Distribution Limited

WHC-2/CONF.002/7Rev
18 November 1992
Original: English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**World Heritage Committee
Sixteenth session**

Santa Fe, New Mexico, United States of America
7-14 December 1992

**Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda: Nominations of Cultural and Natural Properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger**

At its sixteenth session the Bureau examined the nominations of twenty-three cultural and eleven natural properties, and proposals for extending two cultural and two natural World Heritage sites, respectively. It recommended the inscription of eleven cultural and five natural properties (Section I.A). The Bureau did not recommend the inscription of three cultural and six natural properties (Section I.B). Of the proposals made by States Parties for extending the boundaries of World Heritage sites, the Bureau recommended the proposals for one cultural and two natural sites (Section I.C). and returned the proposal to extend one cultural property to the State Party for additional information (Section I.D). The Bureau also returned four nominations of cultural properties to the States Parties requesting supplementary information (Section I.E).

At this sixteenth session in July 1992, the Bureau deferred the inscription of four cultural properties. The reasons for the Bureau's deferral of each of the four cultural properties are given in paragraph 80.D of document WHC-92/CONF.002/2, and are not included in this document.

During the same session, the Bureau recommended the inclusion of one natural property in the List of World Heritage in Danger. (Section II.A). The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the state of conservation of another natural property had stabilized and

recommended that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger (Section II.B).

The recommendations made by the Bureau on each nomination were transmitted by letter to the States Parties concerned. In the case of properties where a response from the State Party has been received, a description of the views of the competent national authorities has been included. Other responses from States Parties which may be received before the beginning of the sixteenth session of the Committee will be reported orally during the meeting.

## I. Nominations to the World Heritage List

### A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List.

| Name of Property | Identification N° | State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention | Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| Butrinti | 570Rev | Albania | C(iii) |
| Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region | 630 | Australia | N(ii)(iii) |

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Fraser Island component of the nomination (excluding the Cooloola National Park), which comprises the majority of the World Heritage values of this site, on the World Heritage List. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee commend the Australian and Queensland authorities for including Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region within their plans for a 'Regional Park' and extend statutory protection to all of Fraser Island.

The Australian authorities in their response to the Bureau's recommendations via their letter have pointed out that they nominated the Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region under all four natural heritage criteria, and that IUCN, while recommending the inscription of the site on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), have not provided any explanation as to why the nomination did not satisfy the other two criteria. In response to this query from the Australian authorities, IUCN has reported that since the site met two criteria, it did not elaborate, in its evaluation, on why other criteria were not met. Furthermore, IUCN is also of the

view that criteria (i) and (iv) are vastly overshadowed by the other two, and are not seen as applicable or necessary for justifying the inscription of Fraser Island.

**Belovezhskaya Pushcha State National Park** | **627** | **Belarus** | **N(iii)**

The Bureau noted that this site is an extension of the Bialowieza National Park of Poland and requested the Belarus authorities to: (a) confirm that the boundaries of the site only include the core zone; (b) prepare a management plan which would be co-ordinated with the management of the adjacent World Heritage site in Poland; (c) co-ordinate and share management experience with their Polish counterparts, and (d) remove the fence between this site and the Polish site if the management plan determines that such an action would improve viability of the site.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Belarus and Polish authorities to recognize the ecological unity of the two sites and agree to the inscription of the whole area as a single transfrontier property on the World Heritage List.

The Bureau's recommendations were transmitted to the competent authorities in Belarus and Poland by letters dated 14 August 1992. The Permanent Delegate of Poland to UNESCO, by letter of 22 October 1992, informed the World Heritage Centre that the competent Polish authorities agree with the inscription of the Bialowieza National Park of Poland and Belovezhskaya Pushcha State National Park of Belarus as a single transfrontier property on the World Heritage List and support the removal of the fence between the two sites. A reply from the Belarus authorities is awaited.

**Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area** | **640** | **China, People's Republic of** | **N(iii)**

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the core zone of this site on the World Heritage List and encouraged the Chinese authorities to manage the buffer zone for conservation objectives and retain the natural characteristics of the site. The Bureau noted that pressure due to tourism is likely to increase and urged the management to be vigilant and protect the integrity of the site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee recommend the Chinese authorities to undertake a census of wildlife in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to study the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criterion (iv) as well.

