

Distribution limited

WHC-94/CONF.003/13  
12 December 1994  
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION  
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

DRAFT REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

Eighteenth extratraordinary session  
Phuket, Thailand, 9 and 10 December 1994

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

**I.1** The eighteenth extraordinary session of the outgoing Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Phuket, Thailand on 9 and 10 December 1994. The following members of the Bureau attended: Ms Olga Pizano (Colombia), outgoing Chairperson, and representatives of China, Oman, Senegal, Thailand and the United States of America as Vice-Presidents. The Vice-President of China, Mr Zhang acted as Rapporteur.

**I.2** Representatives of the following States Parties to the Convention attended the meeting as observers: Canada, Germany, Japan and Mexico.

**I.3** Representatives of the Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants appears in Annex I.

## **II. OPENING SESSION**

**II.1** The Chairperson welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of Thailand for hosting this meeting.

**II.2** The Director of the World Heritage Centre welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO and introduced the provisional agenda and the proposed time-schedule.

## **III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**III.1** The Bureau adopted the provisional agenda outlined in document WHC-94/CONF.001B.1.rev (Annex II).

## **IV. NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**IV.1** The Bureau examined those nominations which were referred back to the States Parties by the Bureau session of July 1994, as well as some nominations of properties that were referred back to the State Party or deferred in earlier years and for which additional information had been received. The Bureau formulated the following recommendations for consideration by the Committee.

Name of Property	Identifi- cation No.	State Party having submitted the nomination in accord- ance with the Convention	Criteria
------------------	-------------------------	---	----------

IV.2. Properties for which nominations were referred back to the State Party by the Bureau session of July 1994

Natural properties

A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Galapagos Marine Reserve (extension of the Galapagos Islands)	1bis	Ecuador	N(ii) (iii) (iv)
---	------	---------	------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee include the Galapagos Marine Reserve proposed as an extension to the World Heritage site of Galapagos Islands on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested the Committee to commend the Ecuadorean authorities for extending the World Heritage property to include marine habitats extending to 40 nautical miles from the islands. The Bureau however, was concerned that the proposed Marine Reserve, and the Galapagos Islands faced the following threats to their integrity:

- overfishing and illegal fishing of a wide range of species;
- human pressures from the local population and tourism on both terrestrial and marine resources;
- inadequate management capacity and infrastructure ;
- adverse impacts of introduced animals and plants.

These threats call for mitigative actions via-à-vis:

- augmenting management capacity;
- encouraging institutional cooperation;
- stepping up law enforcement, and
- conducting research on sustainability.

In view of the prevailing threats to the integrity of the extension proposed in the Marine Reserve and the Islands, the Bureau recommended that the Committee include the Galapagos (Islands and the extension of the Marine Resource Reserve) in the List of World Heritage in Danger and request the Ecuadorean Government to convene, in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre, a donors conference to prepare a plan for financing a programme of actions to mitigate the threats to the integrity of the site.

**Canaima National  
Park**

701

**Venezuela N(i)(ii)  
(iii)(iv)**

The Bureau recalled that, at its last session held in June 1994, it had requested, on the basis of a recommendation made by IUCN, that the Venezuelan authorities revise the boundaries of the nominated area to exclude the savannah area which IUCN considered did not meet World Heritage criteria. The Bureau was informed that, although there was no formal written response from a staff member of the Venezuelan Park authorities with respect to its recommendation, the State Party has indicated verbally that it was not willing to consider revising the boundaries of this site.

The Bureau however, noted that the presence of a population of about 10,000 residents in the substantial area of the savannahs, who have not been consulted regarding the nomination of the area, are a cause of concern. Nevertheless, the Bureau was satisfied that the area met all four natural World Heritage criteria and merits inscription on the World Heritage List. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe Canaima National Park on the World Heritage List and request the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to initiate a process to review the boundaries of the site, taking into consideration the interests of the local people and the need to focus the nomination on the tepui portion of the Park.

#### **B. Deferred nominations**

**Glacier and  
Waterton Lakes**

354rev

**Canada/USA**

The Bureau recalled that when the Glacier National Park (USA) was nominated in 1985, the Bureau had noted that the area "possessed a certain number of important natural features but that similar features were already represented in other parks already inscribed on the List" and suggested that the nomination could be re-examined if it included the Waterton Lakes National Park (Canada). In accordance with the suggestion of the Bureau, a nomination of the Glacier and Waterton Lakes was submitted in 1993, and once again revised in accordance with the suggestions of the 1994 Bureau and re-submitted in November 1994.

The Bureau noted that IUCN had not been able to undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the nomination submitted by Canada and the United States due to time constraints. However, the Bureau learnt that a preliminary evaluation of the nomination carried out by IUCN concluded that the site's universal significance within the biogeographic province under consideration was not of "outstanding value". IUCN however, conceded that there was considerable difference of opinion among experts with respect to the above judgement. The Bureau noted the integrity of the site had considerably improved relative to the time when the site was nominated in 1993. The Bureau recommended that IUCN undertake a thorough evaluation of the nomination

submitted by Canada and the United States and provide to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in mid-1995 more comprehensive evaluation on which the Committee could base its decision regarding the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

### Cultural properties

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

<b>The Temple of Confucius, the Cemetery of Confucius, and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>China</b>	<b>C(i)(iv)(vi)</b>
--	------------	--------------	---------------------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that additional information on the buffer zone had been provided by the Chinese authorities as requested by the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1994. Having studied the information, ICOMOS recommended inscription of this property under criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (i), (iv) and (vi).

