

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

Twelfth Session

(Room XIV - Unesco Headquarters, 14-17 June 1988)

Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda: Report of the Working Group
set up by the Committee at its eleventh session

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Working Group set up by the World Heritage Committee at its eleventh session (December 1987) held five meetings on 29 January, 2 March, 21 April, 4 May and 13 May, 1988 under the chairmanship of H.E. Mr. Ananda Guruge, Vice-Chairman of the World Heritage Committee. These meetings totalled some eighteen hours of work. The first two meetings were devoted to general discussion. At the third meeting the Working Group set out a number of recommendations. A draft of these recommendations was discussed at the fourth meeting and a final version was approved at the fifth and final meeting, together with the text of the present report.

2. The meetings were attended regularly by the representatives of States members of the Working Group as well as by representatives of other States members of the World Heritage Committee. Prof. Leon Pressouyre attended the meeting of 4 May in his personal capacity and the meeting of 13 May as a representative of ICOMOS. Ms. Christina Cameron, Director-General, National Historic Parks and Sites, Environment Canada attended the meeting of 4 May as a representative of the Chairman, Mr. J.D. Collinson. The list of representatives of States members and the Unesco Secretariat who participated in the Working Group is given in Appendix 1.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION

3. At its first meeting the Working Group noted that the terms of reference given to it by the Committee were very broad

indeed.¹ It decided therefore to narrow the scope of its work to manageable proportions. It also appeared to the Group that its attention should focus on the problems posed by the evaluation of the nominations of cultural properties. For this purpose it decided that its main task was to make recommendations on the fourth topic, i.e. the better management of the session agendas with regard to the consideration of cultural properties.

4. The Working Group felt that it had to interpret these three points in a limited sense as well. Thus i) the "review" of all the sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List could not mean a qualitative assessment of the value of the cultural properties but only an analysis of the types of sites inscribed. Similarly, the "review" of the tentative lists received (the second point) could not lead the Group to make judgements on each list but rather to draw some lessons from the comparison of the different lists.

5. At its second meeting the Working Group returned mainly to these two items in its terms of reference. Two different points of view emerged from the discussions:

a) that the Working Group should limit itself to suggesting improvements in the working methods used for the Committee's sessions;

b) that the Working Group should not only suggest such improvements but also suggest ways of improving the entire process of evaluating nominations, on the basis of the tentative list mechanism, by following a "global" approach.

A. Meeting methodology

6. Those advocating a mainly pragmatic approach to the management of the Committee's sessions were of the opinion that the Working Group was expected to make practical suggestions. They added that its members were not qualified to go beyond this.

7. In this connection, the suggestions sent to the Chairman of the Working Group by Mr Collinson, Chairman of the Committee, were shared with the participants. The following ideas expressed by Mr. Collinson were in fact suggestions for practical improvements :

- that the discussion of new nominations at each session be preceded by a quick review of the criteria and operational guidelines, illustrated with examples;

¹ "to review all the sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List; to review the tentative lists already received; to review ways and means of ensuring a rigorous application of the criteria established by the Committee; to review ways and means of better managing the agenda of the Committee sessions." (Report of the World Heritage Committee, eleventh session, para. 35)

- that proposals be sorted by the Bureau into four categories : cases which obviously fit the criteria (hence requiring no discussion in the Committee); cases which should be considered by the Committee; cases which the Bureau recommends be rejected; cases whose deferment is recommended;

- that the Secretariat (or the Rapporteur) should expressly prepare the Bureau's recommendations on nominations in writing;²

- that greater attention be given by the Committee to the "tentative lists"

B. For a global approach to the further inscriptions on the List

8. On the basis of their examination of the properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List and of the tentative lists submitted by Member States, a number of participants suggested the elaboration of a reference list of properties that could be considered of "outstanding universal value" for all humanity. It was in fact within this perspective that the Working Group discussed the first two items in the terms of reference -- an analysis of properties already on the List and an analysis of the tentative lists.