In response to the recommendation of the Bureau, the Chinese authorities have submitted to the World Heritage Centre, a document entitled 'Plans for Wild Animal and Plant Protection in Wulingyan'. A copy of this document has been transmitted to IUCN for information and review.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area** | **637** | **China, People's Republic of** | **N(iii)** |

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List and expressed concern over the question of growing human impact in the reserve and encouraged the Chinese authorities to take appropriate measures to safeguard this site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee also recommend the State Party to undertake a wildlife census in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to study the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criterion (iv) as well.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area** | **638** | **China, People's Republic of** | **N(iii)** |

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the central and second class conservation zones of Huanglong on the World Heritage List, excluding Mouni Gully sub-division in the west, since its condition and natural values have not been adequately investigated. The Bureau also suggested that the authorities undertake a census of wildlife in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to investigate the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criterion (iv) as well.

The Bureau recognized that the Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area and the Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area belong to the same ecological unit, despite being under different county administrations. The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Chinese authorities to initiate a two-phase process as follows: (a) under Phase I, consider including Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong Areas as a single property on the World Heritage List, and (b) under Phase II, to consider nominating an even larger area including not only Jiuzhaigou Valley and Huanglong Scenic Areas, but also the Wanglang Reserve, for inscription as a single site, representing the Minshan range of mountains. The Bureau noted that the Wanglang Reserve was a part of the nomination of the Panda Reserves which was deferred by the Committee in 1987 and 1990.

The Bureau also suggested that the Committee recommend that the Chinese authorities, while implementing such a two-phase process, also consider proposing a new name for the ensemble of Jiuzhaigou,

Huanglong and Wanglang areas. The Bureau recommended that the Committee also encourage the authorities of China and the United States to activate an agreement for "twinning" the Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong Areas with the Yosemite National Park of USA and co-operate in strengthening the management and training of personnel.

The Deputy Director-General of the Department of National Scenic Areas of the Ministry of Construction, in replying to the recommendations of the Bureau by letter of 6 October 1992, has provided a brief note explaining the significance of the Mouni Gully of the Huanglong Scenic Area and several slides of this site; the representative of IUCN felt that the Mouni Galley area had not been adequately investigated. The note and the slides have been transmitted to IUCN for information and review.

The Deputy Director-General has informed the World Heritage Centre that Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong areas are separated by a distance of more than 100 km and high mountains rising 4,000 meters above sea level. The Chinese authorities have pointed out that if the two sites are inscribed as one site on the World Heritage List, it will present several administrative and managerial difficulties which may be detrimental to the scenic resources and the eco-environment of the two areas. Therefore they have requested that the Committee consider inscribing Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong as two separate sites on the World Heritage List.

The Chinese authorities have reacted positively to the Bureau's recommendation to activate the 'twinning' agreement between the Jiuzhaigou and Huanglang areas and the Yosemite National Park of USA, and suggested that they will seek the assistance of the Bureau and the Committee in implementing this recommendation.

The Chinese authorities have also submitted to the World Heritage Centre a compilation on the 'Biological Resources of the Jiuzhaigou Valley' and 'An Investigation Report on the Status of Fauna Species Protection in the Huanglong Scenic Spot'. These reports, together with the letter from the Deputy Director-General of the Department of National Scenic Areas, Ministry of Construction, have been transmitted to IUCN for information and review.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Historic Centre of Prague** | **616** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** | **C(ii)(iv)** |

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property and took note of the new proposal for the boundaries of the buffer zone, but requested ICOMOS to consider the possibility of applying criterion (vi) for this inscription as well. ICOMOS will provide a report on this subject to the Committee.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov** | **617** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** | **C(iv)** |

While recommending the inscription of this property, the Bureau requested the competent Czech and Slovak authorities to take all the necessary measures to reduce pressure due to over-visitation by tourists which threaten this property. The Bureau's recommendation was transmitted to the Czech and Slovak authorities via letter dated 7 September 1992 and a reply is awaited.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Historic Centre of Telc** | **621** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** | **C(i)(iv)** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Bourges Cathedral** | **635** | **France** | **C(i)** |

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested ICOMOS to complete its evaluation with a more detailed justification concerning the exceptional value of this monument with respect to the series of French and European Gothic cathedrals in general. The Centre has received documentation on this subject from the French authorities. This documentation was transmitted to ICOMOS, which will make a report to the Committee during its sixteenth session.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Mines of Rammelsberg and the historic town of Goslar** | **623** | **Germany** | **C(iv)** |

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property and requested ICOMOS to reconsider the criteria for inscription. The Bureau wondered whether in this particular case criterion (i) was applicable, or if criteria (ii) or (iii) would be more appropriate. ICOMOS will present a report on this question to the Committee.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Pythagoreion and Heraion of Samos** | **595** | **Greece** | **C(ii)(iii)** |

Although recommending this property for inscription, the Bureau requested the competent Greek authorities to give assurances regarding the protection of the natural environment of this property. The request of the Bureau was transmitted to the Greek authorities by letter dated 7 September 1992.