<b>The ancient building complex in the Wudang Mountains</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>China</b>	<b>C(i)(ii)(vi)</b>
---	------------	--------------	---------------------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had positively evaluated the map and the conservation plan that had been provided by the Chinese authorities as requested by the eighteenth session of the Bureau. ICOMOS recommended inscription of this property under criteria C(i)(ii)(vi).

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (i), (ii) and (vi).

<b>The Pilgrimage Church of St. John of Nepomuk at Zelena Hora</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>Czech Republic</b>	<b>C(i)(iv)</b>
--	------------	-----------------------	-----------------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the State Party, as requested by the Bureau at its eighteenth session, had provided additional information concerning the effect of the new legislation on the protection of ecclesiastical monuments and on the on-going restoration project. This information was positively evaluated and ICOMOS recommended, therefore, the inscription of this property under criteria (i) and (iv).

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (i) and (iv).

<b>The Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana</b>	700	Peru	C(i)(iii)(iv)
--	-----	------	---------------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, following the request of the Bureau at its eighteenth session, a new map had been submitted by the State Party defining the boundaries of the property along natural and geographical features. ICOMOS recommended the inscription of this property under criteria (i), (iii) and (iv).

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (i), (iii) and (iv). The Bureau also recommended the Committee to urge the authorities to reinforce the protection and management of the vast area of this property.

<b>The earliest 16th Century Monasteries on the slopes of Popocatepetl</b>	702	Mexico	C(ii)(iv)
--	-----	--------	-----------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had received the requested information on the boundaries and the buffer zones for each of the nominated monasteries. It informed the Bureau also that churches in Mexico are state property and that they are under the supervision of the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH). The churches are, furthermore, all still being used for their original functions which ensures the proper use and management of the structures. ICOMOS, therefore, considered that management and conservation arrangements were adequate and recommended the inscription of the monasteries under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (ii) and (iv).

IV.3. Properties for which nominations were referred back to the State Party or deferred in earlier years and for which additional information has been received

Natural properties

A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Central Eastern Australian Rainforest (extension of the Australian East Coast Temperate & Sub- tropical Rainforest Park)	368bis	Australia	N(i)(ii)(iv)
---	--------	-----------	--------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the extension proposed to this site by the Australian authorities under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). The Bureau, noting that the extension increased the size of the World Heritage site by 35%, commended the Australian Government for acting on the the recommendation of the Committee made in 1986 and agreeing to adopt the name "Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves (Australia)" for the enlarged property. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee request the Australian authorities to complete the management plans of individual sites, particularly those within Queensland.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary	654	Oman	N(iv)
------------------------	-----	------	-------

The Bureau recalled that the nomination of Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (then referred to as Jiddat-al-Harasis) was originally submitted in August 1992 and deferred for clarification of the legal structures, boundaries and management plan. It noted that the area was renowned for the success of the re-introduction of the White Oryx Project. It acknowledged that the Royal Decree No. 4/94 of January 1994 concerning the legal responsibilities for the management of the area was a partial response to an earlier request of the Bureau for strengthening the conservation of the site. This required the issuance of appropriate by-laws and directives called for by the Decree.

The Bureau took note of Ambassador Musa Bin Jaafar Bin Hassan's letter of 21 November 1994 which included a preliminary response to the Bureau request for a Management Plan. The framework of the Plan submitted was considered to be technically sound and hence the Management Plan should provide clarification of the boundaries, as well as a zoning plan and improved management regime of the site. The Bureau was informed that due to the late arrival of the letter and the framework plan, IUCN was unable to apply its full evaluation process to the nomination. However, in the evaluation of the 1992 nomination IUCN had noted that the

site had potential for World Heritage listing. The Bureau was satisfied with the new information provided and the political will of the Oman Government to implement a management regime into the site in accordance with its earlier recommendations. Hence the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List with the following provisions:

- 1) the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criterion (iv) which focuses on the conservation of the Arabian Oryx and the Houbara Bustard as well as other threatened wildlife species living in the Sanctuary;
- 2) that a generalised map representing the "essential values" of the Sanctuary be prepared by the Delegate of Oman in consultation with IUCN and a representative of the World Heritage Centre, and be used as a basis for the nomination;
- 3) that the Omani authorities continue to strengthen the management of the site by passing the by-laws and directives called for by the decree and appoint field staff to implement the management regime;
- 4) that the consultant who will prepare the management plan clearly defines the World Heritage values in accordance with the Operational Guidelines and defines the boundaries of the area including a zoning plan which excludes any land uses which may be in conflict with World Heritage values. Clear recommendations must be made on criterion (iii), if applicable to this listing, by 1 April 1995;
- 5) that IUCN present to the nineteenth session of the Bureau an evaluation of the revised boundaries and additional World Heritage criteria (if applicable), based on the consultant's report and such further information it requires;
- 6) that the nineteenth session of the Bureau review the revised boundaries and additional criteria in accordance with its normal procedures.

