certain number of "small" requests not exceeding \$ 20,000 could be developed and submitted to the Committee at its next session. Particular attention should be made to develop such "small" projects for properties already inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger which, according to Operational Guidelines, have priority over other properties as concerns the allocation of technical cooperation. The representative of IUCN indicated that efforts would be made to elaborate appropriate World Heritage requests for Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal), Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania) and Garamba National Park (Zaire).

IX REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

24. Document SC-85/CONF.007/07 was presented to the Bureau by the Secretariat which underlined the fact that material usable for promotion was now available, namely the World Heritage Exhibit and the folding poster, both of which are in three languages (English, French and Spanish) as well as the pocket guide only available in Spanish for the time being, but the copyright of which had been acquired by Unesco. The Bureau congratulated the Secretariat on these tangible achievements and expressed the wish that the folding poster on World Heritage be widely disseminated.

25. In regard to more general information activities, it was emphasized that it was necessary to work towards self-financing which implied a more comprehensive policy using the audio-visual media and which would require the intervention of specialists on promotional activities. The Bureau expressed the wish that this question be discussed at the Committee meeting which should consider the different means possible to develop a veritable promotion strategy. Another check to the implementation of promotional activities was recalled; namely the absence in most countries of a national structure responsible for coordinating the implementation of the Convention, which constitutes an indispensable link and which should have at its disposal sufficient means to launch national activities concerning the Convention. The representative of Malawi announced to the Bureau the creation in his country of a committee entrusted with the implementation of the Convention and among whose members were the representatives of the protection services of natural and cultural heritage.

26. The Bureau also examined the annex to document SC-85/CONF.007/07 which, in accordance with the Committee's wishes at its 8th session, presented a draft of guidelines for the realisation of plaques intended to commemorate the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. The Bureau accepted the draft and recommended to the Committee the adoption of these guidelines with a slight modification of the proposed French text, which should read "Au titre ... afin qu'il soit protégé au bénéfice de toute l'humanité". Once approved by the Committee, these guidelines will be added to the "Operational Guidelines

for the implementation of the Convention."

X DATE AND PLACE OF THE 9TH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

27. The Bureau decided that, taking into account the budgetary difficulties now facing Unesco, it would be preferable that the next session of the Committee take place at Headquarters, rather than in one of the countries that had offered to host the meeting. The Bureau then expressed its warmest thanks to the Cypriot authorities who had on several occasions since 1982 indicated their wish to host a session of the Committee. It also wished to thank the other countries which had shown interest in this respect or had submitted invitations. The dates of the meeting were fixed from 2nd to 6th December. The rapporteur, Mr. Chabason announced to the Bureau that his country would organise on that occasion a visit to one or two French sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

28. The agenda of the Committee's session, as presented in document SC-85/CONF.007/08 was slightly modified to take into account the discussions at the Bureau; in particular an item had been added in order to allow the Committee to discuss the proposals elaborated by the working group, and item 11 on promotional activities was completed by "means to strengthen these activities on a national level".

XI OTHER BUSINESS

a) **India**

29. The Secretariat brought to the attention of the Bureau the letter from the Permanent Delegation of India, dated 13th May 1985, and which is reproduced in Annex 2, giving additional information about the sites of Khajuraho, Hampi and Fatehpur Sikri. It was recalled that during its 8th session, the Bureau decided to defer the study of the nominations of these properties pending the re-definition of their limits and/or assurances as to their protection. These three nominations will be re-examined by the Bureau during the 10th session in 1986, in the light of this additional information and ensuing evaluation by ICOMOS.

b) **Libyan Arab Jamahiriya**

30. The Secretariat distributed to the Bureau copies of a letter from the Permanent Delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, dated April 29, 1985, addressed to the Chairman of the Committee. In it the Libyan authorities referred to the additional documentation on the archaeological site of the city of Ptolemais furnished since the 8th session of the Committee and underlined in particular the importance of this city's water reservoir dating from the 3rd century B.C. and hoped that the nomination of this property would be re-examined. It will be recalled that during the 8th session, the Committee had decided not to inscribe the archaeological site of Ptolemais on the World Heritage List, with the following comment :

"The Committee, while taking account of the great importance of this site for the Libyan national heritage, felt that it did not fulfill the criteria of 'outstanding universal value' as understood by the World Heritage Committee".

