

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
Eighth session

Paris, 4-7 June 1984

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I INTRODUCTION

1. The eighth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris from 4 to 7 June 1984 and was attended by Mme. L. Vlad-Borrelli (Italy), Chairman; Mr. S. A. Kerzabi (Algeria), Mr. E.G. Whitlam (Australia), Mr. Y. Diare (Guinea), Mr. Tschudi-Madsen (Norway), Mr. B. de Silva (Sri Lanka), Vice-Chairmen and Mr. A. da Silva Telles (Brazil) as Rapporteur. Four other States Parties to the Convention were represented by observers. Representatives of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants is found in Annex 1 to this report.

2. Mme. Vlad-Borrelli, Chairman of the Committee, opened the meeting and Mr. Makaminan Makagiansar, Assistant Director-General for Culture, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director-General. He noted that there were now 82 States Parties and that the Secretariat made every effort to encourage

adhesion to the Convention and stimulate contributions to the World Heritage Fund. He recalled the need for countries to submit tentative lists of cultural and natural properties in order to facilitate the technical evaluations by both ICOMOS and IUCN. In this respect, he thanked ICOMOS for the progress it had made, in developing such tentative lists, and also congratulated Mr. M. Parent on his reelection as President of ICOMOS.

3. The Bureau then adopted the agenda for the session.

4. Mr. Batisse, Assistant Director-General (Science Sector), reported on the activities undertaken since the 7th session of the Committee, held in December 1983 in Florence, Italy. Since then, four more countries had ratified or accepted the Convention, namely Mexico, Yemen, the United Kingdom and Zambia. Although the total of 82 States Parties represented half the States Members of Unesco, Mr. Batisse pointed out that the geographical representation was still unbalanced, particularly in Asia, and that the World Heritage Fund was far from able to comply with the growing number of requests for assistance from States Parties. In this connection, he drew attention to the rather alarming state of the World Heritage Fund, which was expected to be of the order of \$330,000 for 1985, compared to almost \$2 million some two years previously. This situation was due to an initial accumulation of capital at the beginning of the operational phase of the Convention after which a number of voluntary contributions had ceased, combined with an increasing number of requests for international cooperation under the Fund. He indicated the necessity of making the maximum amount of savings in the budget approved by the Committee for 1984. Finally, he emphasised the importance of promotional activities destined to bring in other sources of income to the World Heritage Fund.

5. Mr. Batisse briefly listed the small-scale technical cooperation projects and training activities which had been approved by the Chairman since December 1983. He finally noted that with the increase in States Parties, the workload of the Secretariat had also increased both for the cultural and natural aspects of the Convention's implementation.

II TENTATIVE LISTS

6. The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the progress made in elaborating tentative lists of cultural properties. Lists from the Hachemite Kingdom of Jordan and Libyan Arab Jamahiriya were added to those submitted as at the 7th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brazil, Canada, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Pakistan and United States of America). Furthermore, seven States Parties were currently revising their tentative lists of cultural properties, namely Bulgaria, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain and Turkey. Norway and Portugal had announced that the

preparation of such lists was underway, and the Peruvian authorities had informed the Secretariat that they were about to do so. Finally, Switzerland had indicated, as had Yugoslavia on a previous occasion, that the nominations submitted in 1983 were considered as the first, priority part of its tentative list.

7. At the beginning of 1984, the Secretariat had informed all States Parties that ICOMOS and the Committee urgently needed tentative lists from all States Parties that had not already prepared such list and that these should be sent to the Secretariat during 1984. In spite of this reminder, only 16 States Parties out of 82 had as yet submitted or begun to elaborate tentative lists. This indicates that this task presents difficulties for many countries and that the granting of preparatory assistance should be envisaged for this purpose.