#### **B. Deferred nominations**

**Ha Long Bay**

**672**

**Vietnam**

The Bureau recalled that at its last session it referred the consideration of this nomination pending the establishment of a legal framework, a revision of the boundaries of the proposed site and the preparation of a management plan. The Bureau was informed that the Vietnamese authorities have upgraded legislation for the protection of the site and made revisions to the boundaries of the proposed site. However, the Bureau noted that the revised boundaries did not provide the necessary clarity and a management plan had not yet been prepared.



The Bureau was informed that a Vietnamese Delegation was expected to provide additional information to the Committee at this session. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the outgoing and incoming Chairpersons together with IUCN review the information to be provided by the State Party and advise the Committee.

### Cultural properties

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

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (renomination of Uluru National Park under cultural criteria)	447rev	Australia	N (ii)(iii) C (v)(vi)
---	--------	-----------	--------------------------

The Bureau recalled that this property was originally nominated as a mixed site and was inscribed in 1987 under natural criteria N(ii)(iii) and that it had been re-nominated as a cultural landscape for inscription under the revised cultural criteria.

ICOMOS recommended inscription under cultural criteria (v) and (vi) as it considered the property to be one of the most ancient managed landscapes in the world and an outstanding illustration of successful human adaptation over many millennia to the exigencies of a hostile environment; and forming an integral part of the traditional belief system of one of the oldest human societies in the world.

After considerable discussion on the interpretation and application of the criteria for cultural landscapes without any monumental component, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property, in addition to the inscription as a natural World Heritage site, under cultural criteria (v) and (vi).

Following the discussion, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to publish, e.g. in the World Heritage Newsletter, the cases where cultural landscape criteria have been applied, so that their interpretation and application be diffused among the States Parties.

Old City of Dubrovnik (extension)	95bis	Croatia
---	-------	---------

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it had positively evaluated the proposed extension of this World Heritage site to include the island of Lokrum and areas and fortresses at the east and the

west of the walled city. ICOMOS also recommended positively on the proposed buffer zone for the area on the slopes of the hills above the town.

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee extend the actual World Heritage site as proposed by the State Party.

**Petäjävesi Old Church**                      584                      Finland      C (iv)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its fifteenth session in December 1991 deferred this nomination and requested a more exhaustive study on the universal value of this monument. ICOMOS informed the Bureau that this study had been undertaken and that it concluded that the church is "the best preserved of Finland's churches built in the crucifix tradition and is a worthy representative for the type ... It deserves a place on the World Heritage List where, together with Urnes stave-church [Norway], it will serve to represent the height of wooden church architecture in Scandinavia."

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criterion (iv).

**Vilnius Historic Centre**                      541                      Lithuania C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau recalled that the Historic Centre of Vilnius was nominated by the USSR and examined by the Bureau at its fourteenth session. The Bureau referred this nomination back requesting additional information on the town planning schemes which existed in the immediate vicinity of the historic centre. After Lithuania became an independent state it signed the World Heritage Convention in 1992. The Lithuanian authorities then renewed the process of nomination and provided the additional information requested.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it considered the protective legislation for the nominated site and a wide area surrounding it adequate but that the only reservation it had was that the private owners do not have the obligation to maintain and restore their properties.

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property under criteria (ii) and (iv).

**Skogskyrkogården**                      588Rev.                      Sweden      C (i)(ii)

The Bureau at its seventeenth session deferred this nomination until a comparative study on cemeteries and a study on XXth century architecture be undertaken by ICOMOS. Furthermore, the Bureau considered at that time that this property should also be evaluated as a cultural landscape. ICOMOS informed the Bureau that, as a result of a colloquium on cemeteries and consultations



for developing a system of trails in the Park, and take into consideration more urgent conservation priorities for the management of the Park which have been set by the new Management Plan for the site.

### A.1.2 Training

The Bureau noted the increasing demand for support for organizing training courses for natural and cultural heritage specialists. The Bureau recommended that in the future the annual training budget should be divided equally for training natural and cultural heritage specialists.

The Bureau considered eight requests for supporting the training of natural heritage specialists and worked on the assumption that the training budget for 1995 will be the same as that of 1994 and gave priority to supporting training activities in Africa and in less developed countries.

#### Requests approved by the Bureau

1. 17th International Training Course for Protected Area Managers of Latin America, CATIE, Costa Rica	30,000
2. Regional Training Course for Protected Area Managers of Arab States, Egypt	30,000
3. Support to participants from Francophone Africa in the Training Course on Protected Areas, organized by ENGREF, France, in Côte d'Ivoire	19,000
4. Regional Training Course for Protected Area Managers of West Africa, organized by School of Wildlife Specialists, Garoua, Cameroon (an additional US\$ 5,000 for supporting the publication of the proceedings of the training seminar should be sought from other sources)	20,000
5. Fellowships to African World Heritage site and Protected Area Managers at Regional Training Institutions:	
School of Wildlife Specialists, Garoua, Cameroon	22,000
Mweka College of African Wildlife Management, Arusha, Tanzania	20,000

The Bureau also approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 for preparing a strategy for the training of managers of natural World Heritage sites. In this connection a workshop is to be organized in

cooperation with the United States National Park Service in September 1995. The Bureau further urged the Secretariat to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the training supported by the World Heritage Fund in the past and to use the outcome of such an assessment in the elaboration of a strategy for the future.