Analysis of Properties already on the List

9. At its first meeting the Working Group asked the Secretariat to explore ways of classifying the World Heritage cultural properties. Several methods of classifying the properties were suggested, e.g. by function; by cultural area or civilization; by art-historical epoch or style. The Secretariat considered that within the time available it would be possible only, as a first step, to develop a functional typology, for the analysis of the List by art-historical categories was in reality a piece of serious scholarship that needed to be carried out in all deliberation by a group of competent experts. The rough functional typology prepared by the Secretariat using Database III software also showed which of the Committee's six criteria were fulfilled by each property. The Secretariat and members of the Working Group were of the opinion that the functional categories were instructive but insufficient in themselves. In order to be meaningful, the analysis needed to be cross-referenced with a classification by historical or stylistic period, as well as by cultural area. Clearly such a multi-variable analysis was beyond the capacities of the Group itself. The Chairman expressed his satisfaction, however, that data on the properties was now available in this computerized form, which

² N.B. Mr Collinson made several other suggestions of a "logistical" nature which concern the quality and timeliness of material submitted to the Committee. These points have been carefully noted by both the Secretariat and ICOMOS.

would lend itself to further refinement in accordance with the needs of the Committee.

10. Several members of the Group pointed out that the World Heritage List in its present form was not an universally representative list of properties throughout the world, since some regions and cultures were already well represented while others were inadequately represented or not represented at all. Several measures were proposed by them with a view to establishing the truly worldwide List envisaged by the World Heritage Convention.

Analysis of the tentative lists

11. The Working Group examined the tentative lists of cultural properties submitted by States Parties. It noted the rather disparate nature of these lists. Only 32 States Parties had submitted tentative lists of cultural properties. Few of them had adhered to paragraph 7 of the Operational Guidelines in doing so. It was recognized also that there had been little possibility for systematic evaluation of each list by ICOMOS, although the series of harmonization meetings organized by that organization had proved to be very useful in encouraging a comparative approach to possible inscriptions within sub-regions. Clearly also, the establishment of tentative lists was a necessary instrument for any global analysis that aimed to cover properties not yet inscribed. The Chairman of the Group stressed that States Parties should also indicate their priorities for the inscription of sites given on their tentative lists.

Ideas for a global approach

a) Suggestions of the Secretariat

12. The Secretariat referred to the idea of comparative analysis and study with a view to developing a universally representative list of properties throughout the world, i.e. including properties in countries not yet Parties to the Convention. It suggested a system which would respond to the felt need for an approach that corresponded to the original intent of the Convention in Article 11, paras. 1 and 2.³ The Committee had

³ "1. Every State Party to this Convention shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article. This inventory, which shall not be considered exhaustive, shall include documentation about the location of the property in question and its significance.

2. On the basis of the inventories submitted by States in accordance with paragraph 1, the Committee shall establish...under the title of "World Heritage List," a list of properties forming part of the cultural heritage and natural

itself substituted the term "tentative list" for the word "inventory." A return to the original intent of Article 11 would require therefore that a drive be launched to obtain the missing tentative lists, i.e. to obtain tentative lists from all the 100 States Parties. In the meantime, the Committee, from 1989 onwards, should adhere rigorously to its earlier decision that nominations ought not to be considered unless the State Party concerned had prepared its tentative list. ICOMOS could be requested systematically to assess and/or aid in the establishment of the lists (to ensure coherence and comparability in presentation) by States that required such assistance.

13. Concurrently, ICOMOS experts could pursue the global study referred to above. During this time, the Committee should decide to inscribe on the List only such properties whose "outstanding universal value" was self-evident. Once a truly representative list of properties -- a sort of "international tentative list" designed for the guidance of individual States Parties -- had been drawn up by ICOMOS and accepted by the Committee, States Parties could be invited to present as quickly as possible the nominations of the properties included therein. This would naturally involve inscriptions in large numbers, leading fairly rapidly to the establishment of a comprehensive World Heritage List as envisaged by the Convention.

14. But this large number of inscriptions would no longer pose problems for the Committee, since the intrinsic value of the properties inscribed in terms of the Committee's six criteria would have been recognized already. Thus energies and resources now being spent on the process of determining the "outstanding universal value" of properties nominated would be released and could be concentrated on promoting the intensive evaluation by ICOMOS, in co-operation with the Secretariat, of the state of conservation of the proposed World Heritage properties and of the legal and technical means available for their protection.

b) Discussion by the Working Group

15. Several members stressed the need for the Committee to elaborate a working tool for cultural properties similar to the worldwide reference list that had been drawn up by the IUCN for natural properties and had been available since the time the Convention had entered into force. They suggested that the universal representativity of the List could be promoted by constructing a matrix in which the history of civilization would be one axis. The other axis would be provided by the various "cultural entities" that have existed at different times in history. There would be a number of ways of defining these "cultural entities", i.e. in terms of artistic or architectural style, in geographical terms, in terms of a shared religion, etc. Once the matrix is constructed on the basis of a global study ,

heritage...which it considers as having outstanding universal value in terms of such criteria as it shall have established..."

it could be filled in with the most outstanding properties corresponding to each cultural entity and different chronological periods. This would provide the universally representative reference list. The project would be a complex one, requiring the contribution of various specialists, including historians, historians of art and architecture, and archaeologists. It should be entrusted to ICOMOS, which would be responsible for co-ordinating the work of the specialists involved, in co-operation with national experts, ICOMOS Committees and antiquities services. This global reference study and list would be no more than working tools, however; in no case should the result be considered as an imposition on States Parties.

