



Distribution limited

CC-79/CONF.003/13  
Paris, 30 November 1979  
Original: English

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 WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The third session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Cairo, Egypt (22 October 1979) and in Luxor, Egypt (23-26 October) at the kind invitation of the Egyptian Government. The meeting was attended by the following States members of the World Heritage Committee: Australia, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Iran, Italy, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Switzerland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.
2. Representatives of the International Centre for Conservation (ICCROM), of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.
3. Observers from three States Parties to the Convention which were not members of the Committee, namely Canada, Federal Republic of Germany and Honduras also attended the session, as well as observers from two other international organizations: the Organization for Museums, Monuments and Sites of Africa (OMMSA) and the International Union of Architects (IUA).
4. The full list of participants will be found in Annex I to this report.

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Chairman, Mr. David Hales, declared the session open and proposed that items 2 to 4 of the Provisional Agenda be considered before the inaugural ceremony.
6. This proposal was accepted by the Committee which proceeded to examine the Provisional Agenda prepared for the meeting. The Chairman

(CC-79/CONF.003/COL.6)

24 DEC. 1979

proposed that:

- i) an additional item be added to the agenda as item 5, namely "Report by former Chairman and Rapporteur on activities undertaken during the period September 1978-October 1979 and action to be taken thereon";
- ii) items 5 and 6 of the Provisional Agenda be examined as one item, and
- iii) item 14 should be reworded as follows "Support services to the Secretariat and to the advisory international organizations".

With those modifications, the Committee adopted the Agenda.

### III. REVISION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

7. The Committee had before it a recommendation from the Bureau that the Committee's Rules of Procedure be amended to provide for the replacement of the Rapporteur when the Rapporteur was unable to act at any session of the Committee or part thereof or was unable for any reason to complete his term of office (document CC-79/CONF.003/2). The procedure proposed for the replacement of the Rapporteur was identical to that foreseen in the Rules of Procedure for the replacement of the Chairman.

8. After examining the Bureau's proposal, the Committee therefore decided to amend its Rules of Procedure by inserting immediately after Rule 14 an additional Rule providing for the replacement of the Rapporteur. Rules 15 to 37 would be re-numbered accordingly.

### IV. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND RAPPORTEUR

9. Dr. Shehata Adam (Egypt) was elected as Chairman of the Committee by acclamation. The Committee then elected by acclamation the following States members of the Committee as Vice-Chairmen: Bulgaria, Nepal, Panama, Senegal and United States of America and Mr. Michel Parent (France) as Rapporteur.

10. In a reply to a member of the Committee, Dr. Shehata Adam, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee, stated that States members of the Bureau would be invited to designate as their representatives at meetings of the Bureau persons qualified in both the natural and the cultural heritage, so that a proper balance would be maintained.

### V. INAUGURAL CEREMONY

11. The Committee was honoured by the presence of H. Exc. Mrs. Jihan El-Sadat, First Lady of Egypt and of H. Exc. Dr. Mansour Hassan, Minister of Presidency, Information and Culture, who both addressed the meeting during the inaugural ceremony; the representative of the Director General, Mr. G. Bolla, and the Chairman of the Committee also addressed the meeting.

VI. REPORT BY FORMER CHAIRMAN AND RAPPORTEUR ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN DURING THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1978-OCTOBER 1979 AND ACTION TO BE TAKEN THEREON

12. In reporting to the Committee on activities undertaken during the previous year, the former Chairman, Mr. David Hales, focussed on significant successes noted by the Committee and he also referred to serious problems for the future. He drew attention to the increase in the number of ratifications or acceptances of the Convention which totalled 48, to the substantial increase in the number of fellowships provided under the World Heritage Fund as well as in the assistance provided for the protection of sites. Mr. Hales also laid stress on the vast increase in the number of nominations received for inscription on the World Heritage List. However, he had become aware over the past year of the fact that the Convention remained largely an unknown body in the majority of countries and that many Governments did not fully understand its implications. He expressed his concern with respect to the extremely heavy workload for the Secretariat, the advisory organizations, the Bureau and the Committee itself, and he noted that the staff on the Secretariat of the Committee was still insufficient. Another problem was raised by the increasing imbalance between cultural and natural representation on the Committee and he felt that appropriate action should be taken by the States members of the Committee to redress this situation so that the credibility of the World Heritage List should not be put in doubt. Lastly, he underlined the serious responsibility of the Committee with respect to the List, stressing that the Committee's wisdom would be judged by the composition of the List.

13. The Rapporteur then proceeded to report on the last two sessions of the Bureau. The written report of the 2nd session, which took place in Paris from 28-30 May 1979, gave rise to no comments from the members of the Committee.

14. The report on the third session of the Bureau which took place in Cairo on 21 October 1979 was read before the Committee. Those points raised by the Bureau which called for decisions by the Committee and which were not the subject of an item on the Agenda were then taken up by the Committee.

15. Thus, with respect to paragraph 16 of the report on the different types of recommendation formulated by the Bureau to the Committee on nominations, the Committee decided to adopt for its third session the procedure proposed by the Bureau which is as follows: nominations would 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) would 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.

16. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Bureau that in the case of properties which fully met the criteria for inclusion in the World Heritage List and which had suffered damage from disasters, the normal deadlines for the submission and processing of dossiers may be waived by the Bureau.

17. The Committee also shared the concern of the Bureau at the establishment in the United Kingdom of an organization bearing the name of "World Heritage Association" and of a Fund called "Heritage Trust". The Committee felt strongly that the use in names of the terms "World Heritage" should be strictly limited to those activities directly related to the Convention and considered that the use of these terms in the titles of other organizations could only lead to confusion which would be regrettable. It therefore requested the Chairman to write to the above-mentioned Association, expressing the concern of the Committee, requesting it to modify its name so that the terms "World Heritage" no longer appeared therein and suggesting that the Association adopt a name such as the sub-title proposed by its Chairman-designate ("International Federation of Independent Organizations for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage").

18. Following the recommendation of the Bureau, the Committee decided to set up three working groups, as follows:

A. On criteria for the evaluation of cultural property and the processing of nominations, composed of:

Australia, Bulgaria (Chairman), Ecuador, France, Iran, Italy, Panama, United States of America, Canada (observer), ICOMOS and OMMSA.

B. On the management of the Convention and its financial implications, composed of:

Australia, France, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal (Chairman), Switzerland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM.

C. On criteria for the evaluation of natural properties, composed of:

Australia (Chairman), France, United States of America, Canada (observer) and IUCN.

VII. DRAFT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND STATES RECEIVING TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

19. The Chairman introduced the document (CC-79/CONF.003/5) prepared by the Secretariat. Complementary information was provided by the representative of the Director-General who proposed that the standard agreement should only be concluded in the case of large-scale projects and referred in particular to two points of special importance, namely the provisions relating to the protection of experts and to the exemption of taxes and duties on equipment and material necessary for the execution of the projects. After examining the document before it, the Committee approved, as recommended by the Bureau, the revised draft text as prepared

by the Secretariat. Furthermore, it decided to delegate authority to the Chairman to sign such agreements on its behalf. However, in exceptional cases or where necessary for practical reasons, the Committee authorized the Chairman to delegate authority for this purpose to a member of the Secretariat, to be designated by him.

VIII. 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 (Document CC-79/CONF.003/10)

20. The document on this item which proposed a procedure with respect to the deletion of properties from the World Heritage List was introduced by Mr. Bolla who drew attention to the different stages in the proposed procedure. A wide exchange of ideas ensued, during which several participants expressed the hope that the State Party on whose territory the property was located would inform the Secretariat of the Committee if any property inscribed on the List had seriously deteriorated and others drew attention to the obligation contracted by the States Parties under the Convention to properly preserve the properties entered on the List.

21. With respect to the source of information on the deterioration of a world heritage site, the Committee presumed that it would in most cases be the State Party on whose territory the property was located which would transmit such information to the Secretariat. However, information on the deterioration of a site may be made available by other sources and it would be for the Secretariat to check, as far as possible, on the source of the information and on the substance in consultation with the State Party concerned. The Committee requested the Secretariat in such cases to inform the Chairman of the results of its investigations and decided that it would be incumbent on the Chairman to decide whether the information received should be acted upon.

22. After some discussion, the Committee retained the proposal that decisions such as the sending out of fact-finding missions should be taken by the Committee, except in the case where emergency action was necessary, when the Bureau would be authorized to request the Secretariat to take such measures. It was understood that in all cases, the State Party concerned would be consulted. The question of organizing regular inspection missions was also raised, but the Committee felt that such action should not be taken, particularly in view of the States' obligations to adequately preserve properties inscribed on the List and of the cost involved.

23. The representative of ICOMOS proposed that ICOMOS should be consulted on the choice of experts to be sent on fact-finding missions in connection with the state of preservation of cultural properties. In reply, Mr. Bolla indicated that ICOMOS was regularly consulted on the roster of experts maintained by the Secretariat but that any obligation for the Secretariat to consult ICOMOS, in addition to the State Party which was always consulted on the choice of experts, would invariably lead to delays in the sending out of missions.

24. The Committee adopted the procedure proposed by the Secretariat subject to amendments to stage A on the source of information on the deterioration of a property and subject to reference to cases where the necessary corrective measures for threatened natural sites have not been duly taken (see paragraph 40 below). It was decided to incorporate this procedure in the "Operational Guidelines". The full text of the procedure is to be found in Annex II to this report.

IX. FORMS FOR REQUESTS CONCERNING PREPARATORY OR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE AND FELLOWSHIPS

25. Following the recommendation of the Bureau, the Committee approved the draft form for requests concerning preparatory or emergency assistance and fellowships as annexed to document CC-79/CONF.003/8.

X. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

26. The Committee took note of the report of the Secretariat on public information activities undertaken during the preceding year. This report called for decisions by the Committee on the publication of the World Heritage List and on the proposal received from the Swedish firm, Upsala Ekeby, to produce glass and silverware commemorating the World Heritage Convention.

