

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.203/4
4 December 1995
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

DRAFT REPORT OF THE BUREAU

Berlin, Germany

EXPLANATORY NOTE

As four of the seven States Members of the nineteenth Bureau of the World Heritage Committee were not reelected to the Committee during the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage which was held in Paris on 2 and 3 November 1995, and in applying Article 12 (paragraph 1) of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, the quorum required by Article 17 of the Rules was not reached to hold the extraordinary session of the Bureau. However, as the outgoing Bureau had not completed the preparation of the nineteenth session of the Committee, six of its members (China, Colombia, Germany, Italy, Senegal and Thailand) met on 1 and 2 December 1995 in order to present to the new Bureau, to be elected by the nineteenth session of the Committee at its opening session, the recommendations which are contained in the present draft report, which the Bureau is requested to adopt and which it may wish to submit for adoption by the Committee.

The Representative of Colombia assumed the role of Rapporteur for this meeting of members of the outgoing Bureau.

I. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee elected by the nineteenth session of the Committee met on 4 December 1995 to examine the draft report prepared by the Rapporteur of the six members of the outgoing Bureau.

I.2 The Bureau, by consensus, adopted the report of this meeting and the recommendations contained therein.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

II.1 The agenda adopted appears as the proposed Document WHC-95/CONF.202/1.

III. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

A. NATURAL HERITAGE

The Bureau recalled that at its last session in July 1995 it examined ten natural nominations and referred three properties back to the States Parties and one to IUCN.

The Bureau examined at its December session four nominations of natural properties, of which it recommended the inscription of two properties. Two nominations were deferred and one proposed extension to a World Heritage site were referred to the Committee.

A.1 Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Ident. Number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Glacier and Waterton Waterton Lakes International Peace Park	354Rev	Canada/United States of America	(ii) (iii)

The conclusion of the Bureau at its last session in July 1995 was that a full evaluation of the amended nomination was required before a decision could be made. IUCN was therefore requested to undertake the evaluation for the next meeting of the outgoing

Bureau in December. This evaluation noted that an IUCN team visited the site in October 1995. The conclusion of the field visit and IUCN's panel review was that the site meets criteria (ii) and (iii). IUCN further recommended that a single "Biosphere Reserve" should be created from the three Biosphere Reserves already existing in the area.

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the site be listed under criteria (ii) and (iii) and that the World Heritage Centre write to the States Parties with respect to the Biosphere Reserve proposal. The Observer of Canada indicated that Canada would support this recommendation. In addition, the Expert Group recommends that the site be eventually expanded to include the adjacent protected area in the Akamina/Kishinena.

Gough Island

740

United Kingdom (iii)(iv)

The Bureau noted that the British authorities had confirmed that the marine area (three nautical miles) is included in the nomination and the site is to be known as the "Gough Island Wildlife Reserve".

The Bureau discussed at length the question of commercial fisheries in the marine area and recommended the Committee to request the Centre to write to the States Party with respect to the need for continuous monitoring to ensure that the fishery is sustainable and respects the World Heritage values.

The Bureau recommended to the Committee inscription of the site under criteria (iii) and (iv).

A.2 Properties for which the nominations were deferred

**Juan Fernandez
Archipelago
National Park**

716

Chile

The Bureau recalled 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. It recalled that the Bureau at its last session, raised concern about the integrity of the site. No reply had been received by the deadline of 1 October 1995. The Representative of IUCN underlined that there had not been sufficient time to review the document that the Secretariat recently received from the Executive Director of CONAF.

The Bureau therefore recommended that the nomination be deferred until the twentieth session of the World Heritage Bureau.

**Okapi Wildlife
Reserve**

718

Zaire

The Bureau recalled that the site fulfils natural criterion (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats. The Bureau furthermore had noted that the management plan has not been formally approved and raised concern about the integrity of the site.

In the absence of any information from the authorities of Zaire, the Bureau recommended to the new Bureau/Committee that the site be deferred and it was recommended that the Centre be requested to again contact the authorities of Zaire.

A.3 Extension to a World Heritage site referred to the Committee by the Bureau

**Galapagos National
Park Marine
Extension**

1bis

Ecuador

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session deferred the inscription of the Galapagos Marine Reserve due to recognition of serious threats to the site and in accordance with the IUCN recommendation and the wish of the Observer of Ecuador.

In the absence of any further information from the State Party, the Bureau recommended that this nomination be brought to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in order to allow the Representative of Ecuador to provide a statement for information, as well as to have an opportunity to discuss the state of conservation report to be presented by IUCN.