#### **Requests not approved by the Bureau**

Due to budgetary constraints, the Bureau did not approve the sum of US\$ 20,000 requested by the organizers of a training seminar on protected area management in Europe. The Bureau urged that the organizers raise the funds needed through alternative sources in Europe.

#### **A.2 Requests for which the Bureau formulated a recommendation to the Committee**

**Komodo National Park (Indonesia):** The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve a sum of US\$ 40,000 of the US\$ 63,400 requested by the Indonesian authorities for the purchase of a patrol boat and the procurement and installation of a GIS-GPS system. The Bureau recommended that the Indonesian authorities limit the costs of the GIS-GPS system to a maximum of US\$ 19,000 by calling for competitive bids for the supply and installation of this system for the Komodo National Park

**Ujung Kulon National Park (Indonesia):** The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve a sum of US\$ 40,000 as a contribution to buffer zone development activities to provide water facilities for local people. An agreement for cessation of resource extraction inside the Park is under discussion. The objective of this project is to demonstrate operational links between the conservation of Ujung Kulon National Park and benefits to local people.

#### **B. CULTURAL HERITAGE**

##### **B.1. Requests on which the Bureau took a decision**

###### **B.1.1 Technical cooperation**

In examining the ten technical co-operation requests for cultural properties, two submitted by ICCROM and eight by State Parties, the Bureau decided, in accordance with previous decisions taken by the Committee to give priority to activities for properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to those having a catalytic affect rather than for the funding of specific restoration works.

### Requests approved by the Bureau

1. The Historic Town of Ouro Preto (Brazil) - **US\$20,000**

The Bureau approved US\$20,000 out of the total amount of US\$50,000, subject to obtaining assurance that the balance of US\$30,000 for the construction of five houses for the relocation of the affected inhabitants be funded by other sources.

2. ICCROM Technical Assistance - **US\$25,000**

The Bureau approved this financial support to the ICCROM Technical Assistance Programme to supply institutions of State Parties, free of charge, with basic documentation, scientific and didactic equipment and conservation products.

3. Printing of *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites*, by B.M. Feilden and J. Jokilehto - **US\$6,900**

The Bureau approved this request to support the printing cost of the French-language edition of this publication if other sources, notably of the Francophone community cannot be identified.

### Requests not approved by the Bureau

1. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)  
(International Conference on Ngorongoro, in Bellagio, Italy)

The Bureau, while recognizing the value of the proposed international conference in Italy for the Tanzanian conservators, did not recommend approval of this request in view of other requests of higher priority and due to the availability of other funding sources for this conference at the Rockefeller Foundation in Italy.

2. Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)

The Bureau did not recommend the approval by the Committee of this request for US\$90,000. It recommended that the Committee requests the Syrian authorities to prepare a global and coherent conservation programme for this site in accordance with the recommendations of the UNESCO expert mission which took place in December 1993.

#### B.1.2 Training

The Bureau at its eighteenth session in December 1994, examined eleven requests for training activities related to cultural properties of which five were submitted by ICCROM and six by State Parties to the total amount exceeding US\$ one million. In view of budgetary constraints under the indicative allocation for training, the Bureau decided to give priority to

requests submitted by developing countries for activities benefiting site managers of World Heritage cultural properties. The emphasis would be on courses held in situ which take into account local training needs rather than "regular contribution to annual courses" organised at the headquarters of training institutes. This criteria was therefore used to evaluate all training requests.

#### Requests approved by the Bureau

1. Sub-Regional Conservation Workshop on Western European Medieval Wall Paintings, 1 July - 10 September 1995, Sighisoara, Romania - US\$28,000.
2. Scientific Principles of Conservation Regional Course for Latin America, June-July 1995, Belo Horizonte, Brazil - US\$30,000.
3. Training of Technical Personnel, Cap Vert - US\$25,000.
4. Training for the Region of Latin America in Conservation of the Adobe World Heritage, October 1995, Chan Chan, Peru - US\$20,000.

#### Requests not approved by the Bureau

1. International Course on the Technology of Stone Conservation, ICCROM, 30 March - 14 June 1995, Venice, Italy.

Despite recognition of the importance of this course and the support given to it in previous years, the Bureau did not approve this US\$51,000 request from ICCROM due to other funding priorities and in view of the fact that other funding sources were available for the organization of this regular course.

2. International Architectural Conservation Course ARC 95, ICCROM, 18 January - 26 May 1995, Rome, Italy.

In view of the availability of other funding sources for this regular course, the Bureau did not approve this request for US\$25,000.

3. Training Programme in the Conservation of Architecture, Painting, Wood, Stone and Antique Objects for the Preservation of the Hue World Heritage Site (1995, dates not specified), Vietnam

This request for US\$40,790 was not approved in view of the approval under Technical Cooperation of US\$ 108,000 for the purchase of conservation laboratory equipment and related training in Hue which was deemed to be of higher priority.

4. Regional Training Courses in Architectural and Urban Heritage Conservation, 5 September 1994 to 30 June 1995, Bratislava, Slovak Republic.

This request for US\$19,030 was not approved at this time due to budgetary constraints and other requests of higher priorities.

## **B.2 Requests for which the Bureau formulated a recommendation to the Committee**

### **B.2.1 Technical cooperation**

1. Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia) - **US\$50,000**

The Bureau recommended the approval of the full requested amount of US\$ 50,000 for, inter alia, the purchase of equipment for the documentation centre; expertise for the development of a tourism development plan; promotional and educational material and activities on World Heritage in Dubrovnik.