16. While endorsing the need for a fresh drive to obtain tentative lists from States Parties who had not yet submitted them as well as for a global approach, and reiterating the Committee's earlier decision that nominations should not be examined unless the State concerned had submitted a tentative list, the Working Group did not favour the idea of limiting inscriptions during a defined period to those that were "self-evident." While most participants stressed that the Committee should set no arbitrary numerical limit to the number of nominations that could be considered one member felt that there should in fact be such a numerical limit (e.g. 3 per year) for those States with a number of properties on the List already. Given the considerable numbers of nominations that the Committee was now receiving, however, the Working Group did accept the Chairman's suggestions for ways and means of regulating this flow as a result of a more careful preparation of tentative lists, of a more rigorous process of verification by the Secretariat, and of a more rigorous process of evaluation by ICOMOS.

Application of the criteria

17. The Working Group also discussed the application of the criteria. One participant saw this as the essential problem. The Group itself did not feel that it could proceed to assess how rigorously these criteria had already been applied in each case, but some thought that there would be lessons to be drawn from such an analysis. During the discussion one participant had noted that certain properties inscribed satisfied one criterion alone. It was pointed out that the Committee itself had ruled that a cultural property will be considered of outstanding universal value "when the Committee finds that it meets one or more of the (following) criteria and the test of authenticity." (para. 22 of the Operational Guidelines), with the exception of criterion vi).⁴

⁴ "vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or with ideas or beliefs of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria."

18. One participant suggested that an examination of how the criteria had been applied might lead to the identification of certain patterns. It might be feasible for experts to develop a "matrix" which could help determine quite rapidly whether a proposal could be supported, i.e. with a certain automaticity.

19. At the second meeting of the Working Group three of its members, Mss. A. Miltiadou (Greece), G. Ugarte (Mexico) and S. Zaouche (Tunisia), decided to draft a number of joint proposals based on their views with regard to the ideas discussed above. The Secretariat was also asked to set out its suggestions in written form. The latter were incorporated in a document dated 13 April, 1988 and entitled "Trends of discussion in the Working Group of the World Heritage Committee: summary prepared by the Secretariat." The proposals of Mss. Miltiadou, Ugarte and Zaouche were presented in a separate document drafted in French, of which the Secretariat had prepared a summary in English. Both documents were distributed to the Working Group in advance of its third meeting on 21 April and therefore provided a basis for discussion at that meeting.

III. PREPARATION AND DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

20. At its third meeting, the Working Group decided to begin drafting a series of recommendations on the basis of the results of its first two meetings. The Working Group accepted the Chairman's suggestion that it deal first with the question of the timetable of the Committee sessions and to approach it as a "queueing problem" in management terms. The Chairman then invited the Working Group to consider the successive phases involved before and during the submission, processing and evaluation of nominations. He likened the whole process to the passage of a large number of ships from their various home ports to a single port of destination -- inscription on the World Heritage List -- and suggested that ways be found to regulate the flow of the ships, beginning with the measures leading up to their departure from home and ending with their final entry into the docking area.

21. A number of recommendations were made during the ensuing discussion. These were discussed in draft form at the fourth meeting of the Working Group. With regard to one of the topics discussed, viz. the possible preparation of a global reference study and list, the Working Group did not have time to consider the draft but agreed that since the pertinent section of the draft recommendations needed to be clarified it would take a decision on this section at its fifth meeting.

22. At its fifth meeting, held on Friday, 13 May, 1988, the Working Group adopted the present report, including the recommendations given in Section IV below. During the meeting, Mr. Yves Manville, Third Secretary, Permanent Delegate of France to Unesco, made a statement on behalf of Mrs. Marie-Claude Cabana, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of France to Unesco, expressing the regrets of the French specialists who had attended

the meetings of the Working Group that they had been unable to participate in the discussions to the extent that they would have wished because of the lack of English-French simultaneous interpretation and the fact that all the working documents had not been made available in both languages.