8. The work begun in 1983 in order to harmonise the tentative lists of some European countries has made good progress due to a meeting organised by ICOMOS on 10 to 11 April 1984 in Paris, attended by the following countries: Bulgaria, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey. M. Parent, President of ICOMOS, reported on this meeting and its conclusions. This meeting made it possible to replace the original approach, which differed from one country to another and reflected a specifically national vision of tentative lists, by a new method where properties are selected according to their representativity in relation to historic and thematic categories which transcend national frontiers. This procedure implies that countries would eventually desist from nominating certain cultural properties when other countries have properties which represent better the category concerned. The meeting also worked on defining some of the themes or periods which are of relevance to European countries and the tentative lists for the countries present at this meeting were examined in this sense. Through this work, the outline of a common list for part of Europe, made up of complementary national tentative lists of the countries concerned, was already taking shape. The participants intend to complete the revision of the tentative lists for their countries in time for the next session of the Committee.

9. Mr. Parent explained that the idea was to pursue this work at "two paces", that is to draw up a common priority list containing properties whose representativity is obvious as well as additional national lists of properties which could be eventually considered at a later stage. The properties included in the priority list would be considered as being recommended in principle by ICOMOS with the obvious condition that, in the one hand, good nomination dossiers would be presented by the countries concerned and, on the other hand, that these properties were efficiently protected. An ICOMOS

report on this meeting will be presented to the Committee at its next session. The Secretariat emphasised that similar efforts of harmonising tentative lists would also have to be undertaken in other regions. For the two meetings of the European countries, all the States Parties concerned had covered the costs of the attendance of their representatives. Contacts had already been made with the Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science (ALECSO) in order to organise jointly a similar type of meeting for arab countries. In the subsequent discussion, it was emphasised that it was in the interest of all States Parties to rapidly present their tentative list in order to ensure a balanced geographical distribution of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

10. The Secretariat indicated that with respect to natural properties, tentative lists had been submitted so far only by Brazil, Canada, Italy (preliminary list) and the United States. It was furthermore recalled that IUCN had prepared a publication on the "World's Greatest Natural Areas" to illustrate the types of properties that might be considered to be of World Heritage quality. It was emphasised that this international inventory was a preliminary list, that it was by no means exhaustive nor did it anticipate any decision of the Committee concerning natural nominations. The Bureau recommended States Parties to consult this document to prepare their tentative lists of natural properties. Attention was drawn however to the need to also consider properties such as rich fossil sites or harmonious man-made landscapes, as well as mixed cultural-natural sites which were not included in the IUCN World Inventory.

11. In referring to paragraph 18 of the report of the 7th session of the Committee, Mr. Whitlam noted that although the submission of tentative lists of cultural properties had been requested before the end of 1984 in order to consider new nominations in 1985, the report implied that this was not the case for natural properties and he did not recall that such a decision had been taken. Mr. Batisse pointed out that the discussion on this point had initially concentrated on cultural properties and that the final sentence in paragraph 18 had been added when finalising the report with the Rapporteur, in order to reflect the discussion on this paragraph at the time of the adoption of the draft report on the last day of the session, when it was stressed that an effort should also be made for natural properties.

III NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

12. Thirty-nine nominations were examined by the Bureau, eleven of which concerned essentially natural properties, and one a mixed natural/cultural property. Twenty-seven properties were recommended to the Committee for inscription on the World Heritage List: these are listed in section A hereafter. The Bureau recommended that a further five nominations be deferred: these are listed in section B, and that another eight properties should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Section D indicates that two nominations are still to be examined by the Bureau before the eighth session of the Committee. Finally, the Bureau took note that nomination No. 305, Serra da Arrabida Natural Park, had been withdrawn by the Portuguese authorities.

13. The Bureau made the following recommendations to the Committee:

A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>The Castles of Augustusburg and Falkenlust at Bruhl</u>	288	Federal Republic of Germany	C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau invited the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany to study ways of reducing the visual impact of the railway line which crosses this area.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------

<u>Ruins of the Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis</u>	291	Argentina	C (iv)
---	-----	-----------	--------

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe either San Ignacio Mini alone or the ruins of the four missions described in the Argentinian nomination as a group. The Bureau stressed that this nomination is part of the series of the Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis and might be jointly inscribed along with the Ruins of Sao Miguel das Missoes in Brazil and certain missions located in Paraguay, once the latter country had adhered to the Convention.