2. Wieliczka Salt Mine (Poland) - **US\$100,000**

The Bureau recommended, after considerable debate, the approval by the Committee of this request for US\$100,000 to purchase the dehumidifying equipment required for the preservation of the salt sculptures of this World Heritage Site in Danger.

3. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) - **US\$52,000**

The Bureau recommended approval by the Committee of the requested US\$ 52,000 for the deployment of a UNESCO international technical advisor for 6 months in view of the serious and urgent need for strengthened measures to redress the present state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley.

4. The Complex of the Hue Monuments (Vietnam)  
(Upgrading of the Hue Conservation Laboratory) - **US\$108,000**

The Bureau recommended approval of the amount of US\$108,000 to meet the cost of laboratory equipment purchase (US\$ 72,700) and related short-term training to enable the Hue authorities to have the basic facilities to overcome the present obstacles to conservation. The World Heritage Centre should, however, be consulted on the list of equipment, and approve the detailed specification and cost estimate; as well as the selection of the international experts.



5. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)  
(Restoration of the mosaics of Hagia-Sophia) - **US\$80,000**

The Bureau recommended approval by the Committee of an amount of **\$80,000** to complete the final phase of this restoration project.

### **B.2.2 Training**

1. ICCROM/CRATERre (International Centre for Earthen Constructions): Training for a professional team; and craftsmen-technicians team for the restoration and maintenance of the Palace of Abomey, Benin - **US\$ 33,000**

The Bureau recommended the approval of **US\$33,000** out of the original request for **US\$44,000**.

2. Regional Training Course of Maghreb Architects for the Conservation and Protection of Cultural Monuments and Sites (1994 and 1995, Tunisia)

The Bureau recommended the approval by the Committee of the full amount of **US\$50,000** for this request.

3. Regional Meeting of Directors of Cultural Offices in Latin America and the Caribbean (April 1995, Cartagena, Colombia)

The Bureau recommended approval by the Committee of the requested amount of **US\$45,000** under budgetary provisions other than training, subject to the availability of funds.

## **VI. MONITORING: REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES**

**VI.1.** In preparation for the Committee's agenda item 9 section C which deals with the reports on the state of conservation of specific properties, the Bureau examined working document WHC-94/CONF.001B/4 as well as the separate documents prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN.

**VI.2.** In view of the great number of state of conservation reports, the Bureau recommended the Committee to examine particularly, at its plenary session, the state of conservation reports on the following properties:

### **A. NATURAL PROPERTIES**

- A.1. Natural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

Air-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

**A.2. Natural properties on the World Heritage List**

Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

Keoladeo National Park (India)

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania)

Serengeti National Park (Tanzania)

Redwood National Park (United States of America)

Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Virunga National Park  
(Zaire)

**B. CULTURAL PROPERTIES****B.1. Cultural properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

Angkor (Cambodia)

Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor  
(Yugoslavia)

**B.2. Cultural properties on the World Heritage List**

Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid Fields from  
Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)

Petra (Jordan)

Megalithic Temples (Malta)

Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)

The Complex of Hue Monuments (Vietnam)

Pueblo de Taos (United States of America),

as well as the following five properties that have  
been monitored in the context of the Latin American  
pilot monitoring programme:

Serra da Capivara (Brazil)

Quirigua (Guatemala)

Ilha de Mozambique (Mozambique)

Lima (Peru)

Rio Abiseo (Peru).

VI.3. Regarding the remaining state of conservation reports, the Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following text for inclusion in the Committee's report:

### *Reports on the State of Conservation of Specific Properties*

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Committee recalled that the World Heritage Committee at its seventeenth session and the Bureau at its eighteenth session examined reports on the state of conservation of seven natural and six cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on seventeen natural and fifty-nine cultural properties on the World Heritage List.

The Committee commended the States Parties which had responded to its recommendations or observations and urged the States Parties which had not done this, to do so. In this context, the Committee emphasized that, according to the Operational Guidelines, one of the essential functions of the Committee is to monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and that a continuous communication between the Committee and the States Parties regarding the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites is indispensable in this respect.

The Committee examined the state of conservation reports prepared by the secretariat and the advisory bodies and concluded the following:

#### **II. Natural Heritage**

##### **II.1. Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

###### **Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Committee was informed that the Secretariat is continuously in contact with the Bulgarian authorities, which presented a report on their restoration efforts at the last session of the Bureau and have recently updated this report.

The Committee confirmed the decision of the Bureau at its eighteenth session that a detailed report on conservation measures should be presented to the nineteenth session of the Bureau in 1995. The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)**

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. Missions to the site were carried out in 1992 and 1993. Given the fact that there has been a recent outbreak in fighting in the Bihac region, the situation remains critical. The Committee decided, therefore, that another fact-finding mission to this area, particularly to the Korkaova Uvala Virgin forest should take place. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The site was inscribed in 1983 and added to the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. The situation at the site was discussed between a representative of the president of Ecuador and World Heritage Centre staff and the Committee's continuous concerns were brought to the attention of the Government of Ecuador.

The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that another fact-finding mission should be carried out.

