

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.202/3
Paris, 25 September 1995
Original : English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
Nineteenth extraordinary session

Berlin, Germany
1-2 December 1995

Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda : Examination of Nominations of
Properties to the World Heritage List and the List of World
Heritage in Danger.

During its nineteenth session, the Bureau reviewed nine new
natural site nominations and was informed about two nominations
which were referred back at previous sessions of the Bureau or
the Committee.

A. Natural sites :

A.1. Properties for which nominations were referred back by the
Bureau at its nineteenth session to the national
authorities and for IUCN for additional information

Glacier and Waterton
Waterton Lakes
International Peace
Park

354Rev

Canada/United States
of America

The Bureau recalled that at its eighteenth session it had decided
to defer the examination of this nomination and to request that
IUCN undertake a thorough evaluation of the nomination and
provide to the Bureau at its nineteenth session a more
comprehensive evaluation on which the Committee could base its
decision. The Bureau at its eighteenth session further endorsed
a suggestion that the States Parties, in cooperation with IUCN,
organize a working group to examine the possibility of an
"association of management units" or a series nomination.

The Centre and IUCN informed the Bureau that the working group
met in Calgary, Alberta on 28 March 1995 and that copies of the

full report of the meeting had been provided to Bureau members. The report supplements the "criteria" of the amended 1994 nomination and further responds to the conditions of integrity.

IUCN informed the Bureau that the IUCN panel held on 10 May 1995, suggested three options but favoured the options of referral or deferral with consideration being given to a "cultural landscape approach". The Bureau however, did not feel comfortable with this option and had considerable discussion on this matter. Additionally, the Observer of Canada indicated that Canada had no intention of proceeding with a cultural landscape nomination. After consultation between the Chair and the delegates, the Bureau agreed that IUCN be requested to complete its evaluation of the nomination, based on the background material at hand, and the report of the meeting of States Parties held in Calgary. The Bureau also stated that the Operational Guidelines should be adhered to and the question of whether the nomination must be of "outstanding universal value" or the "most outstanding" should be addressed. Finally, it was agreed that the nomination would not be referred back to the States Parties for further information.

The conclusion of the Bureau was that a full evaluation was required before a decision is made. IUCN was therefore requested to prepare the evaluation for the next meeting of the outgoing Bureau in December. This evaluation was not yet available at the time of the preparation of this document.

Juan Fernandez 716 Chile
Archipelago
National Park

The Bureau recognized that the site fulfils natural criterion (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats for threatened species, including the high degree of endemic flora. The Bureau, however, raised concern about the integrity of the site, as the site is under threat from introduced animals, and alien flora. The Bureau, therefore, decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party: (1) to allow the Chilean authorities to outline their action to fulfil the requirements of integrity, and (2) that the State Party indicates how resources will be mobilized to prepare an up-dated management plan of the site, as the present version was formulated 25 years ago. The Bureau requested the Centre to write a letter indicating the above to the national authorities and to request their reply by 1 October 1995 in order to provide the information to the outgoing Bureau in December 1995. At the time of the preparation of this document, no reply has been received.

Gough Island 740 United Kingdom

The Bureau recommended that World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as

one of the least disturbed major cool-temperate island ecosystems in the South Atlantic Ocean, with one of the most important seabird colonies of the world, high scenic qualities and spectacular sea-cliffs and coastline.

The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the national authorities: (1) to ask them for confirmation whether the marine area is included as part of the nomination and, if so (2) that the name of the site should then read "Gough Island Wildlife Reserve". It was further noted that if this was the case, the Government should ensure that any fishery is managed on a sustainable basis. By letter of 31 August 1995 the British authorities informed the Centre that they have no objection to the proposed name "Gough Island Wildlife Reserve". In addition, they confirmed that the marine area is included in the nomination and that commercial fishery operated under strict conditions.

**Okapi Wildlife
Reserve**

718

Zaïre

The Bureau recognized that the site fulfils natural criteria (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats including the Okapi. The site has the highest diversity of primates with 13 species of all African forests and is an exceptional site for threatened birds.

The Bureau noted however, that the cultural values of the site and the living culture of the Pygmies population living in harmony with the forest within the site has not been assessed. The Bureau furthermore noted that the management plan has not been formally approved and raised concern about the integrity of the site. The Bureau therefore, requested the Centre to contact the Ambassador of Zaire and to ask him for the following information for 1 October 1995, to be provided for the outgoing Bureau: (1) when the management plan will be approved; (2) to inform the Bureau about activities underway to halt human intrusion into the site, and (3) to give assurance for operational and financial support of the staff at the site (salaries). At the time of the preparation of this document, no reply has been received.