27. On the publication of the World Heritage List, the Committee decided:

(a) to retard the publication of the List in order to include the properties placed thereon at its third session;

(b) that the List of World Heritage in Danger and the List of properties for which international assistance has been granted would be published as appendices of the List;

(c) that the list of properties for which international assistance has been granted would include reference to properties for which technical assistance has been granted but would make no mention of preparatory assistance;

(d) to publish the full list once every two years.

28. The proposal from Upsala Ekeby to produce glass and silverware gave rise to considerable discussion, since it raised the principle of using the World Heritage Emblem and depictions of World Heritage sites for commercial purposes. There was some reticence among members of the Committee to authorize any commercial company to use the Emblem or pictures of the sites for such purposes. On the other hand the Committee underlined the need to create a world-wide interest in the Convention and recognized the importance of publicity. The Committee therefore decided:

(a) that the World Heritage Emblem should not be used for any commercial purposes unless the Committee has given its authorization; and

(b) that the name, symbol or depiction of any property inscribed on the World Heritage List or of any element thereof should not be used for commercial purposes unless written authorization has been received from the State concerned on the principle of using the said name, symbol or depiction and unless the exact text or display has been approved by that State and as far as possible by the national authority specifically concerned with the protection of the site; such utilization should be in conformity with the reasons for which the property has been placed on the World Heritage List;

(c) to accept the proposal from Upsala Ekeby as set out in the Annex to document CC-79/CONF.003/6.1, authorizing the firm to use the World Heritage Emblem and the name of the Convention on a series of silver spoons and the glassware, subject to the stipulation formulated in paragraph (b) above and on condition that the company was not given exclusive rights to use the emblem and the name of the Convention on articles of the type proposed; it is however understood that the company will retain exclusive rights on its own design as foreseen in international agreements on the protection of industrial property.

29. After examining the proposals of the Secretariat for promotional activities for 1980 (document CC-79/CONF.003/6.2) the Committee authorized the Secretariat to proceed with the following activities within a total budget of \$36,900:

	<u>Estimated cost</u>
	\$
(a) creation of a photo library of world heritage sites	9,600
(b) slide series and sound-track	7,000
(c) poster	7,500
(d) postcards	4,000
(e) journalists' seminars	2,800
(f) postage stamps	6,000
	<u>\$36,900</u>

30. In response to a question from a member of the Committee who sought to avoid the publication of information on cultural and natural world heritage sites in separate publications, Mr. Batisse indicated that the Secretariat was studying the possibility of enlarging the scope of the Cultural Heritage bulletin to cover not only cultural sites but also natural heritage sites.

31. The question was raised as to whether the Committee would authorize States Parties to the Convention to produce material bearing the Emblem such as postage stamps and post-cards for publicity purposes and for raising financial contributions to the Fund. The Committee was of the opinion that States Parties were free to use the Emblem for such purposes, and could make additional voluntary contributions to the Fund by this means.

XI. AMENDMENTS TO THE CRITERIA FOR THE INCLUSION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST BY ICOMOS AND IUCN

32. The Committee considered that it was absolutely essential that the List contained only properties which were of outstanding universal value. Unless this general criterion was applied to every nomination, the List could rapidly decline in value and indeed in credibility. With this in mind, the Committee recommended that the wording in the "Operational Guidelines" and the nomination forms should more adequately reflect this overriding consideration, and that ICOMOS and IUCN should be instructed to regard this requirement as of critical importance in their evaluation of nominations.

33. The Committee heard the reports of the two working groups set up to examine amendments to the criteria and guidelines for the evaluation of nominations and took the decisions set out below:

- (a) Amendments to the criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List and guidelines for the evaluation of nominations by ICOMOS.

34. On the general question of the number of inscriptions to be entered on the World Heritage List, as well as of the selection criteria to be applied, the Committee recalled that the Convention foresees in Article 11 paragraph 1 that each State Party "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 World Heritage List (passages not underlined in the text of the Convention). The Committee recommends that States Parties in future conform to this provision so that the Committee may have access to provisional and non-exhaustive lists of cultural properties for which they intend to submit nomination files. This "inventory" and the nominations should be very restricted, it being understood however that no limit in the number of nominations should be imposed and that assurance be given to each State Party that it may submit nominations for cultural property relating to all the civilizations which have succeeded each other or which coexist in its territory. The Committee was of the opinion that the inventories submitted by the States Parties - inventories which would as it were constitute long-term plans over a period of 5 to 10 years - should enable the Committee to have a better global idea of the form that the World Heritage List would take and thus to better define the selection criteria.

35. In response to specific questions raised by Mr. Michel Parent's report, the Committee adopted the following principles:

- (i) States Parties may propose in one single nomination several individual cultural properties, which may be in different geographical locations but which should:
- be linked because they belong to the same historico-cultural group, or
  - be the subject of a single safeguarding project, or



- belong to the same type of property characteristic of the zone.

the geographical zone in which these properties are situated should be delimited and the cultural properties individually described and also precisely localized.