B. CULTURAL HERITAGE

After having examined at its nineteenth session in July 1995, 28 nominations for inscription of cultural properties and one for a mixed property, the Bureau recommended the inscription of 17 properties. Four nominations had been referred back and six were deferred. The Bureau had also decided to postpone the debate on one proposal for inscription until the session of the out-going Bureau.

The Bureau examined at its December session eight nominations of cultural properties of which it recommended the inscription of six properties. One nominated property was not recommended for inscription and one nomination was deferred.

The Bureau made the following recommendations:

B.I. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Ident. Number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Lunenburg Old Town	741	Canada	C(iv) (v)
<p>During the course of discussions, resulting in the recommendation to inscribe this property, it was proposed that the Bureau examine at its twentieth session in July 1996, the principles and methodology of comparative studies, as well as the cases where such studies are indispensable prior to the nomination of a property.</p>			
Roskilde Cathedral	695Rev.	Denmark	C(ii) (iv)
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	C(i) (ii) (iv)
Crespi d'Adda	730	Italy	C(iv) (v)
Schokland and its surroundings	739	Netherlands	C(iii) (v)
Town of Luang Prabang	479Rev.	Lao People's Democratic Republic	C(ii) (iv) (v)

The Bureau was informed of the evaluation by an expert mission sent by UNESCO in October 1995 to update the February assessment made by ICOMOS on the application of the December 1994 Decree on the legal protection of this property. Satisfied with the

progress made in the implementation of this Decree and the management structure for its enforcement, the Bureau recommended inscription.

B.2 Property which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription

**Savannah City
Plan**

746

**United States of
America**

No information had been received from the State Party following the decision of the Bureau formulated at its nineteenth session which indicated that, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, the site may qualify for inscription on the World Heritage List only if it is extended to the entire urban fabric of the historical area and not confined to the streets and open spaces. The Observer of the United States of America explained to the Bureau that the United States legislation does not permit the Government to nominate private properties without the consent of the owners concerned and that it could not ensure the long-term preservation of the individual privately-owned buildings. He concluded, therefore, that it was impossible for the United States Government to meet the condition of the Bureau. The Bureau expressed its regret that, under these conditions, this important cultural property could not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

B.3 Property for which the nomination was deferred

Jerash

324

Jordan

As the information which was requested by the Bureau during its nineteenth session had not been received, it recommended that this proposal for inscription be deferred.

IV. EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

At the request of the Chairperson, the Centre preceeded its presentation of the individual international requests with a general overview on the 1996 proposed budget for international assistance.

The Director of the Centre explained that 51 requests in all three categories of international assistance totalling some US\$ 1.26 million were received and pending decisions. In view of the depletion of the 1995 budget for international assistance, these requests required support from the 1996 allocation. To formulate its recommendation, the Secretariat worked on the assumption of the following budgetary ceiling for each category of international assistance:

- * US\$ 175,000 for preparatory assistance;
- * US\$ 650,000 for technical cooperation,
1/3 for natural and 2/3 for cultural heritage;
- * US\$ 440,000 for training,
half for natural and half for cultural heritage.

The Centre informed the Bureau that out of the 51 requests, 14 cases (3 for natural heritage and 11 for cultural heritage) were for sums above US\$ 30,000, hence for the Committee's examination. In addition, there are 10 preparatory assistance, 2 training and 4 technical cooperation requests for examination by the Chairperson to be elected by the nineteenth session of the Committee; and another 11 training and 10 technical cooperation requests for decision by the new Bureau.

During the discussions that followed this general introduction, IUCN and a representative of Germany remarked on the imbalance in the number of requests for natural and cultural heritage. The Director stressed that this was a reflection of the imbalance in the number of natural and cultural properties on the World Heritage List and also that of the Centre's staff, which are in the majority specialists on cultural heritage.

IUCN and Germany suggested that the Committee's recommendation at the eighteenth session on the proportion of international assistance to be reserved for natural heritage should be reflected in the Operational Guidelines. The Representatives of Italy and Senegal, however, felt that this ratio should be indicative and not stipulated officially in order to allow flexibility to meet priorities on the basis of needs. The Director also stated that natural heritage could be supported under various sources of international funding for environmental protection while donors for cultural heritage protection still remain limited.

A. NATURAL HERITAGE

A.1 Requests recommended by the Bureau for approval by the Committee

A.1.1 Technical Cooperation

Komodo National Park (Indonesia) (US\$ 64,500 requested)

The Bureau reviewed the request for the purchase of a fibreglass catamaran boat and additional accessories for the GIS system for a total of US\$ 64,500. However, in the light of the amount of funds already provided for the purchase of boats for the site, the Bureau recommended the Committee to approve the above project for a reduced amount of US\$ 30,000, under the condition that the Indonesian authorities find an additional US\$ 30,000 from other sources for its purchase. It furthermore suggested that the boat

be insured by the Indonesian authorities as a matter of general policy.

Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended to the Committee to approve US\$ 30,000 for a technical assistance project for the site. The project includes a comprehensive biological inventory of the Park, which contributes to the preparation of a new management plan, local awareness programmes and community projects, boat purchase and refurbishment, and an alternative income-generating study for the local population.

A.1.2 Training

College of African Wildlife Management, Mweka (Tanzania) (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to approve an amount of US\$ 30,000 for three students to attend the one-year course (1996/97) at the College of African Wildlife Management, Mweka, Tanzania, requesting the Centre to contact the Principal of the School to provide a detailed financial breakdown for each of the students.

B. CULTURAL HERITAGE

B.1 Requests recommended by the Bureau for approval by the Committee

B.1.1 Technical Cooperation

Preparation of Guidelines for Risk Preparedness for World Heritage Sites (request presented by ICOMOS) (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the request of US\$ 30,000 for the preparation and publication of the "Guidelines for Risk Preparedness for World Cultural Heritage Sites" in 1,000 copies. IUCN should be associated. US\$ 15,000 should be provided to ICOMOS from the 1996 budget and the remaining amount would be included in the 1997 budget.

Jesuit Missions of the Chiquitos (Bolivia) (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve an amount of US\$ 30,000 for the preparation of a strategic plan and the formulation of projects for the Missions (US\$ 22,000) and for urgent technical advice (US\$ 8,000). The Centre, in cooperation with the Bolivian authorities, will try to seek additional funding for this project from donors.

Purchase of equipment to improve the security of the site Museum of the Mountain Resort and its Outlying Temples of Chengde (China) (US\$ 34,150 requested)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve an amount of US\$ 34,150 for the purchase of equipment in the framework of a co-financing programme on the understanding that the training request for US\$ 20,000 for the same site be sought from other sources.

Thracian Tomb of Kazanlak, Madara Rider, Boyana Church, Rock-hewn Churches of Ivanovo, Rila Monastery, Ancient City of Nessebar, Thracian Tomb of Sveshtari (Bulgaria) (US\$ 39,000 requested)

As proposed by the Secretariat, the Bureau recommended the Committee to approve this request for an amount of US\$ 20,000. The Secretariat shall propose to the States Party to reexamine the list of equipment in the light of this budgetary constraint.

Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (US\$ 50,000 requested)

Although the restoration of an isolated monument may not be considered as a priority when taking account of other needs expressed this year, the Bureau recognized the high quality of restoration work already carried out during the first stage of the project serving as an example and inspiration for other ongoing restoration activities at this site, and therefore recommended that the Committee approve US\$30,000 for this activity which perfectly illustrates UNESCO's mission in mobilising national and international, public and private funds for the safeguarding of heritage.

Timbuktu (Mali) (List of World Heritage in Danger) (US\$ 41,850 requested)

Given the commitment of the Mali authorities, the quality of the ICCROM/CRATere partnership and the innovative character of the project which had received the recommendation of the Committee at its eighteenth session, the Bureau recommended that the Committee approve an amount of US\$ 40,000 for this project.

B.1.2 Training

Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the Rehabilitation of Historical Cities (CECRE) (Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, March-December 1996): Request for international professors submitted by Brazil (US\$ 45,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to approve an amount of US\$ 30,000 for six international professors.

Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the Rehabilitation of Historical Cities (CECRE) (Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, March-December 1996): Request for fellowships for ten international students submitted by Brazil (US\$ 70,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to approve an amount of **US\$ 35,000** for international fellowships.

James Island and Albreda, Juffure, San Domingo: Prehistoric Stone Circle [sites inscribed on the Tentative List] (The Gambia) (US\$ 98,000 requested)

Pending the formal inscription, the Bureau recommended the Committee to approve **US\$ 10,000**. ICCROM, who will be associated with the implementation of this request, will reevaluate the training needs, both in situ and abroad.

Central America: Training Seminar for Site Managers of Archaeological World Heritage Sites in Central America (Tegucigalpa/Copan, Honduras, 1996) (request submitted by Honduras) (US\$ 35,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended the Committee approve an amount of **US\$ 10,000** for this training workshop/seminar and requested the Secretariat to seek additional funding from donors in cooperation with regional authorities.