<u>Iguazu National Park</u>	303	Argentina	N (iii)(iv)
-----------------------------	-----	-----------	-------------

The Bureau noted the importance of proposals to extend the park boundaries particularly to incorporate the Iguazu National Reserve and to complete the comprehensive management plan for the area. The Bureau furthermore encouraged the Brazilian authorities to nominate the contiguous Iguazu National Park for a joint inscription on the World Heritage List.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------

The Historic Mosque City of Bagerhat

321

Bangladesh

C (iv)

The Bureau noticed that this site was threatened by the plan to widen the Khulna highway which passes close by the mosques of Shait-Gumbad and Singar. It therefore recommends that the Committee requests the Government to: (1) study the possibility of altering the route of this highway and (2) to elaborate a conservation and management plan along the lines of the conclusions of the Unesco mission which took place in 1983.

Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur

322

Bangladesh

C (i)(ii)
(vi)

The Bureau recommended that the Government applies the measures which were proposed for this site by the same Unesco mission, particularly to avoid the installation of industries in the proximity of the monastery.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Canadian Rockies</u> <p>The Bureau noted that this nomination includes the Burgess Shale site, inscribed on the World Heritage List under natural criterion (i). The Bureau requested the Canadian authorities to consider adding Mt. Robson, Mt. Assiniboine, Kananaskis, Fortress and Cummins Lakes and a large portion of the Columbia icefield to the nominated area. The Bureau furthermore invited the Canadian authorities to continue to ensure that urbanization and heavy tourism did not jeopardise the natural integrity of the site.</p>	304	Canada	N (ii)(iii)
<u>Port, fortresses and group of monuments, Cartagena</u>	285	Colombia	C (iv)(vi)
<u>The Mosque of Córdoba</u>	313	Spain	C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)
<u>The Alhambra and the Generalife, Granada</u>	314	Spain	C (i)(iii)(iv)

The Bureau wished to draw the Spanish authorities' attention to the importance of a perimeter of protection which was wide enough to prevent the surrounding area from being degraded, particularly by an increase in the number of parking lots.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>The Cathedral, Burgos</u>	316	Spain	C (ii)(iv)(vi)
<u>Monastery and site of the Escorial, Madrid</u>	318	Spain	C (i)(ii)(vi)
<p>The Bureau wished to draw the Spanish authorities' attention to the importance of strictly protecting the natural environment which is indissociable from this monument.</p>			
<u>Architectural works of Gaudí (Parque Guell, Palacio Guell, Casa Milá), Barcelona</u>	320	Spain	C (i)(ii)(vi)
<p>The Bureau furthermore felt that the other works of Gaudi, even though not inscribed on the World Heritage List, should receive the best protection possible.</p>			
<u>The Statue of Liberty</u>	307	United States of America	C (i)(vi)
<u>Yosemite National Park</u>	308	United States of America	N (i)(ii)(iii)
<p>The Bureau, in noting outstanding natural features of this site, also remarked that it presented certain important cultural features which however were not specific to this site and thereby did not warrant recommendation as a mixed "natural/cultural" property. The Bureau expressed its concern over the possible impact of proposed dam sites in the proximity of this property and requested that the Committee be kept informed of any developments in this respect.</p>			

