

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee

Third Session

Cairo and Luxor, 22 - 26 October 1979

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR ON THE THIRD SESSION OF
THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
(Cairo, 21 October 1979)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Cairo, Egypt, on 21 October 1979. It was attended by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. David Hales (U.S.A.), accompanied by Mr. R.R. Garvey, four of the five Vice-Chairmen, namely Mr. Rodrigo Pallares (Ecuador), Dr. Shehata Adam (Egypt), Mr. Michel Parent (France), accompanied by Mr. Jean-Pierre Bady and Mr. L. Chabason and Mr. Charyar Adle (Islamic Republic of Iran). Mr. Michel Parent acted as Rapporteur.

2. Representatives of the International Centre for Conservation (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended in an advisory capacity.

II. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. After the meeting had been opened by the Chairman, Mr. Batisse, Deputy Assistant Director-General (Science Sector) welcomed the members of the Bureau on behalf of the Director-General and thanked the Egyptian authorities for their kind invitation to hold the third session of the Bureau in Cairo. Mr. Batisse emphasized the important role to be played by the Bureau in preparing the work of the Committee and proposed, in order to facilitate the discussions, that items 7, 8 and 9 of the Provisional Agenda be taken up before items 3, 4, 5 and 6.

19 DEC 1979

1
2
3
4
5

4. In considering the Provisional Agenda prepared for the Bureau meeting, the Chairman proposed that a new item be added, namely the adoption of the Rapporteur's report on the Bureau's second session. He furthermore drew attention to several questions that would be taken up under item 10 ("Other business").

5. The Bureau adopted the Agenda with the modifications proposed.

III. ADOPTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR'S REPORT ON THE SECOND SESSION OF THE BUREAU

6. The Chairman congratulated the Rapporteur on his excellent report. He wished to draw attention to one amendment that was necessary : the nomination of Edison National Historic Site had been withdrawn by the United States of America pending clarification of criterion (vi) for the evaluation of cultural property.

7. Subject to the amendment proposed by the Chairman, the Bureau adopted the report of the Rapporteur on its second session.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED DRAFT TEXT OF A STANDARD AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND STATES RECEIVING TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

8. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the revised text prepared by the Secretariat as set out in document CC-79/CONF.003/5.

V. REVISION OF THE FORM FOR NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

9. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the revised nomination form prepared by the Secretariat in co-operation with ICOMOS and IUCN, subject to any further revision that may be necessary as a result of the conclusions of any working groups the Committee may decide to set up at its third session in Luxor on matters related to the establishment of the World Heritage List. The revised form is set out in document CC-79/CONF.003/7.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT FORMS FOR REQUESTS CONCERNING PREPARATORY OR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE AND FELLOWSHIPS

10. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the above-mentioned draft forms which are to be found in document CC-79/CONF.003/8.

VII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION OF PROPERTIES ON WORLD HERITAGE LIST

11. Mr. Parent introduced the document he had prepared at the Bureau's request on principles and criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List. He underlined in particular the need for careful attention to consistency in compiling the World Heritage List which must above all remain coherent. For this reason

he had proposed a classification system for the cultural sites nominated which he submitted to the Bureau for its consideration. Mr. Parent furthermore emphasized the desirability of carefully selecting the sites which should be representative of the different cultures of the world. He sought above all to assure the credibility of the list, in view of its wide dissemination to the general public.

12. The Bureau felt that the document prepared by Mr. Parent merited careful consideration. He had raised principles which required study in the whole context of the establishment of the World Heritage List. However, the Bureau was of the opinion that since the document raised important questions of substance and since furthermore the members had not had an opportunity to examine it before the meeting it should rather be taken up by a working group. The Bureau therefore recommended that the Committee consider the possibility of setting up such a working group during its third session.

VII. CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

13. The Bureau reviewed the 30 nominations that it had deferred at its second session and formulated the following recommendations to the Committee :

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

- n° 34 - Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (Ghana)
- n° 63 - Virunga National Park (Zaire)
- n° 99 - Ohrid, recommended for its natural characteristics (Yugoslavia) (the Bureau furthermore recommended that the site be considered for its cultural features at a later stage when precise details on the delimitation of the site were available).

B. Properties to be deferred :

- n° 10 -17 (Ethiopia)
- n° 21, 22 and 23 (Syrian Arab Republic)
- n° 25 (Senegal)
- n° 30 (Poland)
- n° 35 (Ghana)
- n° 43 (Bulgaria)
- n° 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62 (Norway)
- n° 79 (Cyprus)
- n° 91 and 93 (Italy)
- n° 100 (Yugoslavia)
- n° 111 and 112 (Ethiopia).

Oral explanations will be provided as necessary on reasons for the deferral of nominations.

IX. WORKING METHODS OF THE BUREAU

14. Under this agenda item the Chairman asked the other members of the Bureau to consider the question as to whether or not members of the Bureau should abstain from intervening in the discussion on nominations submitted by the States they represent. In this connection, the Chairman held that there was a distinct advantage for those States represented on the Bureau. However, there were differences of opinion in the Bureau on this question and it was decided not to pursue the matter further.

15. The representative of IUCN felt that delegates of States Parties attending the meetings of the Bureau, either as members or as observers, should not act as advocates for the nominations submitted by their countries. In particular, he considered that their interventions should be strictly limited to providing clarifications on information already before the Bureau and they should not bring additional information and documentation which the advisory non-governmental organizations had not had an opportunity to examine. In this connection, the decisions taken by the Committee with respect to the deadlines for the submission of dossiers were recalled.