B.2 Request not recommended by the Bureau

B.2.1 Technical cooperation

Historical Centre of Mompox (Colombia) (US\$ 30,000 requested)

The Bureau recommended that the State Party revise the request for a smaller amount and resubmit it to the Chairperson of the Committee.

V. MONITORING: REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES

A. NATURAL HERITAGE

A.1 Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that it examined at its nineteenth session, a substantive state of conservation report,

prepared by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Bulgaria.

The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that a monitoring mission was undertaken by the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention and a detailed monitoring report was prepared. This report indicates that the new water control structure allows an inflow of water on a small scale, and that a small colony of the Dalmatian Pelican had been reestablished. The integrity of the site, however, has not yet been adequately restored.

The Bureau took note of the report received from the Ramsar Secretariat and the comments made by IUCN and recommended to the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee encouraged the Bulgarian authorities in their continuing efforts to restore the site, including increasing the water intake and the preparation of a management plan for the site. The Committee furthermore requested that a status report be presented in three years time. Meanwhile, the Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and that information was received from both the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Croatia to UNESCO and the Croatia National Commission for UNESCO, indicating that damage from the period of occupation was evident. The Bureau furthermore noted that the site was reopened to the public on 10 August 1995 and that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved a request for emergency assistance (communications equipment) for an amount of US\$ 30,000. Upon the granting of US\$ 30,000, the State Party agreed to provide a contribution of US\$ 60,000 for a total of US\$ 90,000. The Centre informed the Bureau that a management and planning meeting for the Park is scheduled for Spring 1996.

The Bureau took note of the report presented by the Secretariat and recommended that the Committee adopt the following:

"The Committee commended the State Party for its special contribution and endorsed the management and planning meeting for the Park scheduled for Spring 1996. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the region stabilizes."

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. It took note of the

preliminary report by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre) on the environmental impact of the construction of the Guamote-Macas road in the Park, and an extensive report of October 1995 provided by the IUCN Office in Ecuador.

From the report it is clear that the road continues to be the main threat and has caused irreversible damage to the natural environment, both through direct (pollution, dynamite use, loss of biological corridors etc.) and indirect impacts (new settlements, poaching, cattle ranching etc.).

Having examined the report presented by IUCN, the Bureau recommended that the Committee adopt the following:

"The Committee commended the State Party for the reports provided, however, expressed its continuing concerns about the construction work causing negative environmental impacts. It requested the Centre to send a determined intervention to the Ecuadorian President for an environmental impact study and to urge the State Party to take steps to ensure much stricter environmental regulations. The Committee furthermore, requested the Centre to write to INEFAN commending them for their actions for modifications of the road, the tenure study and the initiative for an updated management plan. The Committee decided that the site should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

However, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that, before taking any decision, the Delegate of Ecuador should be given the opportunity to provide further information on the situation at the site.

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

The Bureau recalled that the site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of negative impacts from a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighbouring countries. It furthermore recalled that an extensive report was presented to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in July 1995.

In response to the Bureau's request for clarifications on the legal protection and classification of the site, the Ministry for Energy and Environment, by letter of 15 September 1995, indicated that the Government had taken several measures to develop and protect the site. This included the creation of a Management Centre, "Centre de Gestion de l'Environnement des Monts Nimba (CEGEN)", responsible for all environmental and legal questions, as well as the international classification of the site, the monitoring of the water quality in the region and integrated rural development and socio-economic studies.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee commended the State Party for its efforts. However, given the uncertainties and the shortcomings in on-site management, the Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

The IUCN Representative informed the Bureau that it had received recent information on the site indicating that the civil unrest continues to restrict management efforts. Habitat conditions in a portion of Manas were still intact, but numbers of large fauna species were particularly low due to commercial poaching.

The Bureau recalled that the Committee and its Bureau had on numerous occasions expressed its concerns on the state of conservation of the site and requested the State Party to provide detailed information.

After considerable debate on possible actions to be taken, including initiating the delisting procedure and sending an expert mission to the site in conformity with paragraph 52 (d) of the Operational Guidelines, the Bureau recommended that the Committee adopt the following:

"The Committee expressed its serious concern about the conditions of the site and questioned whether the World Heritage values were still present. The Committee also regretted the limited response from the State Party to its repeated enquiries. The Committee requested the Director-General of UNESCO to transmit its concerns to the Indian authorities in the strongest terms possible and to stress the urgent need for a substantive state of conservation report from the States Party. The Committee also requested the future Chairperson to consult with the Indian authorities and to offer the possibilities of assistance which could be provided. The Committee decided that in the absence of any precise information, uncertainties remain concerning the state of conservation of the site, and that the Manas be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Air-et-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances and that a peace accord was signed in October 1994.