31. The Secretariat called attention to the fact that Article 11, paragraph 6, of the Convention stipulates with regard to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, that "before refusing a request for inclusion in one of two lists ... the Committee shall consult the State Party in whose territory the cultural or natural property in question is situated".

32. The Secretariat was of the opinion that the request for re-examination of the nomination of Ptolemais could be considered to be the Libyan authorities' reply to the report of the 8th session of the Committee within the framework of the 'consultation' referred to in the article quoted above. As the Bureau considered that the request was receivable, it could therefore re-examine this nomination and then submit its recommendation to the Committee.

33. The Bureau, having concluded in favour of the receivability of the request for re-examination, took note of the comments made by the ICOMOS representative who proposed drafting a complete evaluation and sending it to the Secretariat for presentation to the Committee. He underlined the fact that ICOMOS had studied the new documents and information provided by the Libyan authorities and, moreover, had already taken into account in 1984 the presence of the ancient reservoir in question. No additional information was furnished that would be likely to alter the judgement of ICOMOS on the intrinsic qualities of this site. It was indeed of very great archaeological interest. However, the cities founded by Alexander or his Generals, called Alexandria or Pella, the numerous cities founded by Ptolomies or Seleucids, called Ptolemais or Seleucia, all testify equally to an important historical phenomenon: the new organization of the Hellenistic World subsequent to Alexander's conquests. Furthermore, many sites around the Mediterranean (around 50, perhaps) can be considered to be of equal worth to Ptolemais and the Committee had already considered that some of these should not be inscribed. Unless the Committee changed its policy, the 1984 evaluation of Ptolemais by ICOMOS was still valid. If, on the contrary, the Bureau decided to re-interpret the criteria in such a way as to allow the inscription of Ptolemais, as of other properties of equal worth, the ICOMOS could take into account this new orientation and revise its evaluation at the Bureau's request.

34. After a debate on the question, the Bureau unanimously decided to recommend to the World Heritage Committee to uphold its decision and therefore not to inscribe the archaeological site of the city of Ptolemais on the World Heritage List.

c) **Peru**

35. The Secretariat brought to the attention of the Bureau a letter from the Peruvian House of Representatives, dated 25th April 1985, which reproduced a declaration voted by this assembly subsequent to the inscription of the town of Cuzco and the historic sanctuary of Machu-Picchu on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested that the Committee be informed of the contents of this letter at its next session.

d) **United States of America**

36. The Chairman informed the Bureau that he had received a letter dated 22nd May 1985 from the American authorities regarding Yosemite National Park which was inscribed on the World Heritage List by the Committee at its eighth

session in 1984. This letter was pursuant to the Committee's request to be kept informed of any developments regarding possible dam construction in proximity of this property. The Bureau took note of the recent legislation which had the effect of enhancing the protection of the property and precluding the possibility of dam construction. The Bureau requested that the contents of this letter be brought to the attention of the Committee at its next session.

37. After having thanked all participants, the Chairman closed the meeting.

Paris, le 12 juin 1985

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

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

Neuvième session / Ninth session

Paris, 3-6 juin 1985

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

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

ALGERIE/ALGERIA

M. Sid Ahmed BAGHLI
Ministre plénipotentiaire, Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

Mr. Jorge GAZANEO
Director, Conservation of Urban and Rural
Heritage Center, University of Buenos Aires

Président/President

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

H. E. The Honourable E.G. WHITLAM
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. David MACINTYRE
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

FRANCE/FRANCE

M. Lucien CHABASON
Chef du service de la recherche
Ministère de l'Environnement

Rapporteur

NORVEGE/NORWAY

Mr. Stephan TSCHUDI-MADSEN
Director General, Historic Monuments

Mrs. Oda SLETNES
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

PAKISTAN/PAKISTAN

Mr. Mustafa Kamal KAZI
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

SENEGAL/SENEGAL

M. Henri MENDY
Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

**II. ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT AVEC UN STATUT CONSULTATIF/
ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY**

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

M. Michel PARENT
Président

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE
Professeur à l'Université de Paris I