Each State Party submits only the cultural properties situated on its territory (even if these properties belong to an ensemble which goes beyond its borders) but it may come to an agreement with another State Party in order to make a joint submission.

- (ii) In its justification of the outstanding universal value of the property nominated, each State should, whenever possible, undertake a sufficiently wide comparison;
- (iii) The Committee should not take into consideration nominations of immovable property which are likely to become movable.
- (iv) The authenticity of a cultural property remains an essential criterion.
- (v) Particular attention should be given to cases which fall under criterion (vi) so that the net result would not be a reduction in the value of the List, due to the large potential number of nominations as well as to political difficulties. Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention.

36. The Committee took note of the typology proposed in Mr. Michel Parent's report. It considered that it was on the basis of the inventories submitted by States Parties that such a typology could be finalized. The question will therefore continue to be studied until its next session.

- (b) Amendments to the criteria for the inclusion of natural properties in the World Heritage List and guidelines for the evaluation of nominations by IUCN

37. In view of the difficulty of assessing nominations without an adequate inventory, the Committee decided to encourage States Parties to prepare such inventories. It was furthermore decided to ask IUCN to prepare a proposal for the next meeting of the Bureau relating to the methodology and cost of preparing an inventory on a global basis.

38. The Committee decided to instruct IUCN to use great caution in the application of criterion (iv) when it was the sole criterion for recommending sites for the World Heritage List. The sites nominated under this criterion should be habitats where "significant populations" or "concentrations of populations" of rare or endangered species of plants

or animals survive, that is, sites representing in some way "superlative situations".

39. The Committee considered the complex issues concerning sites occupied by migratory species on a seasonal basis and decided to add to paragraph 11 on integrity in the "Operational Guidelines" a new sub-paragraph (v) as follows:

"In cases of migratory species, integrity will require critical areas necessary for the survival of the species to be included in the nomination. States which are parties to the Convention are requested to seek the co-operation of other States which contain seasonable sites for populations of World Heritage species so as to ensure that these species are protected throughout their full life cycle. Agreements of this nature should be noted in the nomination".

40. The Committee noted that several areas nominated which meet the criteria may be marginal because of the inability of States, for various reasons to apply the rigid management criteria which they believe is necessary. The Committee was concerned that this could lead to further deterioration of these sites if corrective measures were not implemented. The Committee therefore decided to amend the "Operational Guidelines" by adding a sub-paragraph (vi) to paragraph 11 as follows:

"Where the intrinsic qualities of a World Heritage site are threatened by action or works of man and yet meet the criteria set out in paragraph 10, an action plan outlining the corrective measures required shall be submitted with the nomination form. Should the corrective measures submitted by the nominating State not be taken within the time proposed by that State, the site will be considered by the Committee for delisting in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Committee."

(c) Other questions

41. The application of the procedure foreseen in paragraph 40 above to cultural properties will be considered by the Committee at a later meeting.

42. The Australian Delegation drew attention to the fact that, on several occasions, members of the Committee and representatives of IUCN and ICOMOS had referred to the threat to which certain nominated sites were exposed, and had suggested that this factor should influence the favourable and rapid acceptance of the site in question. The Delegation expressed concern at this development, pointing out that acceptance should be based only on the established criteria dealing with the intrinsic properties of the site and, further, that if the threat affected the integrity of the site, acceptance should be deferred. The Bureau was asked to discuss this matter in detail at its next meeting.

43. The Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of the "Operational Guidelines" reflecting the above-mentioned decisions and to present this text to the Bureau at its next session. One question that should be studied in this connection would be the possibility of adding a criterion on integrity for the evaluation of cultural properties.

44. T  
examir  
natio  
Part  
wo  
p

44. The Committee considered that it would be desirable to be able to examine nominations at its fourth session within the framework of a national inventory of cultural and natural properties which the State Party considers suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List. This would allow for a preliminary evaluation of the comparative value of properties within that State. The Committee therefore expressed the hope that each State Party concerned would make available to the Committee before its next session a list of those properties which it intends to nominate to the World Heritage List during the next five to ten years.

## XII. CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

45. The Committee took up one by one those nominations which had been recommended by the Bureau for inscription on the List, those which had been recommended by the Bureau not to be entered on the List and nominations which raised a problem of application of the criteria, in accordance with the Committee's decision mentioned in paragraph 15 above. In each case the Committee heard, as appropriate, the comments of the representatives of IUCN and/or ICOMOS who referred to the criteria met by the property in question.