It felt however, that the situation was still unstable and that the authorities should be encouraged to undertake all efforts to re-establish the management regime.

The Bureau therefore recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee decided that the site should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger for another year and that the situation be reviewed at its twentieth session."

However, the Bureau recommended the Committee, before taking this decision, to give the Delegate of Niger the opportunity to provide new information on the situation at the site.

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that 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 World Heritage List in 1979 and that Federal State and local governments, as well as private foundations, had joined forces in providing significant financial support for the management of the site and its long-term restoration.

The World Heritage Centre presented a monitoring report, received from the State Party in November 1995, indicating that the rehabilitation of the Everglades ecosystem (restoration of water regime) would take 17 years at a cost of US\$ 2 billion. The Observer of the United States confirmed this long-term restoration project and said that the State Party would report when it considered it timely for the site to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau therefore recommended that the Committee adopt the following:

"The Committee concluded that the site remains seriously threatened and decided that it be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Virunga National Park (Zaire)

The Bureau recalled that Virunga National Park was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the last session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1994, due to the tragic events in Rwanda and the subsequent massive influx of refugees from that country. It noted that the site is seriously threatened by the uncontrolled arrival of refugees, causing deforestation and poaching at the site.

The Bureau took note of the reports provided both by the Secretariat and IUCN, as well as the responses received by the States Party (Ministry for the Environment) on the concerns raised by the Bureau at its last session. The Bureau took note that the European Union, the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) and UNHCR are currently carrying out projects mainly to strengthen the management of the site.

After considerable discussion about measures to be taken, including international campaigns, donor conferences and the coordination of international assistance activities, the Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee, taking into account the presence of thousands of refugees in and adjacent to Virunga, expresses its serious concerns about the continuing degradation of the Park and decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Centre to support the work of IGCP and other organizations and asked both the Centre and IUCN to continue to liaise with various donors and agencies. It requested the Centre to organize a mission to the site and asked that a report be provided to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Bureau."

A.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

The Bureau recalled that this mixed site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 and that the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1994, discussed reports received on logging operations in areas adjacent to the World Heritage area. It furthermore recalled that two concerns were raised: (a) that there is forested land outside the site which may have World Heritage values, and (b) that logging and roading activities adjacent to the site could have an adverse impact on the existing World Heritage site.

The Bureau noted that the national authorities have provided information to the effect that negotiations to alleviate possible impacts are still underway, and a report may be available in time for the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that substantial progress had been made with the negotiations and that studies will continue on the assessment of wilderness areas and on the World Heritage values of adjacent areas to the World Heritage site until mid-1997.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee, taking note of the action by the States Party to strengthen the protection of the site and that negotiations are still underway, requested the Centre to contact the State Party to obtain a report on the situation as soon as possible."

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recommended that the full report be presented to the Committee by the representatives of IUCN and IUCN's regional

Office and - before taking any decision - to give the Delegate of Ecuador the opportunity to provide information on the situation at the site.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)

The Bureau recalled that Yellowstone National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 and that it was the first National Park in the world. It furthermore recalled that it discussed the potential threats to Yellowstone at its last session in July 1995. The Bureau had requested a joint mission to the site to review the situation. The mission was carried out in September 1995 by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, representatives of the World Heritage Centre, and a representative of IUCN's Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA). An oral report was presented to the Bureau on the possible impacts of the proposed mine, if it were permitted and the other potential threats facing Yellowstone. It concluded that the site be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in conformity with paragraph 80 (i) and (ii) (b & d) of the Operational Guidelines.

The Representative of the United States noted that the Assistant Secretary of the Interior in a letter dated 27 June 1995 wrote "that the Committee should be informed that the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List is in danger." In a follow-up letter dated 1 December 1995, the Assistant Secretary provided an update on the situation. The Representative of the United States further noted that the State Party is taking a number of positive steps to address key issues. The National Environment Protection Act (NEPA) requires a thorough and detailed environmental impact study (EIS), of the Crown Butte/Norender Mine proposal.

At the moment nine possible alternatives are being considered. The EIS draft is expected in late January 1996 and further public and government review will last another year. He stated that the State Party does not consider action by the Committee to be an intervention in domestic law or policy. If the property is listed as in Danger, the State Party will keep the Committee fully informed with respect to actions to be taken. The State Party intends to demonstrate the proposed mine and other key issues including bison, the lake trout and Park roads and sewage have been thoroughly analysed, management plans developed as appropriate and corrective actions taken as necessary so that the property can be removed from the Danger List as soon as possible.