In their reply dated 7 October 1992, the Ministry of Culture of Greece has assured that the site of Heraion is protected within a radius of 2 km by all the provisions of the Codified Antiquities

Act which requires that erection of all edifices within this site require the Ministry's consent. The ancient city of Samos (Pythagoreion) has been protected by a Presidential decree, effective from 1991; the decree has created two zones where erection of edifices is prohibited and usage of earth is prescribed. The letter from the Greek authorities has been transmitted to ICOMOS for information and review.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **El Tajin, Pre-Hispanic City** | **631** | **Mexico** | **C(iii)(iv)** |
| **Old City of Zamosc** | **564** | **Poland** | **C(iv)** |
| **Historic Monuments of Novgorod and surroundings** | **604** | **Russian Federation** | **C(ii)(iv)(vi)** |
| **Pueblo de Taos** | **492Rev** | **United States of America** | **C(iv)** |

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

| Name of Property | Identification N° | State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention |
|---|---|---|
| **Macquarie Island Nature Reserve** | **629** | **Australia** |

The Bureau noted that the site had geological value but was of the view that its characteristics were not of universal significance. However, in the light of the work of the IUCN/SCAR Task Force on Islands of the Southern Ocean, the Bureau noted that this site may be considered at a future date as part of a Southern Ocean Island site of Australia and New Zealand.

**Berezinsky Biosphere Reserve** **628** **Belarus**

The Bureau noted that this site is recognized as one of UNESCO's Biosphere Reserves but did not meet criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

**Mir Castle** **625** **Belarus**

While recognizing the architectural value of this property, the Bureau considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List, and more particularly the conditions of authenticity.

In their letter of 15 July 1992 to the Director-General, the Belarus authorities disagreed with the evaluation of the universal significance of this property and expressed their regrets that this site was not recommended for inscription. In his reply of 18 September 1992, the Director-General explained the procedures by which nominations to the World Heritage List are evaluated by ICOMOS and informed the Belarus authorities that this recommendation will be submitted to the Committee for a final decision regarding the inscription Mir Castle on the World Heritage List.

**Cidade Velha** **607** **Cap Vert**

The Bureau considered that in spite of its indisputable historic value, the property did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

**Lunan Scenic Area of the Stone Forest** **639** **China, People's Republic of**

The Bureau was of the view that this site did not meet World Heritage criteria.

The Permanent Delegate of China, and the Deputy Director-General of the Department of National Scenic Areas of the Ministry of Construction, in their letters of 30 September and 6 October 1992, respectively, have expressed the view that the Lunan Scenic Area of the Stone Forest is a geological and scenic area of worldwide importance and have provided supplementary information for the consideration of the Committee. The information received has been transmitted to IUCN for review and evaluation.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Huangguoshu Waterfalls Scenic & Historic Area** | **641** | **People's Republic of China** |

The Bureau was of the view that this site did not meet World Heritage criteria.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Karlstejn Castle** | **619** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** |

The Bureau recognized the great national value of this property, but considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Tatra National Park** | **656** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** |

The Bureau acknowledged the high national importance of this site, but was of the view that it did not meet any natural heritage criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau, however, encouraged the nomination of this site to UNESCO's International Network of Biosphere Reserves.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Gir Wildlife Sanctuary** | **615** | **India** |

The Bureau noted that the conservation of this site will be greatly enhanced if it were included in UNESCO's international network of biosphere reserves. The Bureau was of the opinion that although it is a site of high national value, it did not meet World Heritage criteria.

## C. Extension of World Heritage sites

| Name of Property | Identification N° | State Party having submitted the proposal for extension of the property in accordance with the Convention | Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Kakadu National Park** | **631** | **Australia** | **N(ii)(iii)(iv) C(i)(iii)(iv)** |

The Bureau recommended that the Committee commend the Australian authorities for concluding a 10-year programme to extend this Park, for setting-up an exemplary management regime and nominating the full extent of the Park for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Bureau suggested that the Committee also request the Australian authorities to implement management recommendations made by IUCN in its evaluation report, and consider proposing a new name taking into account the ecosystem rather than the administrative characteristics of the site. The Bureau also suggested that the Committee recommend that IUCN undertakes a monitoring mission to the site within the next five years.