46. The Committee decided to enter in the World Heritage List the following 45 properties:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>State Party</u>
19	Fasil Ghebbi, Gondar Region	Ethiopia
20	Ancient City of Damascus	Syrian Arab Republic
	The Committee noted the reservation expressed by ICOMOS concerning the threat to the site from rapid urban development.	
31	Auschwitz concentration camp	Poland
	The Committee decided to enter Auschwitz concentration camp on the List as a unique site and to restrict the inscription of other sites of a similar nature.	
33	Białowieża National Park	Poland
34	Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions	Ghana
36	Medina of Tunis	Tunisia
37	Site of Carthage	Tunisia
38	Amphitheatre of El Jem	Tunisia
39	Ngorongoro conservation area	Tanzania
42	Boyana Church	Bulgaria
43	Madara Rider	Bulgaria
44	Thracian tomb of Kazanlak	Bulgaria

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>State Party</u>
45	Rock-hewn churches of Ivanovo	Bulgaria
58	Urnes Stave Church	Norway
59	Bryggen	Norway
63	Virunga national park	Zaire
64	Tikal national park	Guatemala
	The Committee learned of a tourism development project in the park and expressed the hope that the planned construction would not jeopardize the cultural and natural value of the site.	
65	Antigua Guatemala	Guatemala
71	Dinosaur provincial park	Canada
72	Kluane national Park, Wrangell-St. Elias National monument	Canada & USA
75	Grand Canyon national park	USA
76	Everglades national park	USA
78	Independence Hall	USA
80	Mont St-Michel and its Bay	France
81	Chartres Cathedral	France
83	Palace and Park of Versailles	France
84	Vezelay, Church and Hill	France
85	Decorated grottoes of the Vezere Valley	France
86	Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid fields from Giza to Dahshur	Egypt
	The Committee took note of the ICOMOS proposal that a safeguarding plan for the environment of the pyramids should be drawn up.	
87	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis	Egypt
88	The Nubian monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae	Egypt
89	Islamic Cairo	Egypt
	Note was taken of the concern expressed by ICOMOS at the problems involved in safeguarding this site.	
90	Abu Mena	Egypt
94	Rock drawings in Valcamonica	Italy

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name of property</u>	<u>State Party</u>
95	Old City of Dubrovnik	Yugoslavia
96	Stari Ras and Sopoćani	Yugoslavia
97	Historical complex of Split with the Palace of Diocletian	Yugoslavia
98	Plitvice lakes national park	Yugoslavia
99	Lake Ohrid (that part which lies in Yugoslavia)	Yugoslavia

The Committee decided to inscribe this site on the List in view of the assurances received concerning the integrity of the Lake as a whole.

113	Tchogha Zanbil	Iran
114	Persepolis	Iran
115	Meidan-e Shah Esfahan	Iran
120	Sagarmatha National Park	Nepal
121	Kathmandu Valley	Nepal
125	Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	Yugoslavia

Following the recommendation of the Bureau, the Committee decided to enter this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger as requested by the State Party concerned.

47. The Committee decided furthermore to defer the following sites:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>State Party</u>
8	Ichkeul National park	Tunisia
	The Committee deferred this nomination until the Tunisian Government has contacted the other States concerned to ensure adequate protection of summering and wintering areas of major migratory species found in Ichkeul.	
79	Paphos, Birthplace of Aphrodite	Cyprus
	The Committee deferred this nomination until more precise information was available on the possible adverse impact on the sites of the pressing needs of tourism development.	

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>State Party</u>
92	Sta. Giulia/St. Salvator's Monastery	Italy

The Committee heard the comments of ICOMOS which referred to the outstanding universal value of the property. However, ICOMOS was concerned by the fact that the property had not been presented in the more general context of the cultural heritage of the country as a whole. While recognizing the value of the site nominated, the Committee decided to defer a decision until indications had been received from the Italian Government on the properties situated in Italy which it was considering nominating to the List.

48. The Committee furthermore decided not to inscribe the following two sites on the World Heritage List:

- No. 5: Zembra and Zembretta Islands National Park (Tunisia) and
- No. 73: the Madeleine Island (Senegal).

49. In order to facilitate the examination by the Committee of nominations, it was decided that in future documents submitting nominations to the Committee would include indication of the criteria under which each nomination was to be considered.

XIII. CONSIDERATION OF TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION REQUESTS

50. After examining the requests received from States Parties and the recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee decided to grant technical co-operation as follows:

(a) Ecuador

Equipment to enable the authorities to ensure the integrity of the natural environment of the Galapagos Islands through protective measures.

up to a maximum of \$ 50,000

(b) Tanzania

Services of an architect-museologist for three weeks in order to draw up a project for the conservation and presentation of the prehistoric sites of Olduvai and Laetolil.

estimated cost \$ 5,400

(c) Egypt

Services of specialists in cultural heritage as well as equipment to draw up a project for the restoration and development of the Islamic Centre of Cairo.

up to a maximum of \$ 30,000

51.  
were  
Vir  
Ch  
P

51. The Committee was informed that requests for technical co-operation were forthcoming for the Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania and Virunga National Park in Zaire and agreed to delegate authority to the Chairman to approve these requests after consultation with members of the Bureau if he considered it desirable.

#### XIV. REVISION OF THE NOMINATION FORM

52. The Committee approved the revised nomination form (CC-79/CONF.003/7) subject to the following:

(a) the text should be revised to reflect the decisions taken by the Committee on the criteria for the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List and guidelines for the evaluation of nominations (see session XI above); the attention of States Parties should be drawn, in particular, to the essential criterion of outstanding universal value that should be met by properties nominated;

(b) The form should emphasize the importance of adequate buffer zones and ask for details on measures taken by the State Party on the establishment of such zones.