During the discussion it was noted that whether the State Party should grant a permit to the mining company or not is entirely a domestic decision of the State Party. It was further stated that there is no wording in the Convention or the Operational Guidelines which could lead to an interference in sovereignty. It was also noted that even if the State Party did not request action, the Committee still had an independent responsibility to take action based on the information it had gathered. The

Convention was referred to as an emergent tool to assist all States Parties in conservation.

After considerable discussion the Bureau recommended that the Committee adopt the following:

"On the basis of both ascertained dangers and potential dangers, the Committee recommends that Yellowstone National Park be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the Committee should request continuing reports on the results of the EIS and mitigating actions being taken to ensure in due course the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

The Bureau recalled that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1994 and took note of a report by IUCN. The report outlines two potential threats to the site: (a) a new port is to be developed in the Bay which would route large transport ships through the site and (b) a license for a large floating hotel at the site which would have further impacts on the heavy tourist pressures in the Bay.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the World Heritage Centre to contact the Vietnamese authorities for further information on the potential threats and the measures being taken to minimize them.

A.3 State of Conservation Reports not examined by the Bureau

Due to a shortage of time, the Bureau did not examine the reports of a number of natural World Heritage sites. The Committee was therefore requested to take note of the following state of conservation reports, which will be presented by the Secretariat and IUCN (document presented by IUCN on Monitoring of the State of Conservation of Natural World Heritage Properties) to the Committee at its nineteenth session:

Canadian Rocky Mountains Park (Canada)

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

Huascarán National Park (Peru)

Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)

Redwood National Park (United States of America)

For the following sites, no particular action seems necessary, therefore, the Committee may simply wish to take note of the information contained in working document WHC-95/203/5:

Komodo National Park (Indonesia)

Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

B. MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

B.1 Mixed Natural and Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

Willandra Lakes Region (Australia)

The Bureau at its eighteenth session recalled that it took note of the IUCN mission report to the site indicating problems with landowner residents, aboriginal concerns and delays in the preparation of a management plan, as well as a recommendation for a redefinition of the boundaries.

In their response of 29 September 1995, the national authorities advised the Centre of a proposed amendment to the boundary of Willandra Lakes Region based on a review of the boundaries which was carried out with the participation of scientists, local landholders and Aboriginal communities. Both IUCN and ICOMOS recommended that the boundaries be accepted according to the proposal presented by the authorities to gain credibility with regard to World Heritage values. IUCN underlined that the boundary review is part of a package of management and planning measures being developed for a sound future management of the site.

IUCN and ICOMOS both underlined that they agreed that the reduction in the size of the area would enhance and confirm the World Heritage values of the site and eliminate a number of areas that do not contain the values for which the site was listed.

The Bureau, having taken note of the fact that the new boundary will reduce the total area by about thirty percent, which would constitute a major change in relation to the original nomination, recommended that the Committee accept the revised boundaries, as they better define the area containing the World Heritage values and will considerably facilitate the management of the property.

C. CULTURAL HERITAGE

C.1 Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

Islamic Cairo (Egypt)

The Bureau recommends the Committee to examine the information contained in the working document and the oral report provided

by the Secretariat/advisory body. The Bureau recommends the Committee to adopt the following:

"The World Heritage Committee was informed to its great satisfaction of the successful efforts of the Egyptian authorities in ensuring the long-term safeguarding of the Pyramid fields from Giza to Dahshur as well as the quality of the restoration work undertaken for the al-Sinnari House and warmly congratulates them. However, the Committee regarded the renovation and reconstruction works which have destroyed the authenticity of the three Fatimid mosques of Al Aqmar, Al-Guyushi and Lu-lu-a, situated within the World Heritage site of Islamic Cairo, with grave concern. It drew the attention of the Egyptian authorities to Articles 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention by which States Parties should endeavour to ensure the protection and conservation of their heritage, and that this conservation should be carried out in accordance with international standards, such as the Charter of Venice, in order to ensure respect of authenticity. It also recalled Article 24(b) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention regarding the respect of authenticity of inscribed properties, and requested that, in the future, the authorities should conform to Article 58, inviting "States Parties to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention, major restorations or new constructions".

"It finally reminded the Egyptian authorities that UNESCO is always willing to provide, whenever necessary, international expert advice prior to any restoration work and those who are sent on a regular basis to the site, are at their entire disposal to provide advice whenever necessary."