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>The Sun Temple, Konarak</u>	246	India	C (i)(iii)(vi)
<u>Group of monuments at Mahabalipuram</u>	249	India	C (i)(ii)(iii)(vi)
<u>Prehistoric Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus</u>	287	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C (iii)
<p>The Bureau recommended the inscription on the World Heritage List of the rock art sites of Tadrart Acacus situated approximately in latitude between 24° 30' and 27° North and, in longitude, between the Algero-Libyan border and 11° East. The Bureau expressed the wish that the protection of this site be coordinated with that of the analogous site of Tassili N'Ajjer in Algeria and that at a later stage these two properties be jointly inscribed on the World Heritage List.</p>			
<u>Anjar</u>	293	Lebanon	C (iii)(iv)
<u>Baalbek</u>	294	Lebanon	C (i)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property on the condition that the Government accepts the perimeter of protection proposed by ICOMOS. This nomination could be extended in the future so as to protect a larger area in the Bekaa Valley.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Byblos</u> The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on the condition that the Government defines a wide area of protection, encompassing, besides the ancient habitat, the medieval City within the walls and the areas of the necropoles.	295	Lebanon	C (iii)(iv)(vi)
<u>Sidon</u> The Bureau recommended that this nomination be modified by the government in order to restrict it to the sanctuary of Echmun, which is recommended for inscription.	297	Lebanon	C (iii)
<u>Tyr</u> The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on the condition that the Government accepts the perimeter of protection of the two zones defined by ICOMOS. In addition, the Bureau suggested that the committee invites the Government to adopt the measures proposed by ICOMOS in order to better protect the property.	299	Lebanon	C (iii)(vi)

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Lake Malawi National Park</u>	289	Malawi	N (ii)(iii) (iv)
<p>The Bureau recommended that the Malawi authorities take the following measures to enhance the integrity of this property (a) officially adopt and implement the management plan that had already been prepared for the Park, taking the necessary measures to provide alternative sources of firewood outside the National Park, (b) continue research on the Park's natural resources, and (c) consider extending the area of the National Park and of other protected parts of the lake.</p>			
<u>Royal Chitwan National Park</u>	284	Nepal	N (ii)(iii) (iv)
<p>The Bureau noted and supported the efforts of the Nepalese authorities to extend this Park to the west. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee be kept informed on the possible construction of pulp mills on the Narayani River and their potential impact on this property.</p>			
<u>Vatican City</u>	286	Holy See	C (i)(ii) (iv)(vi)

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>N^o</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with the</u> <u>Convention</u>
<u>Chaco Canyon Historic National Park</u>	353	United States of America

The Bureau examined this nomination in the light of the ICOMOS evaluation. The originality of the Chaco group with regard to the Anasazi culture (already represented on the World Heritage List by the site of Mesa Verde) resides mainly in the importance given to the road system. The Bureau regretted that the present boundaries of the site nominated for inscription did not include the major roadways and therefore was of the opinion that it would be premature to take a decision on the inscription of this site, before having received from the American government precise details about the possibility of enlarging the area to be inscribed.

<u>Glacier National Park</u>	354	United States of America
------------------------------	-----	--------------------------

The Bureau noted that this national park possessed a certain number of important natural features but that similar features were already well represented in other parks already inscribed on the list. The Bureau felt, however, that joint nomination with the contiguous Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada would give an added dimension to this nomination, on the precedent set by the Kluane National Park and Wrangell/St. Elias National Monument. This park does not appear on Canada's tentative list, but the Canadian authorities informed the Secretariat that they would be prepared to add it to the list with a view to a joint nomination.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Salonga National Park</u>	280	Zaire	N (ii)(iii)

The Bureau noted with concern that there is no management plan for this property and recommended that the accompanying request for technical cooperation be examined by the Committee in the light of the need for the Zaire authorities to prepare and implement such a plan, with due regard to the possibility of creating a corridor linking the two sectors of this National Park.

<u>Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas</u>	302	Zimbabwe	N (ii)(iii) (iv)
--	-----	----------	---------------------

The Bureau requested to be kept informed by the Zimbabwean authorities of the possible construction of a new dam on the Zambezi and Mapata Gorge. The Bureau furthermore welcomed the recent adhesion of Zambia to the World Heritage Convention and requested the Zambian authorities to consider nominating the property contiguous to Mana Pools National Park on the Zambian side of the Zambezi River in order to eventually constitute a joint inscription on the World Heritage List.

B. Nominations to be deferred

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--

<u>Khajuraho group of monuments</u>	241	India
-------------------------------------	-----	-------

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until the Government presents a larger area for nomination which encompasses the entire property after effective protective measures have been adopted, in particular after the definition of a wide zone non aedificandi.