### **Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)**

The site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees. An expert mission was undertaken in 1993 and proposals to revise the boundaries of the site were endorsed by the seventeenth session of the Committee in 1993. An international assistance project under the World Heritage Fund was carried out in 1994. The Committee was informed that the French Ministry of the Environment in cooperation with IUCN France is carrying out a study and review of the site with regard to potential future investment. A report on this project is expected in due course.

The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested that the Bureau at its nineteenth session be informed of the results of the French mission.

### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

At its eighteenth session, the World Heritage Bureau took note of the response by the Indian Government concerning Manas Wildlife Sanctuary which was inscribed on the List of World Heritage In Danger in 1992.

The Committee was informed that the Secretariat received a report

on the conditions of the site from WWF-India. The report emphasises the critical situation in the area. Furthermore, the Government of India has indicated its interest in a joint mission to the site by World Heritage Centre staff and local NGO's.

The Committee commended the Indian authorities on this initiative and recommended that this mission be undertaken when conditions in the area are sufficiently stable. The Committee decided to retain Manas Wildlife Sanctuary on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **Air-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

#### **Everglades National Park (United States of America)**

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1993 due to an increasing number of threats since the date of its inscription on the List in 1979. The Government is providing significant financial support for the management of the site and for its long-term restoration in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars. The American authorities had prepared a report for the eighteenth session of the Committee.

The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **II.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List**

#### **Great Barrier Reef (Australia)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

#### **Shark Bay (Australia)**

The Committee recalled that at the time of inscription of this site it requested IUCN to report back on the progress with respect to (1) implementation of the Commonwealth/State management agreement and (2) efforts to achieve more effective conservation of the site.

As the Government of Australia had assured that the October 1990 agreement was to provide the management framework for this site, the Committee was concerned that most of the provisions of the agreement have not been operationalised. Therefore, the Centre wrote to the Australian authorities requesting positive and concrete action, and was informed by the national authorities that a copy of the new agreement would be available by early

December. A report from the Australian authorities is anticipated shortly.

#### **Willandra Lakes Region (Australia)**

The Committee was informed of IUCN's field evaluation report on the state of conservation of this property. It requested the Australian authorities to review the boundaries of the site to exclude areas which no longer held World Heritage values and to continue their recent progress in improving the management of the site.

#### **Mount Athos (Greece)**

A report prepared by WWF and Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (EPC) has pointed out that the ecology of this site is being impacted by overgrazing, chemical pollution and forestry activities. In early December the World Heritage Centre received a letter from the Greek authorities outlining the measures which are being implemented to address these concerns. The Committee requested that a field review together with the appropriate Greek authorities be carried out to evaluate these conflicting reports.

#### **Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania)**

The Committee recalled that IUCN reported to the Bureau at its eighteenth session on a planned capture operation of six monk seals from the sea population of the park. Subsequently, the Centre was informed by the French Ministry for the Environment that the experiment was carefully planned and coordinated with IUCN's Species Survival Commission and that the capture operation and breeding experiment is under the direction of the "Comité scientifique international pour le suivi du programme français de sauvegarde du phoque moine".

The Committee took note of the above information.

#### **Te Wahipounama (New Zealand)**

In July 1994 the Bureau was advised of threats to the integrity of this site arising from cattle grazing in some parts of the Park and the impact of potential logging operations in Maori-owned coastal forests immediately adjacent to the Park. As requested by the Bureau, the New Zealand authorities have submitted a report outlining measures being implemented for mitigating these threats. IUCN has expressed satisfaction with these measures and no further action is required at the present time.

**Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

**Serengeti National Park (Tanzania)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

**Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Virunga National Park (Zaire)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

**Redwood National Park (United States of America)**

(to be examined by the Committee)

**Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia and Zimbabwe)**

The World Heritage Centre was informed by letter of 5 August 1994 from the National Heritage Conservation Commission of Zambia that the proposal to build the Batoka Dam was dropped. The Batoka Gorge Hydro Electric Scheme would have had a major environmental impact on the World Heritage site and would have flooded the Batoka Gorge of the Zambezi River, a two million year old unique geological and geomorphological formation.

The Committee commended the Government of Zambia on the decisions taken to ensure the integrity of this World Heritage site.

**Mana Pools, Sapi and Chewore Reserves (Zimbabwe)**

The Committee regretted that with the relocation of the ten remaining rhinos from this Park to an intensive protection zone, this World Heritage site has lost one of its "flagship" species. The Committee urged the Centre that in order to protect populations of similar species in other World Heritage sites, it should expand its cooperation with IUCN's Species Survival Commission and the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade on Endangered Species (CITES).

**III. Natural and Cultural Heritage (mixed sites)****Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**

The Committee was informed on proposed helicopter flights from Cusco to the village of Aguas Calientes, which is only two kilometers from the ruins of Machu Picchu, authorization of which would be subject to the approval of an environmental impact study by the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA). IUCN

informed that it was finalizing the examination of the impact study and that it will transmit its recommendations to the Secretariat as soon as these are available.

The Committee requested that the Bureau at its forthcoming nineteenth session be informed of the outcome of IUCN's observations.

#### IV. Cultural Heritage

##### IV.1. Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

###### Palace of Abomey (Benin)

The Committee commended the Government of Benin and ICCROM for the activities undertaken since 1992 in training in preventive conservation and for the project for the conservation and enhancement of the Royal Palaces of Abomey which is foreseen for 1994-1996 in collaboration with ICCROM and the Government of Italy. The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Secretariat to ensure that a monitoring mission be undertaken to Abomey to evaluate the state of conservation of the eleven palaces that have not yet been subject to restoration and to report on it to the Bureau at its nineteenth session.