23. The Working Group also examined and approved section 7 of the recommendations on a possible global reference study and list. It indicated to the representative of ICOMOS that should the Bureau endorse its recommendations ICOMOS would be invited to indicate formally whether it could take on the tasks involved and, if so, to prepare a proposal to the Committee explaining how the work would be carried out, within what time-frame and at what cost. Finally, at this meeting the Working Group also returned to the proposal put forward by Mss. Miltiadou, Ugarte and Zaouche that it recommend to the Committee to suspend its examination of two categories of cultural property in relation to which the Committee's position was not yet clear. The two categories are rural landscapes and traditional villages. The Working Group added, however, that the period of suspension should allow the Committee to pursue without delay the study of these types of property. The purpose of these studies would be to develop criteria for determining the "outstanding universal value" of properties that might be nominated for inscription. The Group also considered the category of "new towns of the twentieth century" together with that of contemporary architecture. It decided to recommend that para. 29 of the "Operational Guidelines" be adhered to in this respect (see para. 43 of the Recommendations).

24. Before closing this final meeting the Chairman made a statement to record the Working Group's deep and sincere appreciation of the highly efficient and helpful manner in which the Secretariat had prepared the documentation for its meetings and had participated in its deliberations.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

25. At a time when more and more Unesco Member States are becoming Parties to the Convention, the problem of evaluating cultural nominations must be seen as part of a global picture. This will require an inter-related set of measures to regulate and rationalize both the submission and the evaluation of future nominations. These measures, however, are in no way intended to block such nominations or impose arbitrary limits of any kind on the proposals of States Parties.

4.2 Appeal to States Parties

26. In anticipation of the implementation of the following recommendations and with a view to establishing the truly

worldwide List envisaged by the World Heritage Convention, the Committee might consider:

- a) renewing its invitation to States not yet Parties to ratify the Convention;
- b) inviting States Parties to consider whether their cultural heritage is already well represented on the List and if so to slow down voluntarily their rate of submission of further nominations so as to provide an opportunity for the List to become more universally representative;
- c) calling on States Parties whose cultural heritage is not yet adequately represented on the List and which might be in need of assistance in preparing nominations of cultural properties to seek such assistance from the Committee;
- d) reminding States Parties that their delegations to the sessions of the Committee should include at least one qualified specialist.

4.3 Preparation and submission of nominations by States Parties

27. Inventories (cf. Article 11, called "tentative lists" by the Committee)

- a) The Committee should encourage States Parties to adhere rigorously to criteria it has established for the preparation of tentative lists (see para. 7 of the Operational Guidelines).
- b) The Committee should therefore develop a format, i.e. a standard form for the submission of these tentative lists, which should be sent to all States Parties. Those States which have already submitted tentative lists that do not correspond to the requirements should be invited to re-submit their lists in accordance with the new standardized format. States Parties should be invited to indicate, if possible, the order in which the properties so listed would be presented for nomination.
- c) Regional and sub-regional workshops as well as expert missions should be organized by the Secretariat upon request by States Parties so as to assist the latter in preparing their tentative lists.
- d) If the States Parties concerned so desire, regional and/or sub-regional meetings could continue to be organized with a view to the "harmonization" of tentative lists.
- e) States who have not submitted a tentative list should be encouraged to do so as early as possible and should be informed once again of the Committee's earlier decision that the submission of a tentative list should be a condition for the consideration of nominations by the Committee.

28. Submission of nominations

a) States Parties should be once again reminded of the need to prepare their nominations as carefully as possible, following the guidelines established by the Committee. The Committee should reiterate that assistance for this purpose can be made available under the World Heritage Fund.

b) States Parties should be reminded of the requirement that they furnish adequate evidence to establish the "outstanding universal value" of the properties nominated. For this purpose they could be invited to attach to the nomination forms if possible an analysis of references in world literature (e.g. reference works such as general or specialized encyclopaedias, histories of art or architecture, records of voyages and explorations, scientific reports, guidebooks, etc.) along with a comprehensive bibliography (already required in the nomination form). As regards newly-discovered properties, evidence of the attention which the discovery has received internationally would be equally helpful.

c) Under the "Juridical data" section of the nomination form States Parties should be invited to provide, in addition to the legal texts protecting the property being nominated, an explanation of the way in which these laws actually operate. Such an analysis is preferable to a mere enumeration or compilation of the legal texts themselves, as is currently very often the case.