<u>Group of monuments at Hampi</u>	241	India
------------------------------------	-----	-------

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until the Government defines a perimeter which ensures the protection of the whole site and not only its western part. The Government's attention is drawn to the dangers pointed out by ICOMOS.

<u>Fatehpur Sikri Group of Monuments</u>	255	India
--	-----	-------

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until the Government presents a larger area for nomination comprising the whole area intra muros of the ancient city. This site should be protected particularly from the dangers of new quarrying.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--

<u>Upemba National Park</u>	282	Zaire
-----------------------------	-----	-------

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until IUCN had received more information to re-evaluate this site.

<u>The Matobo Hills</u>	306	Zimbabwe
-------------------------	-----	----------

The Bureau noted that the nomination dossier lacked justifications for inscription on the World Heritage List, but had been evaluated by both ICOMOS and IUCN. In the light of ICOMOS's positive evaluation of the rock art of this site, the Bureau requested the Zimbabwean authorities to re-submit this nomination defining the cultural and natural criteria justifying this nomination.

C. Nominations not to be considered for inclusion in the World Heritage List

<u>National Archaeological Park of Guayabo de Turrialba</u>	106	Costa Rica
---	-----	------------

In its current state, this site did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. A new nomination could be presented in the event that the excavations (which will no doubt need to be continued for a considerable time) produce results of exceptional universal interest.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--

<u>Archaeological Site of the of Ptolemais (Tolmeita)</u>	301	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
---	-----	------------------------

The Bureau, while taking account of the great importance of this site for the Libyan national heritage, felt that it did not fulfil the criteria of "outstanding universal value" as understood by the World Heritage Committee.

<u>Tripoli</u>	298	Lebanon
----------------	-----	---------

The Bureau asked to draw the Government's attention to the fact that urbanisation and factory pollution were threatening this site which, although it does not fulfil the World Heritage criteria, is of great value in the Lebanese national Heritage.

<u>Deir el-Qamar and Beit Ed-Dine</u>	296	Lebanon
---------------------------------------	-----	---------

The Bureau, while taking account of the great importance of this site for the Lebanese national heritage, felt that it did not fulfil the criteria of "outstanding universal value" as understood by the World Heritage Committee.

<u>Nyika National Park</u>	290	Malawi
----------------------------	-----	--------

Although this property does not fulfil the World Heritage criteria of outstanding universal value, the Bureau however noted the importance of this property on the national and regional levels.

<u>Name of property</u>	<u>Ident. No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>
-------------------------	-------------------	--

Rani Kot Fort (Kirthar National Park

176 Pakistan

The Bureau, while taking account of the great importance of this site for the Pakistani national heritage, felt that it did not fulfil the criteria of "outstanding universal value" as understood by the World Heritage Committee.

Maiko National Park

281 Zaire

The Bureau noted that the natural features of this property were well represented in other World Heritage properties and that the criterion of integrity was not fulfilled. Although this property does not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List, the Bureau recommended that the Zaire authorities take all the necessary steps to safeguard this highly valuable site which constitutes one of the largest tracts of primary forest remaining in Africa.

Kundelungu National Park

283 Zaire

This park did not meet World Heritage criteria and its integrity was in doubt. The Bureau however recommended that the Zairois authorities be encouraged to strengthen the protection of this very important park.

D. Properties not examined by the Bureau

14. ICOMOS recalled that the Committee at its seventh session had requested that it examine the general problem of inscribing historic towns on the World Heritage List and propose appropriate criteria. As ICOMOS was awaiting the conclusions of a forthcoming experts meeting on this subject, it therefore had not evaluated the nominations concerning the Historic Centre of the City of Salvador in Brazil (Id. n° 309) and the Historic Area of the City of Quebec in Canada (Id. n° 300). The Bureau proposed that ICOMOS should analyse these two nominations after the meeting. The Bureau decided to meet at the beginning of the 8th session of the World Heritage Committee to examine the criteria presented by ICOMOS as well as the two nominations in the event that ICOMOS had been able to evaluate them. The Bureau would then be able to address its recommendations thereon to the Committee.