Mme. Delphine LAPEYRE
Directrice du Secrétariat international

Mme. Florence PORTELETTE
Documentaliste

**UNION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE ET DE SES RESSOURCES (UICN)/
INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATUREL RESOURCES (IUCN)**

Mr. James THORSELL
Executive Officer, CNPPA

Mr. Daniel NAVID
Head, International Relations

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

Mr. Bernard FEILDEN
Director Emeritus

III. ETATS PARTIES PRESENTS EN TANT QU'OBSERVATEURS/STATES PARTIES ATTENDING AS OBSERVERS

BENIN/BENIN

Mme. Paulette AGBOTON
Premier Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

M. S. Edouard KOUTINHOIN
Directeur des Musées, Monuments et Sites

BRESIL/BRAZIL

M. Carlos ASFORA
Premier secrétaire d'Ambassade
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Mme. Magdalena STANTSHEVA
Professeur à l'Université de Sofia

M. Ivo VLADIMIROV
Comité de la Culture

CHYPRE/CYPRUS

H.E. Mr. Constantinos LEVENTIS
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

M. Christos CASSIMATIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

INDE/INDIA

Ms. Banashri BOSE
Second Secretary
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

MALAWI/MALAWI

M. Gadi G.Y. MGOMEZULU
Principal Conservator of Antiquities

TURQUIE/TURKEY

M. Ali Engin OBA
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

Mme. Asli UGDUL
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

IV. SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO/UNESCO SECRETARIAT

M. Makaminan MAKAGIANSAR
Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture

M. Bernd VON DROSTE
Directeur
Division des Sciences écologiques

M. S. NAQVI
Directeur
Division du Patrimoine culturel

Mme. Anne RAIDL
Chef, Section des Normes internationales
Division du Patrimoine culturel

Mme. Jane ROBERTSON-VERNHEES
Division des Sciences écologiques

M. François-Bernard HUYGHES
Division du Patrimoine culturel

M. Michel BATISSE
Conseiller en Sciences de l'environnement



Délégation Permanente de l'Inde
auprès de l'UNESCO

1, RUE MIOLLIS
75015 PARIS

Tél. : 977-18-10
poste 54-85 et 54-86

No.PDI/CLT/WHC

13 May 1985

Dear Mrs. Raidl,

20 MAY 1985

I am writing to you to give some additional information regarding the cultural properties of Khajuraho, Hampi and Fatehpur Sikri, which my Government has nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Khajuraho: Archaeological Survey of India is arranging to have prepared a comprehensive plan covering all the monuments. It may be mentioned that the Government of Madhya Pradesh has already prepared a Development Plan of Khajuraho which guarantee the effective control of the entire area of Khajuraho as such.

Hampi: The site plan of Hampi Complex already furnished by Archaeological Survey of India includes the protected area of the Complex under the Survey which is covered by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological sites and Remains Act, 1958 and Rules 1969. To ensure planned development in the interest of the ancient site, Master Plan of Hampi has been prepared. Under this plan both natural and archaeological resources of the site have been duly taken into account.

Fatehpur Sikri: The principal group of monuments at Fatehpuri Sikri is under Central protection and a site plan of this group indicating the limits of protection has already been furnished. It may not be possible to include larger areas under protection for various reasons. However, to ensure that the interest of this important group of monuments is safeguarded a Master Plan of Fatehpur Sikri has been prepared which adequately takes into account the need of protecting and preserving environments of these monuments. To check the mining and quarrying operations the entire area comprising Mauzas Sikri I hissa, Sikri II Hissa, Sikri IV Hissa, Arazi Imlak, Kandau Barau, Dadu Pura and Gurh Ki Mandi have been declared prohibited under the A.M.A.S.R. Rules, 1959. The quarrying and mining operations which were previously going on in the area have since been completely stopped.

I hope this supplementary clarification will answer some of the queries raised by the ICOMOS at the last bureau meeting of the WHC and that these monuments will soon be given their rightful place on the World Heritage List.

Please accept, Madam, the assurances of my highest consideration.


(Miss B. Bose)
Second Secretary

Mme A. Raidl,
CLT/CH
Bureau B 12.26, Unesco