By their letter dated 21 August 1992 the Australian authorities, in reply to the Bureau's recommendations, have pointed out that the 1991 nomination of the enlarged Kakadu National Park was made under all four natural heritage criteria but the Bureau recommendation of the inscription of the site was on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). IUCN, in response to this observation made by the Australian authorities, have reiterated that they did not think that criterion (i) was applicable to this site and have indicated that they will include a justification of their position on this question as part of their evaluation of this property which will be submitted to the Committee.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Palaces and Parks of Postdam and Berlin** | **532bis** | **Germany** | **C(i)(ii)(iv)** |

The Bureau recommended that the Committee extend the **Palaces and the Parks of Potsdam and** Berlin to include **the Park with Sacrow Castle and Sauveur Church.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Glacier Bay National Park extension of the Wrangell/St.Elias/ Kluane site of Canada-USA)** | **72bis Rev** | **United States of America** | **N(ii)** |

The Bureau noted that this extension of the American part of this transfrontier World Heritage site would increase the extent of the site by 25%, as well as the comment of the Observer from Canada that they support the extension proposed by the authorities of the United States of America. The Bureau recommended that the Committee include this extension as part of the Wrangell/St. Elias/Kluane World Heritage site and request the authorities of the United States of America to (a) eventually incorporate the small area between Glacier Bay and the World Heritage site which has not been included in the proposed extension, and (b) consider a further extension of the World Heritage site to include Yakutat, Cape Suckling and the Admiralty Islands.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Canadian authorities and obtain their written support for the extension prepared by the American authorities to this transfrontier site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee request the two States Parties concerned to propose a new name for this site reflecting its international character and universal significance. The Bureau was informed that IUCN was undertaking another mission to this site to evaluate the potential threats to the site's integrity due to a proposal to exploit the Windy Craggy mine in Canada. The Bureau noted that IUCN will include its findings from this mission in its evaluation report to the Committee in December 1992.

The Bureau's recommendations were transmitted to the authorities of Canada and the United States of America by letters of 14 August 1992 and replies are awaited. IUCN has undertaken a mission to evaluate the potential threats due to a proposal to exploit the Wind Craggy mine in Canada and will include its findings in the evaluation of this proposed extension which will be submitted to the Committee.

## D. Proposal for extension referred back to the State Party for further information/documentation

| Name of Property | Identification | State Party having submitted the proposal for extension of the property in accordance with the Convention |
|---|---|---|
| **Megalithic Temples** | **132 bis** | **Malta** |

The Bureau, recognizing the exceptional universal value of these monuments, recommended that they be inscribed on the World Heritage List, but returned the nomination dossier to the competent Maltese authorities to allow them, in consultation with ICOMOS, to reformulate the proposal so that all the Megalithic monuments of the Maltese archipelago are included under the same title. Furthermore, the Bureau drew the attention of the Maltese authorities to the management problems of these sites which are subject to heavy pressure from tourism. The recommendation of the Bureau and the nomination dossier were transmitted to the Maltese authorities by letter of 7 September 1992 and a reply is awaited.

## E. Properties for which nominations were referred back to nominating States for further information/documentation

| Name of Property | Identification N° | State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention | Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Kasbah of Algiers** | **565** | **Algeria** | |

At its fifteenth session in Carthage, 9-13 December 1991, the Committee decided to initiate the procedure for the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List. At its sixteenth session held in Paris, 6-10 July 1992, the Bureau decided to examine complementary information concerning the Kasbah during its next session in Santa Fe. To this end, and in agreement with the World Heritage Centre, a technical mission comprising Mr. Azedine Beschaouch, Professor Raymond Lemaire and Mr. Daniel Drocourt, visited Algiers in October 1992. This expert mission examined the proposed plan for safeguarding the Kasbah. Services concerned with the protection of the Kasbah were informed of the findings of the mission. The Chairperson of the Committee will present to the Bureau as well as to the Committee a report on the results of this mission.

On the basis of the conclusions of the Bureau, the Committee is requested to make a decision concerning the inscription of the Kasbah of Algiers on the World Heritage List.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Angkor** | **667** | **Cambodia** |

At its sixteenth session held in Paris from 6-10 July 1992, the Bureau recognized the universal and outstanding value of this property and recommended that the Committee initiate the procedure for urgent inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

During its next session in Santa Fe, the Bureau will examine the proposed nomination on the basis of an evaluation of the site undertaken by ICOMOS.