IV NOMINATIONS TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

15. The Secretariat presented document SC/84/CONF.001/4 referring to three natural World Heritage properties for which the Committee had requested the Secretariat to initiate the procedure for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

16. The Bureau noted that the Zaire government had officially requested that Garamba National Park (N° 136) be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to the critical situation of the white rhinoceros population, considered to amount to less than 20 individuals. It was recalled that the Committee, at its 7th session, had granted \$40,000 for emergency assistance for this property. The Bureau took note of IUCN's technical evaluation in which it was indicated that although Garamba National Park still fulfilled criterion (ii) under the Convention, it would no longer fulfill criterion (iv) (constituting habitats of endangered species) in the event that the rhinoceros population were completely exterminated. Taking account of the IUCN recommendation and noting that all the conditions set out in the Operational Guidelines (paragraph 46) had been met, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

17. The Bureau noted that the Director-General of Unesco had written to the Senegalese authorities in April 1984 to initiate the procedure of nominating Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (N° 25) for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger but that at the present time, no reply had been received. IUCN, reporting on the conservation status of this site, indicated that if the proposed protective measures were not taken soon, the ecological conditions would be irreversibly changed and the site would no longer possess the natural

characteristics which warranted its inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau expressed its grave concern over the future of this property and requested the Secretariat to contact the Senegalese authorities again, not only concerning its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger but also to explore possible sources of funding for the costly protective measures required to safeguard this site.

18. The Director-General of Unesco had also written to the Tanzanian authorities in April 1984 to initiate the procedure for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger of Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Nº 39). No reply had yet been received but the Bureau noted that IUCN confirmed the serious management problems which faced the Ngorongoro Conservation Area and its region. It was recalled that the World Heritage Fund had contributed \$31,950 towards the preparation of a management plan for this property but that due to various circumstances, including a change in the Conservator, this draft management plan had not been adopted. However, the Bureau noted that the assistance required for the safeguarding of Ngorongoro Conservation Area was now far beyond the capacity of the World Heritage Fund, and that it would be necessary to launch an integrated rural development project for the whole of the North Tanzanian region. In this respect, IUCN indicated that discussions were in progress with the funding agencies of the Nordic countries to elaborate a project of this kind. The Bureau expressed the wish that the World Heritage Fund be associated even in a very modest way with such a project and requested the Secretariat to continue efforts to initiate the procedure for nominating this property for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

19. Reference was made to ICOMOS' remarks on the status of the Lebanese sites which have suffered and will perhaps again be victim of the current armed conflict. ICOMOS felt that after the Lebanese sites which had been recommended by the Bureau had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, they might also be nominated for the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with the procedure set out to this effect.

20. IUCN recalled that it had been requested by the Committee at its 7th session to keep the Bureau and the Committee informed on the conservation status of natural World Heritage properties. IUCN reported to the Bureau on the following three natural properties under particular threat:

a) Simen National Park (Ethiopia)(No. 9)

IUCN reported that the National Park personnel had abandoned this park due to civil unrest and that the area was now in the hands of armed groups. IUCN expected to receive more information in the near future but pointed out that this property is extremely fragile and will probably be seriously damaged. This was all the more regrettable as the management

plan which was prepared with support from the World Heritage Fund had been recently completed and adopted by the Ethiopian authorities.

b) Mount Nimba (Guinea and Ivory Coast)(No. 155)

A workshop supported by the World Heritage Fund to establish a research programme and an integrated management plan for this property had taken place at Mount Nimba in December 1983. No progress had been made on such a plan however, and the report of the workshop indicated that the property is now under severe pressure from poaching to the extent that almost half the wildlife has disappeared. This situation is exacerbated by the lack of personnel and surveillance patrols.

c) Tai National Park (Ivory Coast)(No. 195)

IUCN recalled that the problems indicated in their evaluation of 1982 had become worse. The site is continually invaded for poaching of wildlife, gold prospecting and tree-felling. IUCN indicated that if these practices continued unchecked in the next 5 to 10 year period, Tai National Park would lose its outstanding natural features and would have to be deleted from the World Heritage List. The Secretariat recalled that the Division of Ecological Sciences had excellent relations with the Ivory Coast authorities under the Man and Biosphere (MAB) Programme for which a meeting was to be held in Yamoussoukro in August 1984, with a field trip to Tai National Park. All efforts would be taken to explore the means of safeguarding this property.