###### Angkor (Cambodia)

(to be examined by the Committee)

###### Dubrovnik (Croatia)

The Committee was informed that the restoration of what is called the fifth facade of the city -the roofs- was almost completed and that there remained but a few insulae awaiting repairs, and that important progress had been made in the restoration of several of the most important monuments of the city.

The Committee commended the Government of Croatia and UNESCO on the progress made in the conservation and restoration of Dubrovnik. It noted, however, that after the priority needs had been taken care of, other works such as the restoration of nine destroyed palaces and details of Franciscan and Dominican cloisters needed to be undertaken. The Committee decided, therefore, to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.



**Timbuktu (Mali)**

The Committee was informed that the Government of Mali had fully endorsed the recommendations of a UNESCO mission that was undertaken in early 1994 and which recommended a method of intervention involving the local population which, since the construction of the mosques, had been responsible for their upkeep, thus perpetuating a living religious cultural tradition. The Committee also endorsed this proposal and decided that it would support its implementation, if and when requested by the State Party. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Bahla Fort (Oman)**

The Committee recalled that it was informed during its seventeenth session, that intensive restoration works were being undertaken at this site and that it appeared probable that the nature of the material used for the restoration work, the rapidity with which the work was being carried out and the methods used could raise a certain number of questions with regard to conserving the authenticity of the monument. The Committee was informed that, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, at the invitation of the Government of Oman, undertook a mission to Oman in March 1994 at which he was able to examine the progress of restoration work underway. Following this mission it was agreed with the national authorities that an expert mission would take place from 10 to 19 December 1994.

The Committee decided to retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested that the results of this mission be presented to the nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in 1995.

**Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)**

The Committee welcomed the initiative of the Government of Peru to organise in October 1995, in collaboration with ICCROM and CRATERre, a regional course on the conservation of adobe parallel to which the participants and international experts would also evaluate the past conservation practices and experiences in Chan Chan and define new conservation policies for this site. The Committee requested the authorities to submit the results of the course and the assessment of the conservation policies and practices to the Secretariat so that recommendations for future actions can be presented at the next session of the Committee. It decided that this site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Wieliczka Salt Mine (Poland)**

The Committee took note of the long-term conservation strategy that had been developed for this site, which included a project

for ventilation and dehumidification. The Committee encouraged the Polish authorities to implement this long-term conservation strategy and requested to be kept informed on its implementation. It decided that this site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor (Yugoslavia)

(to be examined by the Committee)

### IV.2. Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

#### Europe Region

##### Medieval City of Rhodes (Greece)

The Committee requested the Greek authorities for precise information on the legal protection of the Medieval City as well as to define a legal framework for the main principles guiding the restoration of the buildings of the Medieval City of Rhodes.

##### Kremlin and Red Square (Russian Federation)

The Committee was informed that the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of the Russian Federation to UNESCO informed the Director-General of UNESCO of a project concerning the possible erection of a monument in honour of Marshal G. Zoukhov on the Red Square. The Director-General, in a letter to the mayor of Moscow dated 2 December 1994, underlined that the responsibility for protecting a cultural property lies with the State Party concerned, which should conserve it and avoid taking any measures that would damage it. The Director-General suggested in his letter that another appropriate location be sought for the monument and requested that UNESCO be consulted prior to undertaking any proposed work on the Red Square and the Kremlin. The Committee fully endorsed this position and requested to be kept informed on any development in this World Heritage site.

##### Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)

(to be examined by the Committee)

##### Burgos Cathedral (Spain)

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its eighteenth session congratulated the various Spanish organizations involved in the actions taken for the conservation of Burgos Cathedral and that it, at the same time, expressed a desire to see those components of the total project which were still under negotiation put into effect with the minimum delay.

The Committee noted that in August 1994, a statue fell off the façade of the cathedral and requested ICOMOS to continue to monitor the state of conservation of the cathedral and to report its findings to the nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

#### *Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)*

The Committee was informed that problems with the project's financing had caused some delays in the restoration of the mosaics and that UNESCO's experts present on the site had expressed their regret to the authorities responsible for the work that, in spite of their recommendations, the metallic covering of the Haghia Sophia was executed with a material which was too thin and therefore fragile.

Furthermore, it was informed that, according to the UNESCO experts on site, reconstruction of long portions of the Roman and Byzantine walls was being undertaken using new stones without taking account of the advice of archaeologists and art historians.

The Committee recommended to the Turkish authorities to take the necessary steps to speed up the transfer of funds approved under the World Heritage Fund for the restoration of the mosaics in the Haghia Sophia to those responsible for its conservation.

The Committee also requested that the Turkish authorities immediately stop the reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine walls, and that they undertake their restoration, in accordance with principles accepted by the international community, and in collaboration with the Turkish antiquities services.

#### *Xanthos-Letoon (Turkey)*

In the framework of the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan, the Coordinator of the Programme "100 Historical Sites of the Mediterranean" carried out a mission to Turkey at the request of the World Heritage Centre.