A.2 Extension to a World Heritage site

**Galapagos National Ibis
Park Marine
Extension**

Ecuador

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session recognized that the Galapagos Marine Reserve met natural criteria. It deferred, however the inclusion of the Galapagos Marine Reserve as an extension of Galapagos Islands to be included on the World Heritage List due to recognition of serious threats to the site and in accordance with the IUCN

recommendation and the wish of the Observer of Ecuador. The Committee, requested the Centre and IUCN to report back to the nineteenth session of the Bureau. The Centre provided the Ecuadorian Authorities by letter of 1 February 1995 with details of the Committee's decision. No reply was received so far.

The Bureau therefore, requested the Centre and IUCN to report back to the outgoing Bureau in December 1995. The Observer from Ecuador stated that his Government will provide information in time before the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. No reply has been received at the time of the preparation of this document.

B. Cultural properties :

The Bureau examined twenty-eight cultural properties and one mixed property nomination of which seventeen were recommended for inscription, four were referred and six were deferred. The Bureau could not reach a consensus on one of the nomination.

B.1 Properties for which nominations were referred back to the national authorities for further information

Avignon: Monumental ensemble formed by the Place du Palais, Palais des Papes, Cathedral of Notre Dames des Doms, Petit Palais, Tour des Chiens, Ramparts and Saint-Bénézet Bridge	228Rev.	France
--	----------------	---------------

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to give precise boundaries for the area proposed for inscription. On the condition that this information is provided by 1 October 1995, in time for the next session of the Bureau, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). At the time of the preparation of this document, the national authorities have not sent any information to the Centre.

Jerash	324	Jordan
---------------	------------	---------------

The Bureau decided to refer this nomination to the State Party until such times as assurances can be given on the following points:

- a) the establishment of a buffer zone of at least 50m, but preferably 100m to the north, west and south of the site within which no construction of any kind would be permitted;

- b) effective cooperation should be established between the Department of Antiquities and the Ministry of Tourism, with the participation of the Municipality of Jerash and the Jerash Festival Committee for the future management of the site;
- c) that all permanent structures associated with the Festival should be removed from the archaeological site and restricted periods agreed for their subsequent erection and dismantling during the Festival.

If the State Party can provide the necessary assurances on these different points by 1 October 1995, the Bureau would recommend that the site be inscribed under cultural criteria (i), (ii) and (iii) on the World Heritage List. At the time of the preparation of this document, the national authorities have not sent any information to the Centre.

**Schokland and its
surroundings**

739

Netherlands

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party in order to allow the State Party to resolve the situation regarding the potential recreation area. In the event of a satisfactory solution being proposed by 1 October 1995, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (v). The national authorities have sent, by letter dated 24 August 1995, information on this matter which will be evaluated by ICOMOS.

Savannah City Plan

746

United States of America

The Bureau adopted the recommendation made by ICOMOS to refer this nomination back to the State Party, indicating that it is only likely to be inscribed on the World Heritage List if it is extended to the entire urban fabric of the historic plan area and not confined to the streets and open spaces. The Centre wrote a letter indicating the above to the national authorities and requested their reply by 1 October 1995. At the time of the preparation of this document, the national authorities have not sent any information to the Centre.

**B.2 Nomination for which the Bureau decided to adjourn the
debate to the outgoing session of the Bureau in December
1995**

The Bureau examined the nomination of **Lunenburg Old Town, Canada (741)** and considered the following recommendation made by ICOMOS: "ICOMOS recommends that consideration of this nomination be deferred for two years to await the outcome of a comparative study of European colonial planned settlements. In the event of the British component of this study not being completed by that time, ICOMOS recommends that consideration be given to inscription of Lunenburg on the List without further delay, on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v)." During the Bureau session,

the Representative of ICOMOS indicated that ICOMOS was prepared to recommend the inscription of Lunenburg Old Town without the preparation of comparative study.

As no consensus could be reached on the necessity of a comparative study as recommended by ICOMOS, the Bureau decided to adjourn the debate to the outgoing session of the Bureau in December 1995.

The debate on this nomination led to an extensive discussion on the general principle and scope of comparative studies. In response to the Italian Delegate's indication of doubt on the whole notion of comparative studies, the Representative of Germany recalled that the Committee had long considered such studies, whether of a universal or a regional framework, to be essential in determining the outstanding universal value of properties to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. ICOMOS maintained that comparative studies are necessary for certain types of property to avoid the over-representation of the same type of property. The Director of the Centre cited Article 11.2 of the Convention which refers to universal value and to paragraph 12 of the Operational Guidelines which specifically refers to the need for comparative evaluations. The Chairman stated that the Committee and Bureau, on numerous occasions had requested such studies as *modus operandi*.

B.3 Deferred nomination for which additional information has been received

**Roskilde
Cathedral**

695 rev.

Denmark

This nomination was deferred during the eighteenth session of the Bureau (July 1994) and a comparative study on religious brick Gothic architecture was requested.

This study has been completed and ICOMOS will give his advice and present his recommendations to the Bureau.