21. The Bureau noted with concern the threats facing these three natural properties and the difficulty of drawing up appropriate solutions. IUCN was requested to prepare a document on the conservation status of these three sites for the attention of the Committee at its next session.

22. The Chairman informed the Bureau of a letter which the Permanent Delegate of Saudi Arabia had sent to her on behalf of the Arab group of Unesco. This letter drew attention to a recent attack on the Haram al-Sharif sanctuary and the threat of such acts to the Old City of Jerusalem. It requested that the Committee be informed of this situation. The Bureau decided that this letter should be brought to the attention of the Committee, which, during its eighth session, would review the protection of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

23. The Secretariat presented the Bureau with the financial statements for contributions to the World Heritage Fund as at 31 January 1984, the state of the Fund as at 1st May 1984 and the state of the budget adopted for 1984 by the Committee

at its seventh session as at 11 May 1984.

24. The Bureau expressed its concern over the budgetary provision for 1985 which, even if supplemented by the voluntary contributions which were expected during the course of 1984, would be considerably less than the amount considered in 1983.

25. Concerning these voluntary contributions, it was recalled that Article 16, paragraph 4 of the Convention stipulates that these contributions "...shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should not be less than the contributions which they (States Parties having opted for voluntary contributions) should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article." (ie. mandatory contributions amounting to 1% of the annual contribution of States Parties to Unesco). The Bureau recommended that the States Parties which had opted for voluntary contributions be reminded of their moral obligation to pay at least 1%, for in the spirit in which the Convention had been drafted, it was the intention that such States Parties pay more than this amount. It was suggested therefore that the statement on voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund to be presented to the Committee at its 8th session should contain a column indicating the amount corresponding to the 1% contribution for the States Parties concerned.

26. In order to further reduce the difference between the budget for 1984 and that envisaged for 1985, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to make savings, wherever possible, on the 1984 budget, amounting to some \$50,000.

27. In the light of the considerations above, the Bureau foresaw, at that stage, a budget amounting to \$450,000 for 1985, and recommended that this be broken down as follows:

I	Preparatory assistance and regional studies	\$30,000
II	Technical cooperation	100,000
III	Training	100,000
IV	Emergency assistance	30,000
V	Promotional activities and information	40,000
VI	ICOMOS/IUCN advisory services	80,000
VII	Temporary assistance to the Secretariat	<u>70,000</u>
		450,000
		=====

28. In the event that there were an increase in income which would allow consideration of a higher figure for the budget, the Bureau recommended that priority should be given to increase the provisions for training activities and for the services of IUCN and ICOMOS, which were highly appreciated.

29. The Bureau noted ICCROM's report on the provision of small-scale equipment and conservation materials to States Parties, for which \$20,000 had been allocated from the World Heritage Fund. This programme was considered very useful and practical. The Bureau therefore recommended that a similar sum be provided if possible for 1985 to enable ICCROM to continue this programme.

VI REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

30. The Secretariat presented the requests for technical cooperation which had been received by the 1st March 1984 deadline for properties which were already inscribed on the World Heritage List or had been recommended by the Bureau for inscription thereon at its present session. It was noted that the total of the amounts requested for technical cooperation and of their training components were two to three times greater than the expected budgetary provisions. It was therefore necessary to contact the States Parties concerned to request them to reduce their requests to a more modest amount and to indicate their priority needs. The Bureau also recognised that it would be impossible to meet all requests adequately. In this connection, the Bureau recalled that the Committee had already drawn up an order of priorities for the granting of international assistance, which was presented in paragraph 80 of the Operational Guidelines (WHC/2 Revised January 1984). Priority was given particularly to emergency measures to save World Heritage properties and to projects which were likely to have a "multiplier effect". The Bureau recognised the need for equitably distributing the modest World Heritage Fund and recommended that the Committee also favourably consider requests from countries which had not yet benefited from international assistance under the Fund.