The Chairperson of the Committee will establish the case for urgent action based on his own mission to Angkor in October this year at the request of the Director-General of UNESCO. The Committee may wish to take a decision about the inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List based on the conclusions of the Bureau.

**Reserve of Popular Architecture of Vlkolinec** | **622** | **Czech and Slovak Federal Republic** | **C(v)**

The Bureau decided to return the nomination to the competent Czech and Slovak authorities so that additional information may be provided regarding the natural and rural environment of the village and to supply details of the management plan for the ensemble. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to carry out a comparative study among similar properties in Central Europe.

The competent Czech and Slovak authorities have submitted, on 9 October 1992, additional information requested by the Bureau. These documents have been transmitted to ICOMOS to prepare a comparative study and provide a report to the Committee.

**Cultural and natural historic ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands** | **632** | **Russian Federation** | **C(iv)**

The Bureau requested the competent Russian authorities to reconsider the title of this property, which could be modified as follows "Cultural and historic ensemble of Solovetsky".

The Russian authorities, by a telex of 6 October 1992, have given their agreement to the name proposed by the Bureau.

**Monuments of Vladimir and Monuments of Suzdal** | **644 633** | **Russian Federation** | **to be defined**

The Bureau recommended the inscription of these properties on the condition that a new proposal be submitted, bringing together the universal architectural values of the monuments of the ensemble of Vladimir and Suzdal. The recommendation of the Bureau was transmitted to the Russian authorities by letter dated 7 September 1992.

By a telex dated 14 October 1992, the competent Russian authorities informed of their acceptance that the Monuments of Vladimir and Suzdal be considered as an ensemble and in consequence be inscribed on the World Heritage List as one property.

**Safranbolu Village** | **614** | **Turkey** | **C(ii)(v)**

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested the competent Turkish authorities to transmit to ICOMOS

a plan clearly showing the boundary of the site proposed for inscription, as well as additional information on the village mosques. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to also take into consideration the possibility of applying criterion (iv) for the inscription of this property.

The recommendations of the Bureau were transmitted to the Turkish authorities by letter dated 9 September 1992 and a reply is awaited. ICOMOS will report on the possibility of applying criterion (iv) for the inscription of this property.

## II. List of World Heritage in Danger

### A. Property recommended for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger

**Srebarna Biosphere Reserve** **Bulgaria**

The Committee, at its last session, recommended that the Bulgarian authorities nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger because this small (600 hectare) World Heritage site had lost much of its ecological viability. At its sixteenth session, the Bureau was informed that IUCN had undertaken two missions to this site during early 1992, and that although its importance as a Ramsar site and a biosphere reserve within a European context could still be retained with the implementation of specific remedial actions, its World Heritage status can no longer be justified because it has deteriorated to a state where it has irretrievably lost many of the characteristics which determined its inclusion in the World Heritage List. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its forthcoming session in December, consider deleting this property from the World Heritage List, and in accordance with paragraph 41(c) of the Operational Guidelines, requested the World Heritage Centre to inform the Bulgarian authorities of its recommendation to the Committee. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to obtain all observations and comments the Bulgarian authorities may wish to make regarding this recommendation in time to submit them for the consideration of the Committee.

The Permanent Delegate of Bulgaria to UNESCO was informed of the Bureau's observations and recommendations by a letter dated 14 August 1992. By his letter dated 7 October 1992, the Permanent Delegate of Bulgaria to UNESCO transmitted to the World Heritage Centre a letter from the Minister for Environment, who agrees that the ecological conditions in Srebarna have deteriorated. The Minister for Environment has thus requested the Committee to include Srebarna in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Minister, however, has provided information to justify his view

that the deterioration in the ecology of the lakes is not irreversible; he has also provided a description of efforts to assess the state of conservation of Srebarna and take necessary measures for its rehabilitation. Details of the Minister's response to the Bureau's recommendation is provided in document WHC-92/CONF.002/5.

**Plitvice Lakes National Park** — **Croatia, Republic of**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its last session had expressed concerns that this property, which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 at the request of the Government of Yugoslavia, had been abandoned due to armed conflict in the region, and that the Park faced several threats due to lack of supervision. The Bureau noted that since the last session of the Committee the Croatian Government informed the Director-General of UNESCO that it considers itself committed to all international agreements, including the World Heritage Convention, signed and ratified by the previous government of Yugoslavia under the auspices of UNESCO.