Tyr (Lebanon)

The Bureau recommends the Committee to examine the information contained in the working document and the oral report provided by the Secretariat/advisory body. The Bureau recommends the Committee to adopt the following:

"The World Heritage Committee noted with satisfaction the letter dated 20 November 1995 from Mr. Michel Edde, Minister of Culture and Higher Education, stating the commitment of the Lebanese Government for the preservation of the site of Tyr. The Committee expressed, however, grave concern to the Lebanese authorities with regard to the land fill project in a part of the bay alongside the old port north of Tyr, in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage site of Tyr, for the construction of a tourist complex. This project would irremediably destroy the underwater archaeological heritage of this area and would be a major threat to the adjacent World Heritage site.

It reminded the Lebanese authorities of Article 58 of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention stipulating that: 'The World Heritage Committee invites the States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention, major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the world heritage value of the site is fully preserved.'

"It therefore requested the national authorities to halt this project until technical advice be provided by UNESCO following the expert mission which was undertaken in December 1995, as well as in the framework of the Campaign for the Safeguarding of Tyr, with regard to the impacts on the preservation of the world heritage values of the site inscribed on the List."

Medina of Fez (Morocco)

The Bureau recommends the Committee to examine the information contained in the working document and the oral report provided by the Secretariat/advisory body. The Bureau recommends the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee expressed its grave concern to the national authorities of Morocco concerning the road construction projects within the World Heritage site of the Medina of Fez, which still appear to be ongoing, as well as on the demolition which has already taken place at Aïn Azliten. It reminds them of the content of the Declaration of Fez, adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO at the end of its 146th session held in Fez on 3 and 4 June 1995, which emphasize that too many examples throughout the world have unfortunately shown that the brutal intrusion of the automobile has had an irretrievably destructive effect on the social and urban fabric of historic cities. It underlined that the pursuance of this type of brutal urban intervention constituted grave threats to the preservation of the characteristics for which the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. It requested them to immediately halt all further demolition and to prepare, if necessary with the assistance of international experts, an integrated project taking into consideration the different architectural, cultural, sociological, technical and financial aspects for the urban rehabilitation, and measuring the potential impacts on the multiple aspects of world heritage values in the Medina. Finally, it requested

the national authorities to keep them informed, through its Secretariat, before 1 April 1996, of the situation and the measures undertaken to ensure the long-term preservation of the cultural heritage in all its dimensions in the Medina of Fez."

C.2 State of Conservation Reports not examined by the Bureau

Due to time constraints the Bureau was unable to examine state of conservation reports on the following cultural World Heritage properties:

Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)
 Angkor (Cambodia)
 Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)
 Timbuktu (Mali)
 Bahla Fort (Oman)
 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)
 Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)

Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

Asia-Pacific Region

Borobudur (Indonesia)
 Meidan Emam of Isfahan (Iran)
 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)
 Taxila (Pakistan)
 Hue (VietNam)

Africa

Rock-hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia)
 Ihla de Mozambique (Mozambique)

Europe and North America

Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)
 Megalithic Temples (Malta)
 Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)
 Taos Pueblo (United States of America)
 Potsdam (Germany)

Latin America

Potosi (Bolivia)

Arab States

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)
 Memphis and its Necropolis- the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)
 Petra (Jordan)

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

In reference to the great number of state of conservation reports that were presented to this session of the Bureau, the Delegate of Germany referred to the discussions at the nineteenth session of the Bureau in July 1995. He recalled that the Bureau considered whether it would be desirable to create a consultative body as mentioned in Article 10.3 of the Convention for the examination of technical matters such as the state of conservation reports, the establishment of which would allow more States Parties to participate directly in the implementation of the Convention (paragraph VI.7 of the report). The Bureau decided to take this matter up at a later date.

VII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The Chairperson thanked the participants, Secretariat and interpreters for their constructive participation and collaboration in this meeting. The Director of the World Heritage Centre, on behalf of the participants, thanked Dr. Adul Wichiencharoen for the excellent manner in which he conducted the meeting.

The Chairperson then declared the session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee closed.

**PROVISIONAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE PROVISOIRE DES PARTICIPANTS**

I. BUREAU MEMBERS/MEMBRES DU BUREAU

CHINA/CHINE

Mr ZHAO Jianrong
Deputy Director
Division of Scenic Areas
Department of Rural & Urban Construction
Ministry of Construction of China

Mr CHENG Xiaolin
Chief of Division of General Policy
Culture and Communication
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

H.E. Mr Pablo Gabriel OBREGON
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Ms Isabel VERNAZA
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO
UNESCO House

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Ambassador Dr Horst WINKELMANN
Federal Foreign Office
BONN

Prof. Peter P. CANISIUS
President of the German National Commission for UNESCO
Europaring 46
D-51109 COLOGNE