(c) A provision would be added inviting States to prepare a brief summary of each nomination for reproduction and for distribution to members of the Committee.

#### XV. SUPPORT SERVICES TO THE SECRETARIAT AND TO THE ADVISORY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

53. The Committee heard the report of the working group on the management of the Convention and its financial implications and took note of the following points:

i) The Convention was now entering its operational phase particularly as regards technical co-operation, emergency assistance and the training of specialists, which implied a considerable increase in the workload of the Secretariat. An amount of approximately \$210,000 had been spent by the Unesco Secretariat in 1979 under its Regular Budget for the management of the Convention.

ii) Funds actually obligated in 1979 under the World Heritage Fund for programme support were as follows:

ICOMOS . . . . . \$15,600

IUCN . . . . . \$ 6,000

Temporary  
assistance  
to the  
Secretariat \$59,000

\$80,600

iii) The representatives of ICOMOS and IUCN explained that they had received funds under a lump-sum arrangement depending on the number of nominations examined but that this approach did not enable the Organizations to assure proper processing of the files and their continuous participation in the management of the Convention. They indicated that the direct contributions of their organizations to the management of the Convention could be estimated at \$30,000 and \$12,500 respectively in 1979.

53. The Committee then decided:

- a) that it was not opportune at the present time to retain a fixed percentage such as 14%, as indicated in paragraph 26 of document CC-79/CONF.003/12, to cover direct management costs of the Convention;
- b) to ask the Director-General of Unesco to make additional efforts to provide the Secretariat with an adequate permanent staff to enable it to meet the substantial increase in workload due to the fact that the Convention has now entered its operational phase. Until the Secretariat could be fully constituted and a sufficient number of Member States ratified the Convention, the Committee considered it necessary to continue to provide for temporary assistance for the Secretariat and decided to review this question at its next session;
- c) that with respect to temporary assistance and the processing of files by the advisory organizations, only a limited number of files could be processed between two Committee sessions, and therefore no allocation per nomination file should be made.
- d) to allocate the following funds for programme support for the implementation of the Convention:

- for the Secretariat: under  
temporary assistance.....\$ 70,000

of which \$40,000 for two consultants  
each for 6 m/m, one consultant for the  
cultural part, and one consultant for  
the natural part, and \$30,000 for two  
(part-time) secretaries-documentalists

- for IUCN.....\$ 12,000

of which \$4,000 for evaluation of files  
based on approximately 20 files,

\$2,500 for travel and per diem costs  
for participation in meetings of the Bureau,

\$2,500 for promotion of the Convention  
and, if necessary, field visits,

\$3,000 for professional experts in the  
evaluation of the nominations



- for ICOMOS.....\$ 30,000  
of which \$20,000 for a part-time  
co-ordinator to evaluate nominations...  
based on approximately 80 files,  
\$10,000 for one third of a full-time  
secretary and miscellaneous secretariat  
expenditures.

\$112,000

XVI. PRESENTATION OF THE STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND ADOPTION OF A BUDGET

55. The Committee took note of the statement of account of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period which ended on 31 December 1978 and the interim statement of account of the Fund for the two-year financial period 1979/80 as set out in document CC-79/CONF.003/9.

56. The Committee adopted the following budget for the period October 1979 to December 1980.

BUDGET

October 1979 - December 1980

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Brought forward from 1978-1979</u>	<u>Additional funds allocated</u>	<u>Total funds authorized for period October 79-December 80</u>
	\$	\$	\$
I. Preparatory Assistance	69,234	80,000	149,234 (30 m/m)
II. Technical Co-operation	--	165,400	165,400
III. Training	4,700	200,000	204,700
IV. Emergency	70,000	100,000	170,000
V. Promotional Activities	500	36,400	36,900
VI. Programme Support			
- ICOMOS }	-3,600	45,600	42,000 (12,000 IUCN
- IUCN }	(deficit)		30,000 ICOMOS)
VII. Temporary Assistance to the Secretariat	--	70,000	70,000
	<u>140,834</u>	<u>697,400</u>	<u>838,234</u>
	=====	=====	=====

Contingencies: 3% of total funds authorized

XVII. OTHER MATTERS

a) Balance between natural and cultural properties

57. The working group on natural criteria also reported to the Committee on its concern at the relatively low number of natural properties so far included in the World Heritage List. It considered that, if the List gave an initial impression of being a list of cultural properties, it would deter further nominations of natural properties. The working group was also concerned that the delegations of States Members at the third session of the Committee did not include a sufficient number of specialists in the natural heritage field which reduced the Committee's ability to evaluate properly natural properties. In order to increase the awareness of the Committee and of States Parties of the need to redress this situation, the working group made two specific recommendations to the Committee:

- (i) that in future a quorum for a meeting of the Committee should require, in addition to a majority of States Members at least five delegates among the delegations with expertise in natural heritage; and
- (ii) that, in allocating funds for assistance to States, not more than 60% should be allocated to either cultural or natural properties.