16. The different types of recommendations formulated by the Bureau to the Committee on the nominations gave rise to some discussions. In conclusion the Bureau considered that nominations should not be examined by the Committee : a) when the deadlines for their submission had not been respected; b) when their proper processing had not been possible; and, c) when it was evident that the supporting documentation was incomplete and/or inadequate; on the other hand those nominations which raised problems of application of the criteria (calling in some cases for the submission of additional documentation) should be submitted to the Committee for consideration with a recommendation from the Bureau that action be deferred, together with those recommended to the World Heritage List and those definitively not recommended for inscription on the List.

17. The attention of the Bureau was drawn to the fact that the Operational Guidelines did not foresee any procedure enabling the Committee to enter in the World Heritage List on an emergency basis properties which fully met the criteria for inclusion in the World Heritage List and which had suffered damage from disasters. The Bureau felt that in such circumstances, the normal deadlines should not apply and that the Committee should be able to take immediately any action as it deemed appropriate.

X. PROCEDURE FOR THE EVENTUAL DELETION FROM THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST OF PROPERTIES IN CASE OF DETERIORATION LEADING TO THE LOSS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS WHICH DETERMINED THEIR INCLUSION

18. The Bureau considered that the document prepared by the Secretariat (document CC-79/CONF.003/10) should be submitted to the Committee as a discussion draft.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Nomination submitted by Yugoslavia of the Kotor natural and historical region to the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger

19. The Bureau examined the request submitted by Yugoslavia for the inscription of the natural and culturo-historical region of Kotor on the World Heritage List and on the World Heritage List in Danger; it also noted that a technical co-operation request had been received for this site. The inscription request was favourably considered by ICOMOS which recommended its inscription on the two lists. The Bureau decided to recommend that this site be entered in the two lists provided that the Committee agreed with a special procedure for the emergency inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. (It will be recalled in this connection that the Convention foresees in Article 11.4 that "the Committee may at any time, in case of urgent need, make a new entry in the List of World Heritage in Danger" but does not refer specifically to the possibility of adding properties for emergency reasons to the World Heritage List). The Bureau decided that the technical co-operation request should be examined after the Committee had taken decisions on the above-mentioned matters.

b) Request from Nepal for technical co-operation for Sagarmatha National Park

20. The Bureau noted that the Secretariat had received a request for \$60,000 for technical co-operation for Sagarmatha National Park in Nepal. However, this request had been received after the deadline and had not been fully processed. The Bureau consequently decided to examine it at a later session.

c) Training Seminar in the Galapagos

21. After examining the request, the Bureau decided to grant to Ecuador funds amounting to \$ 12,000 in connection with the organization of a ten-day seminar in the Galapagos for national park personnel.

d) World Heritage Association

22. Mr. Bolla reported to the Bureau on the results of the measures taken by the Secretariat at the Bureau's request with respect to the establishment in the United Kingdom of the "World Heritage Association" and of the "Heritage Trust", the names of which were very similar to those of the Convention and in particular of the World Heritage Fund. A representative of the Secretariat had discussed the matter with the Chairman-designate of the World Heritage Association. The results of this discussion can be summarized as follows : 1) the aim of the Heritage Trust is exclusively to finance the cost of running the Association and of production of publicity material; 2) the World Heritage Association does not intend to raise any funds for actual restoration work; 3) the Chairman-designate would be prepared to add the following subtitle to the name of the Association "International Federation of Independent Organizations for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage" and 4) the Association would be pleased to co-operate with the World Heritage Committee.

23. After some discussion, it was decided to recommend that the Committee request the Association to adopt as its title the proposed subtitle. This would avoid any confusion and would assure the separate identity of the Convention and the bodies created thereby.

e) Proposals submitted by ICOMOS

24. For the discussion of this question, the Chair was taken by Dr. Shehata Adam (Egypt), Vice-Chairman,

25. The Président of ICOMOS introduced the three proposals submitted to the Bureau for consideration :

a) Proposal for the processing of the nominations submitted by States Parties for inscription on the World Heritage List (ICOMOS project 101);

b) Proposal for the duplication of the original nomination files (ICOMOS project 100);

c) Manual for the inventory of historic monuments and sites (ICOMOS project 103).

Mr. Lemaire referred also to the financial implications of the proposals put forward.

26. Mr. Batisse considered that the proposals submitted by ICOMOS should be examined together with all other questions related to the management of the Convention and in particular to the contributions requested not only from the advisory organizations but also from the Unesco Secretariat. He suggested that over and above the contribution which each of the participating organizations would provide from its own resources in view of its interest in the Convention, the Committee should examine the possibility of setting aside a certain percentage of the annual income of the Fund for management purposes which would assist the organizations concerned in discharging the tasks entrusted to them in the procedural and operational aspects of the implementation of the Convention. He referred, as an illustration, to the 14% overhead costs charged by UNDP.

27. During the ensuing discussion, reference was made to the necessity to ensure that the cost of activities of a procedural nature was not out of proportion with respect to the total funds available, so that a proper balance was maintained between funds allocated for procedural matters and those allocated for operational activities.

28. The Bureau recommended that this question be considered by a working group set up by the Committee at its third session.

XII. CLOSING OF THE MEETING

29. Dr. Shehata Adam, acting as Chairman, declared the meeting closed.

Michel Parent
Rapporteur