Thus, in accordance with the request of the Minister of Education, Culture and Sports of the Republic of Croatia, (letter of 24 April 1992 to the Secretariat), the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

A team of three experts who undertook a mission to this site from 18 to 27 September 1992, found that although the values for which the site was granted World Heritage status still remain preserved, the site faces several threats due to political and military conflict prevailing in the region where this Park is located. Hence, **the experts have endorsed the Bureau's recommendation that the Committee include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.** Conclusions of the team's assessment of the state of conservation of Plitvice Lakes National Park and the recommendations the team had proposed for the consideration of the Committee are included in document WHC-92/CONF.002/5.

**Aïr-Ténéré National Nature Reserve** — **Niger**

The Bureau expressed concerns that the region in which this site is situated has recently been affected by armed conflict. The Bureau was informed that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Niger had requested the Director-General of UNESCO to launch an appeal for the protection of this site. The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Centre contact the authorities in Niger and obtain more information on the impact armed conflict in the region is having on this site and request them to nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In accordance with the wish of the Bureau, the Permanent Delegate of Niger to UNESCO, by his letter of 1 October 1992, has requested that the **Committee include the Aïr-Ténéré National Nature Reserve in the List of World Heritage in Danger.** IUCN will provide a report on the state of conservation of this site.

## B. Property recommended for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger

**Garamba National Park** **Zaire**

The Committee, at its last session in Carthage, Tunisia, was glad to learn that the rhino population in this Park had increased to 31 individuals and the local management capacity and budget had increased substantially. Poaching had also been brought under control. The Minister for Environment and Nature Protection of Zaire, by his letter of 26 February 1991, had requested the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Although the Bureau at its last session in June 1991 recommended the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee took note of the fact that during the latter half of 1991, civil order in the country had deteriorated. Therefore, the Committee agreed with IUCN's observation that the rhino population was still too small and continuous assistance and political stability are essential for maintaining the success achieved in the last five years. In view of the uncertainties which were associated with the civil unrest that prevailed in Zaire during late 1991, the Committee deferred its decision on the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger until its next session.

The Bureau, at its sixteenth session held at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, from 6 to 14 July 1992, was happy to note that the rhinoceros population in the Park has now increased to 32 individuals and that the budget and staff available for the management of the Park has also been strengthened. The Bureau concluded that the state of conservation of this site continued to be stable. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee, in accordance with the request made by the State Party by letter of 26 February 1991, remove this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

## III. Deferred Nominations

| Name of Property | Identification No. | State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention |
|---|---|---|
| **Rohtas Fort** | **586** | **Pakistan** |

At its fifteenth session held during June 1991, the Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending receipt from the Pakistani authorities of a precise description of all structures which have been preserved inside the Fort and in the village in encloses, and the results of a comparative examination of properties of this type in the geo-cultural area concerned. The Secretariat informed the Pakistan authorities of the recommendation of the Bureau by letter of 23 August 1991.

The Pakistan authorities by their letter of 21 February 1992 have transmitted the information requested by the Bureau to the Secretariat. This information has been transmitted to ICOMOS for review and evaluation.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Ban Chiang Archaeological Site** | **575** | **Thailand** |

At its fifteenth session in June 1991, the Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending a more thorough study of the Ban Chiang site and a comparative study of the sites of the same type.

ICOMOS, in consultation with the competent authorities in Thailand, has organized an evaluation mission to this site in November 1992 and will report its finding to the Committee at its sixteenth session.

## IV. Cultural characteristics of natural World Heritage Properties

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Tongariro National Park** | **421** | **New Zealand** |

This site was inscribed on the World Heritage List at the fourteenth session of the Committee, in December 1990. At the time of inscription, ICOMOS was not in a position to evaluate the cultural value of this site because a comparative study of the heritage of the Asia-Pacific cultures had not been carried out. The New Zealand authorities have requested the World Heritage Centre to take necessary steps for inscribing Tongariro on the World Heritage List on the basis of its cultural heritage values as well. The

Committee may request ICOMOS to report on the feasibility of launching a comparative study on the heritage of Asia-Pacific cultures.

**Rio Abiseo National Park** **548** **Peru**

At its fourteenth session held in Banff, Canada, during December 1990, the Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of natural heritage criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). At its fifteenth session held during June 1991, the Bureau requested the Peruvian authorities to furnish details of the results of recent archaeological excavations carried out in this site. In the light of this additional information the Bureau recommended that the inscription of this site, on the basis of cultural heritage criteria as well, be examined. The Peruvian authorities have submitted to the World Heritage Centre, the information requested by the Bureau, which has been transmitted to ICOMOS for review and evaluation.