58. The Committee shared the concern of the group. It considered, however, that in view of the difficulty of determining precisely whether persons were competent in the fields of nature conservation or of the protection of cultural property, it would not be feasible to introduce such a rule on the quorum for meetings of the Committee. The responsibility for ensuring balanced representation lay with each State Member of the Committee.

59. The Committee requested the Secretariat to renew its efforts to ensure that the authorities in each State Party responsible for the natural heritage were fully informed of the activities undertaken under the Convention and of the meetings of the Committee. IUCN could also be of assistance through its direct contacts. It was decided that copies of letters of invitation would be sent to those authorities responsible for the national heritage in the States Parties. The Committee decided furthermore to take up the matter again if the situation did not improve.

b) Emergency assistance for the Natural and Culturo-historical region of Kotor (Yugoslavia)

60. Note was taken of the request from Yugoslavia for emergency assistance, in the form of equipment and consultant services, for the Natural and Culturo-historical region of Kotor. However, the Committee felt that further information should be made available on the equipment required and decided to grant in the first instance \$20,000 for consultant services.

61.  
by t  
tak

c) Charter on the rights and obligations relating to towns inscribed on the World Heritage List (Cracow-Quito)

tee  
61. The Committee noted that a draft Charter had been prepared jointly by the Ecuadorian and Polish authorities on this question and decided to take up the matter at a later stage.

d) Appeal of Mrs. El-Sadat

62. The Committee fully supported the appeal launched by Mrs. El-Sadat for assistance in preserving the Islamic heritage of Cairo and members declared that they would transmit details of the appeal to their respective governments.

e) Date and place of fourth session of the Committee

63. The next session of the Committee will take place early in September 1980, probably in France. The precise place and dates will be communicated to all concerned as soon as possible.

XVIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

64. Following an expression of thanks from the floor to the Egyptian authorities for the remarkable hospitality offered to the Committee, to the Chairman for the admirable way in which he had conducted the meeting and to all those who had contributed to the smooth running of the meeting, the Chairman declared the session closed.

++++++

Michel Parent  
Rapporteur

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

H. Eve. Professor R.O. Slatyer  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Australia to Unesco

Mr. Peter Dalkin  
First Secretary, Australian Embassy, Cairo

BULGARIA/BULGARIE

Mme Magdalena Stantscheva  
Membre de la Commission nationale pour  
l'Unesco  
Maître de Recherches au musée de Sofia

Vice-Chairman/Vice-President

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

Mr. Rodrigo Fallares  
Director, Instituto de Patrimonio Cultural

EGYPT/EGYPTE

Dr. Shehata Adam  
President  
Organization of Egyptian Antiquities

Chairman/Président

FRANCE

Mr. Michel Parent  
Inspecteur général des Monuments historiques

Rapporteur

Mr. Jean-Pierre Bady  
Directeur de la Caisse nationale des  
Monuments historiques et des sites

Mr. Lucien Chabason  
Chef de Service de l'Espace et des Sites  
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

IRAN

Mr. Charyar Adle (observer/observateur)  
Archéologue

UNITED STATES  
(cont'd)  
Mr. Ad  
Counse  
U.S.  
M

ITALY/ITALIE

Mr. Giovanni d'Andrea  
Directeur des Relations culturelles de  
la Région de Lombardie

Mme Carla Maria Burri  
Attachée culturelle à l'Ambassade italienne au Caire

NEPAL

H. Exc. Gen. Singh Bahadur Basnyat  
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador  
of Nepal to Egypt

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président

PAKISTAN

Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel  
First Secretary, Pakistan Embassy in Cairo

PANAMA

Dr. Reina Torres de Arauz  
National Director of Historical Heritage

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président

SENEGAL

Mr. Amadou Lamine Sy  
Directeur du patrimoine national

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE

Mr. Ernest Martin  
Membre correspondant de la Commission fédérale  
des Monuments historiques

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr. David Hales  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and  
Wildlife and Parks  
Department of the Interior

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président

Mr. Robert R. Garvey, Jr.  
Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Mr. Richard Cook  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior

Mr. Robert C. Milne  
Chief, International Park Affairs  
National Park Service

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/E'ATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE  
(cont'd) / (suite)

Mr. Addison E. Richmond  
Counselor for Scientific and Technological Affairs,  
U.S. Embassy in Cairo

Mr. William H. Eddy (observer/observateur)  
National Park Service

YUGOSLAVIA/YOUGOSLAVIE

Mr. Milan Prelog  
Professeur à l'Université de Zagreb

II. OBSERVERS FROM OTHER STATES PARTIES/OBSERVATEURS D'AUTRES ETATS PARTIES

CANADA

Mr. Peter H. Bennett  
Adviser on Unesco World Heritage Convention  
to Assistant Deputy Minister, Parks Canada

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY/REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE D'ALLEMAGNE