d) When nominating properties belonging to certain well-represented categories of cultural property the nominating State Party should be expected to provide a comparative evaluation of the property in relation to other properties of a similar type, as already required in para. 7 of the "Operational Guidelines."

e) In certain cases it may be necessary for States Parties to consult the Secretariat and Icomos informally before submitting nomination forms.

f) In all cases, so as to maintain the objectivity of the evaluation process and to avoid possible embarrassment to those concerned, States Parties should be requested to refrain from giving undue publicity to the fact that a property has been nominated for inscription pending the final decision of the Committee on the nomination in question.

g) The Secretariat should be requested to modify page 11 of the current nomination form so that three separate boxes are provided for the three distinct sets of information required under section 5 of the form ("Justification for inclusion in the World Heritage List"), viz. i) the "outstanding universal value" of the property in terms of the Committee's

six criteria; ii) the state of preservation of the property; iii) the manner in which the property meets the test of authenticity.

4.4 Verification of nominations by the Secretariat

29. The Secretariat should examine nominations received very thoroughly and ensure that they are in order and accompanied by all the required documentation. Should nominations appear to be incomplete or inadequately supported the additional information should be requested immediately from the States Parties concerned. Nominations should not be transmitted to ICOMOS until such time as they are complete.

4.5 Evaluation of nominations

Icomos

30. Icomos should be invited to classify the nominations it evaluates under three categories;

- a) properties which it recommends for inscription without reservation;
- b) properties which it does not recommend for inscription;
- c) properties whose eligibility for inscription is not considered absolutely clear.

The Bureau

31. The Bureau in turn should be invited to classify the nominations it evaluates (on the basis of the recommendations of Icomos) under the following four categories:

- a) properties which it recommends for inscription without reservation;
- b) properties which it does not recommend for inscription;
- c) properties that, in the opinion of the Bureau, need to be referred back to the nominating State for further information/documentation;
- d) properties whose examination should be deferred on the ground that a more in-depth assessment or study is needed.

32. The Bureau's recommendations should be transmitted as rapidly as possible to the States Members of the Committee and to the States Parties having submitted the nominations.

The Committee

33. The Committee should be invited, during its sessions, to examine the Bureau's recommendations in the following order:

- a) properties recommended for inscription (these should not be considered case by case but as a group);
- b) properties not recommended for inscription (these should be examined case by case);
- c) properties for which further information had been requested from the nominating State (provided the information has reached the Secretariat no later than 9 weeks before the start of the session);

34. The discussion of the nominations should be preceded by a quick presentation by the Secretariat of the criteria and the salient points in the "Operational Guidelines."

4.6 Facilitating the work of the Committee and Bureau

Availability of documents before the sessions

35. Every effort should be made to ensure that all working documents are made available to States members of the Committee no later than 6 weeks before the start of the Committee sessions in order that the representatives of States members may study the documents well in advance.⁵

Organisation of the agenda of the Committee and Bureau

36. Having decided that it would not be feasible to recommend any increase in the number of days (currently 5 days) devoted to the sessions of the World Heritage Committee, the Working Group considered that the items on the Committee's agenda could be discussed in the following order so as to optimize the use of the time available:

⁵ N.B. It is understood that ICOMOS will have to be consulted as to the feasibility of completing its evaluations within this timetable. It may well be that the deadline for submission of nominations will have to be brought forward to a date earlier than 1 January.

DAY 1

Morning

1. Formal opening of the session: to be kept as short as possible, with a brief introduction by the Secretariat (i.e. no reference to be made to details which would be taken up elsewhere in the agenda).

2. Monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and linked technical problems

Afternoon

3. Promotional activities and technical cooperation

DAY 2

Morning

4. Budget

5. Introduction to cultural nominations (slides, etc.)

Afternoon

6. Nominations of cultural properties

DAY 3

Morning

6. (contd.)

Afternoon

6. (end)

DAY 4

Morning

7. Nominations of natural properties

Afternoon

7. (continuation and end)

DAY 5

Morning

(No meeting: time required by Secretariat for preparation of report)

Afternoon

8. Adoption of report and concluding meeting.

37. With regard to the Bureau, the Working Group recommends that in view of the more rigorous process of examining nominations that is being recommended, a prolongation of the spring session of the Bureau that precedes the winter session of the Committee should be envisaged. The agenda item on the nominations of properties to the World Heritage List should be taken up as late as possible during this session.