Dr Hans CASPARY
Office for the Conservation of Historic Monuments
Landesamt für Denkmalspflege Rheinland-Pfalz
Göttelmannstrasse 17
D-55130 Mainz
Germany

Prof. Dr Harald PLACHTER
University of Marburg
Fachbereich Biologie
Karl-von-Frisch-Strasse
D-35032 MARBURG

Mr Heiner MODEL
Counsellor
Federal Foreign Office
BONN

Mr Thilo KOHLER
Counsellor
Federal Foreign Office (Referat 611-9)
Postfach 1148
D-53001 BONN

Mrs FRANK
Secretary
Federal Foreign Office
BONN

ITALY/ITALIE

S. Exc. M. Giancarlo LEO
Ambassadeur
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO
PARIS

M. Pasquala Bruno MALARA
Directeur des Biens Culturels
TURIN

Mme Margherita SABATINI
Direction générale des Relations culturelles
du Ministère des Affaires étrangères
ROME

SENEGAL

M. MBaye Bassine DIENG
Directeur du patrimoine historique
et ethnographique
B.P. 4001 DAKAR

THAILAND/THAÏLANDE

Dr Adul WICHENCHAROEN
Chairman
National Committee for Protection of the
World Cultural & Natural Heritage
Office of Environmental Policy & Planning
60/1 Phibulwattana, Rama VI Road
BANGKOK 10400

Ms Srinoi POVATONG
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Mr Weena SAKULTAB
Director
Public Education and Extension Division
Department of Environmental Quality Promotion
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment
114 soi Tibordee, Pracharas II
BANGKOK 10800

Mr Borvornvej RUNGRUJEE
Director, Ayutthaya Historical City Project
Fine Arts Department
Ministry of Education
Office Ayutthaya Province
BANGKOK 13000

Mr Tawee NOOTONG
Forest Technical Officer
Royal Forest Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives
Paholyothin Road
BANGKOK 10900

Mrs Usa KIATCHAIPAT
Secretariat Officer
National Committee for Protection of the World
Cultural and Natural Heritage
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment
Soi Pibunattana 7, Rama VI Road
BANGKOK 10400

II. ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY/ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF

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

Mr Henry CLEERE
World Heritage Co-ordinator
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

Mr Peter STOTT
ICOMOS-US
23, Bellevue Street
MEDFORD MA 02155
United States of America

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO
Assistant to the World Heritage Coordinator
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

Mr Niels GUTSCHON
ICOMOS
Germany

**THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)/UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE
(UICN)**

Mr James THORSELL
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage
Rue Mauverney, 28
CH-1196 GLAND
Switzerland

Mr Bing LUCAS
Vice-Chair, World Heritage,
Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA)
1/268 Main Road, Tawa,
WELLINGTON
New Zealand 6006

III. OBSERVERS

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Dr David KAY
Assistant Secretary
World Heritage and Biodiversity Branch
Department of the Environment and Territories
CANBERRA

CANADA

Ms Christina CAMERON
Director General
National Historic Sites
Department of Canadian Heritage
25, Eddy Street
OTTAWA (Ontario)
K1A 0H3

Ms Gisèle CANTIN
Chief, International Affairs
Parcs Canada
25, Eddy Street
OTTAWA (Ontario)
J8V IG6

Mr Murray McCOMB
Park Planner
Parcs Canada
25, Eddy Street
OTTAWA (Ontario)
K1A 0H3

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Mr János JELEN
Hungarian MFA

JAPAN/JAPON

Mr Yasufumi SAKITANI
Director-General
Cultural Properties, Protection Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO 100

Mr Akio KAWATO
Deputy Director-General
Cultural Affairs Department
TOKYO

Mr Kazunobu ASADA
Deputy Director
Monuments and Sites Division
Agency for Cultural Affairs
Shinjuku-ku 3-1-2
TOKYO

Mr Makoto MOTONAKA
Senior Specialist of Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Properties
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO 100

Ms Nobuko INABA
Senior Specialist of Cultural Properties
Agency for Cultural Properties
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO 100

Ms Tobuko NABESHIMA
Third Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO
UNESCO House

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr Robert MILNE
Special Adviser, Office of International Affairs
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
P.O. Box 37127
WASHINGTON D.C. 20240

IV. SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bernd von DROSTE
Director/Directeur
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Daniel de SAN
Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs/
Office des Normes internationales et des Affaires juridiques
UNESCO

Ms Breda PAVLIC
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Minja YANG
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Harold EIDSVIK
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr Herman van HOOFF
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial

Ms Maria PERERS
World Heritage Centre/Centre du patrimoine mondial