Dr. Georg Mörsch  
Conservator in Rhineland-Westfalie

HONDURAS

Mr. Armando Alvarez  
Minister, Secretary of Culture and Tourism

Mr. Guillermo Casco  
Adviser, Ministry of Culture

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

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR CONSERVATION (ICCROM)/CENTRE INTERNATIONAL  
POUR LA CONSERVATION

Mr. Louis-Jacques Rollet-Andriane  
Special Representative of the Director

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

Prof. Raymond Lemaire  
Président

Mr. Krzysztof Pawlowski  
Vice-Président

Mr. François Leblanc  
Directeur du Secrétariat

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES/  
UNION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE ET DE SES RESSOURCES

Mr. Harold Eidsvik  
Executive Officer  
Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas

IV. OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS/D'AUTRES ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES

ORGANIZATION FOR MUSEUMS, MONUMENTS AND SITES OF AFRICA (OMMSA)/  
ORGANISATION POUR LES MUSEES, MONUMENTS ET SITES EN AFRIQUE

Mr. Kwasi Myles  
Secretary General

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ARCHITECTS/UNION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES

Mr. Yehya Mohamed Eid  
Member of the Board of the UIA

V. SECRETARIAT

Mr. Gérard Bolla  
Deputy Assistant Director General  
Sector of Culture and Communication  
Representative of the Director-General

Mr. Michel Batisse  
Deputy Assistant Director General  
Science Sector

Mr. Bernd von Droste  
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mrs. Margaret van Vliet  
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mrs. Anne Saurat  
Consultant

PROCEDURE FOR THE EVENTUAL DELETION OF PROPERTIES  
FROM THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

1. At its third session, the World Heritage Committee adopted the following procedure for the deletion of properties from the World Heritage List in cases:

- a) where a property has deteriorated to the point where it has lost those characteristics which determined its inclusion in the World Heritage List; and
- b) where the intrinsic qualities of a natural world heritage site\* were already threatened at the time of its nomination by action or works of man and where the necessary corrective measures as outlined by the State Party at that time, have not been taken within the time proposed.

A. When a property inscribed on the World Heritage List has seriously deteriorated or, in the case of a natural site\*, when the necessary corrective measures have not been taken within the time proposed, the State Party on whose territory the property is situated should so inform the Secretariat of the Committee.

B. When the Secretariat receives such information from a source other than the State Party concerned, it will, as far as possible, verify the source and the contents of the information in consultation with the State Party concerned and request its comments. The Secretariat will inform the Chairman of the Committee of the results of its investigations and the Chairman will decide whether the information is to be acted upon. If the Chairman decides that the information is not to be acted upon, no action will be taken.

C. The Secretariat will request the competent advisory organization(s) (ICOMOS, IUCN or ICCROM) to forward comments on the information received.

D. The information received, together with the comments of the State Party and of the advisory organization(s), will be brought to the attention of the Bureau of the Committee. The Bureau may take one of the following measures:

- (a) it may decide that the property has not seriously deteriorated and that no further action should be taken;
- (b) when the Bureau considers that the property has seriously deteriorated but not to the extent that its restoration is impossible, it may recommend to the Committee that the property be maintained on the List provided that the State Party takes the necessary measures to restore the property within a reasonable period of time. The Bureau may also recommend that technical co-operation be provided under the World Heritage Fund for work connected with the restoration of the property, if the State Party so requests.

-----  
\*The Committee decided to examine at a later stage the possibility of applying this rule to cultural properties.



(c) when there is evidence that the property has deteriorated to the point where it has irretrievably lost those characteristics which determined its inclusion on the List, the Bureau may recommend that the Committee delete the property from the List; before any such recommendation is submitted to the Committee, the Secretariat will inform the State Party concerned of the Bureau's recommendation; any comments which the State Party may make with respect to the recommendation of the Bureau will be brought to the attention of the Committee, together with the Bureau's recommendation;

(d) when the information available is not sufficient to enable the Bureau to take one of the measures described in (a), (b) or (c) above, the Bureau may recommend to the Committee that the Secretariat be authorized to take the necessary action to ascertain, in consultation with the State Party concerned, the present condition of the property, the dangers to the property and the feasibility of adequately restoring the property, and to report to the Bureau on the results of its action; such measures may include the sending of a fact-finding mission or the consultation of specialists. In cases where emergency action is required, the Bureau may itself authorize the Secretariat to take such measures.

E. The Committee will examine the recommendation of the Bureau and all the information available and will take a decision. Any such decision shall, in accordance with Article 13(8) of the Convention, be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting. The Committee shall not decide to delete any property unless the State Party has been consulted on the question.

F. The State Party will be informed of the Committee's decision.

G. If the Committee's decision entails any modification to the World Heritage List, this modification will be reflected in the next updated list that is published. The reasons for the deletion of any property from the List will also be given in the publication.

2. In adopting the above procedure, the Committee was particularly concerned that all possible measures should be taken to prevent the deletion of any property from the List and was ready to offer technical cooperation as far as possible to States Parties in this connection. Furthermore, the Committee wished to draw the attention of States Parties to the stipulations of Article 4 of the Convention which reads as follows: "Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State..."