38. With regard to the Bureau meeting held during the winter session of the Committee the Working Group recommends that this meeting be held as early as possible during the session; the meeting should be sure to discuss the budget as well as nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List.

4.7 Global reference study and list

39. Since the long-term goal of the World Heritage Convention is to define a World Heritage List that is universally representative, the Committee needs to have at its disposal, as a working tool, a global reference list of properties of "outstanding universal value." This universally representative list would have to be based upon a global study of the world cultural heritage, including the heritage of States that are not yet Parties to the Convention.

40. Carrying out such a global study would be a complex task, requiring the contributions of historians, historians of art and architecture, and archaeologists. It should be entrusted to ICOMOS, which should co-ordinate the work of the specialists involved, in co-operation with national experts, ICOMOS Committees and antiquities services. The study would enable the Committee as well as States Parties to evaluate the List as well as the tentative lists, and to take note of possible lacunae and redundancies with a view to future inscriptions.

41. The global study would enable the Committee to identify the outstanding cultural properties handed down as patrimony to our contemporary world by all the "cultural entities" that have made up the history of world civilization. The best possible definition of these cultural entities, based on such factors as artistic styles or schools, historical periods, geo-cultural groupings, etc. cannot be laid down in advance but would have to be worked out in the course of the study itself. With chronology on one axis and the cultural entities on the other a matrix could be developed. This matrix would then be filled in to include the most significant properties representative of each of the entities concerned at different historical periods.

4.8 Suspension of the consideration of certain categories of cultural property pending further study

42. The Working Group recommends that the Committee proceed forthwith to further study the question of rural landscapes and traditional villages so as to develop guidelines for determining which such properties might be considered of "outstanding universal value."

43. Having considered the problems posed by the inscription of new towns and of contemporary architecture in general the Working Group recommends that para. 29 of the "Operational Guidelines" be adhered to by the Committee.⁶

ybrf/wkgroup.rep

⁶ This paragraph reads as follows: "It is difficult to assess the quality of new towns of the twentieth century. History alone will tell which of them will best serve as examples of contemporary town planning. The examination of the files on these towns should be deferred until all the traditional historic towns, which represent the most vulnerable part of the heritage of mankind, have been entered on the World Heritage List."

Appendix 1

Working group on World Heritage List nominations
Fourth meeting - Wednesday 4 May 1988
Room XV -

List of participants

1. States members of the World Heritage Committee

Australia

Mr. J.L. Lander, Minister
Alternate Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Bulgaria

Mr. K. Pachev
Attaché, Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Canada

Mrs. Christina Cameron
Director-General
National Historic Parks and Sites Directorate

Mrs. Marie Bernard-Meunier
Counsellor
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

France

Mme. M. de Raissac
Ministère de la Culture
Chargée de mission, Direction du patrimoine

M. F. Enaud
Ministère de la Culture
Inspecteur général des Monuments historiques

Greece

Mrs. A. Miltiadou
Counsellor, Permanent Delegation to Unesco

India

H. Exc. Ms. A. Ghose
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. Pradeep Singh
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Italy

M. R. Brigli
Chancellor
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Mexico

Mrs. G. Ugarte de Bernard
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Pakistan

Mr. Mohammad Haroon Shaukat
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Sri Lanka

H.E. Mr. A. Guruge
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Tunisia

Ms. S. Zaouche
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Mr. A. Beschaouch
Maître de recherches archéologiques
Directeur général de la Bibliothèque nationale

Turkey

Mr. A.E. Oba
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

2. Unesco Secretariat

Mrs. A. Raidl
Director, Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr. B. von Droste
Director
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mr. Y.R. Isar
Chief, International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mrs. J. Robertson
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. M. Jardin
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. C. Lyard
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr. N. Ishwaran
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mexico

Mrs. G. Ugarte de Bernard
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Pakistan

Mr. Mohammad Haroon Shaukat
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Sri Lanka

H.E. Mr. A. Guruge
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Tunisia

Ms. S. Zaouche
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Mr. A. Beschaouch
Maître de recherches archéologiques
Directeur général de la Bibliothèque nationale

Turkey

Mr. A.E. Oba
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

2. Unesco Secretariat

Mrs. A. Raidl
Director, Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr. B. von Droste
Director
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mr. Y.R. Isar
Chief, International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mrs. J. Robertson
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. M. Jardin
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. C. Lyard
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr. N. Ishwaran
Division of Ecological Sciences