Having taken note of the extensive and detailed report, which the Committee requested to be made available to the Turkish authorities, the Committee recommended the Turkish authorities:

- to transmit to the World Heritage Centre the Protection Plan for the Development of the Patra/Xanthos/Letoon site, which should have been ready in 1992;
- to implement the measures for the diversion of traffic on the roads crossing the sites of Xanthos and Letoon;
- to review the construction of the superstructure of the television relay installed at the summit of the

Xanthos Acropolis.

Arab States and Mediterranean Region

Memphis and its Necropolis - the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)

(to be examined by the Committee)

Petra (Jordan)

(to be examined by the Committee)

Megalithic Temples (Malta)

(to be examined by the Committee)

Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

(to be examined by the Committee)

City of Valetta (Malta)

The Committee was informed that in the framework of UNDP's Action Plan for the Mediterranean, the Programme Coordinator for "100 Historical Sites of the Mediterranean" carried out a mission to Malta at the request of the World Heritage Centre. The Committee took note of the report and endorsed the mission's recommendations that, faced with the accelerated degradation affecting the historical buildings of Valetta, the authorities of Malta should take appropriate urgent measures so that:

- the team of the Valetta Rehabilitation Project acquires legal recognition and may call upon a Works Division for the maintenance and restoration of the historical buildings of Valetta;
- the Bill on the protection of Valetta can be finalized as soon as possible in an appropriate form, in keeping with the obligations for inscription on the World Heritage List;
- a regulation on the signs, billboards and commercial storefronts can be better formulated and applied by the competent authorities, in order to preserve the characteristics of the historical buildings of Valetta.

Asia and the Pacific region

*Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)*

(to be examined by the Committee)

*The Complex of Hue Monuments (Vietnam)*

(to be examined by the Committee)

North and South America region

*Puebla (Mexico)*

The Committee recalled that a rehabilitation plan for a part of the World Heritage site of Puebla, the Rio de San Francisco area, was briefly discussed at its seventeenth session and that more detailed information was provided at the eighteenth session of the Bureau on the basis of a report from the Mexican National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) and the report of a UNESCO expert in urban rehabilitation and conservation who visited Puebla in June 1994.

The Committee was informed that following the eighteenth session of the Bureau and on the request of the Government of Mexico, the same expert had undertaken a series of missions to Puebla to advise the authorities in the preparation of the urban development plan for the Rio de San Francisco area. The Committee commended the authorities of Mexico, the State of Puebla and the Municipality of Puebla on their positive response to the expert's advice, and invited them to report on a regular basis to the Secretariat on the further development of this project.

*Pueblo de Taos (United States of America)*

(to be examined by the Committee)

Latin American monitoring programme

*Serra da Capivara (Brazil)*

(to be examined by the Committee)

*Quirigua (Guatemala)*

(to be examined by the Committee)

*Ilha de Mozambique (Mozambique)*

*(to be examined by the Committee)*

*Lima (Peru)*

*(to be examined by the Committee)*

*Rio Abiseo (Peru)*

*(to be examined by the Committee).*

Following the examination of the state of conservation reports, the Committee adopted the following proposals for the monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of individual World Heritage properties in 1995 and invited the Secretariat to ensure their implementation:

- The highest priority will be given to the monitoring of and reporting on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
- The Secretariat will again report to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in 1995 on the state of conservation of all sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger with an assessment of the appropriateness of their continued inclusion in this List.
- The Secretariat, in collaboration with the advisory bodies, will continue to undertake reactive monitoring whenever deemed necessary.

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**VII.1** Following the decision of the Bureau to defer the Glacier and Waterton Lakes National Park World Heritage nomination, the Delegate of the United States, the Observer of Canada and the Representative of IUCN, carried out consultations to explore future courses of action.

**VII.2** The result of these consultations was a proposal to convert the Glacier and Waterton nomination and to have it considered in the context of a "Northern Rocky Mountain World Heritage site" extended to include Yellowstone and the Canadian Rocky Mountain World Heritage sites.

**VII.3** It became evident during these discussions that such a proposal would reflect the biodiversity of both the plant and animal species of this extensive biogeographic region, including far-ranging species such as the grizzly bear and grey wolf populations. The proposed site would also, incorporate the endemic species in each of these World Heritage sites.

**VII.4** A symposium will be convened prior to the next Bureau, by the States Parties and in cooperation with IUCN, with the objective of creating an international advisory panel and a conceptual framework for the management of the proposed Northern Rocky Mountain World Heritage site.

**VII.5** The concept of this association parallels management principles relating to the Central-Eastern Rainforest Reserves of Australia, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Te Wahipounamu South West New Zealand and similar concepts being developed in Central America.

**VII.6** The Bureau endorsed the concept of incorporating the Glacier and Waterton nomination into an extended World Heritage site together with Yellowstone and the Canadian Rockies, and encouraged the State Parties to bring a revised nomination for consideration by the nineteenth session of the Bureau and the World Heritage Committee. IUCN was in favour of this approach and indicated that it could complete the evaluation of the proposed nomination for submission to the next session of the Bureau.

#### **VIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**VIII.1** The outgoing chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ms Olga Pizano, thanked the members of the Bureau, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat for their support in undertaking her work. The Delegate of Thailand, on behalf of all the members of the Bureau, thanked the chairperson for her commitment to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and for the pleasant and efficient manner in which she conducted the sessions of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau.

**VIII.2** The Chairperson then declared the session closed.