31. The Bureau regretted the decrease in the amounts of the World Heritage Fund which limited its impact, particularly in the field. This would decrease the visibility of the Convention and thereby the support from those involved in the protection of the World Heritage properties themselves. In this connection, the Bureau encouraged the Secretariat, in cooperation with ICOMOS and IUCN, to seek where possible other sources of funding to synergetically support World Heritage technical cooperation projects. As regards training, the Bureau recommended that maximum use be made of the fellowship programmes and training facilities offered by many States Parties.

VII REVIEW OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

32. Document SC-84/CONF.001/7 was presented to the Bureau by the Secretariat. It was recalled that these activities were carried out in accordance with the Committee's decisions at its 7th session and that priority was being given to public information and activities designed to generate revenue to the World Heritage Fund. The Secretariat drew particular attention to the documents being prepared in cooperation with the Spanish publishing house, INCAFO. The sales of the book "El Patrimonio del Mundo", of which the first volume had been presented to the Committee in 1983, had been successful and the first payment of profits going to the World Heritage Fund, amounting to \$1200 had been made in March 1984. The mock-up of the colour folding poster was presented to and approved by the Bureau. This poster would be printed in English, French and Spanish and would be available for wide distribution as from November. As concerned the World Heritage Exhibit, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Spanish authorities had recently approved their support of this activity and it was envisaged that the first of the three copies, consisting of some 170 panels each in three languages, would be ready for the IUCN General Assembly meeting in Madrid in November 1984. A second copy would be mounted in Buenos Aires during the 8th session of the Committee, to be thereafter circulated throughout Argentina. The third copy would be used by Unesco in Paris and at its regional offices. Further progress had been made with the World Heritage Guide and the periodicals which were destined for sale in particular in European countries.

33. The Bureau agreed that these activities were very useful, particularly at a time when the Convention needed all possible support at the governmental and private levels. Use should be made of all media and in particular television which lends itself admirably to presenting cultural and natural heritage to the general public. In this respect, ICOMOS informed the Bureau of the meeting on "Patrimoine et média" (Heritage and the Media) organised by the French section of ICOMOS on 21-22 June 1984 in Paris, at which specialists in audio-visual programmes, and notably several television companies, would be present.

34. The Bureau also underlined once more the importance of private voluntary associations in heightening the public's awareness on the Convention and its activities, as well as in generating income to the World Heritage Fund. Such associations needed to be provided with high quality documentation on the Convention and the properties on the World Heritage List and in this connection, the Secretariat recalled that States Parties were requested to provide all possible photographic and audio-visual material on World Heritage properties - with the appropriate copyright for commercial and non-commercial use - for the preparation of Unesco-supported documents on the Convention.

35. ICOMOS informed the Bureau that a French World Heritage Committee had just been established. This committee, which grouped the mayors of all the localities at which World Heritage properties were situated, intended to initiate a "twinning" system between World Heritage sites in different countries. The Bureau greatly welcomed the creation of this French committee.

VIII PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

36. The Bureau noted that the dates for the eighth session were now 29 October-2 November 1984 and adopted the following provisional agenda:

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Election of Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur
4. Report of the representative of the Director-General on activities undertaken since the seventh session of the World Heritage Committee
5. Report on the eighth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Paris, 4-7 June 1984)
6. Tentative lists of cultural and natural properties received since the seventh Ordinary Session of the Committee
7. Nominations to the World Heritage List and to the List of World Heritage in Danger
8. Statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund and budget for 1985
9. Requests for technical cooperation
10. Protection and management of properties included on the World Heritage List.
11. Review of promotional activities and promotion of voluntary associations.
12. Date and place of 9th ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee
13. Other business
14. Closure of the session

37. It was recalled that the Bureau had to meet prior to the Committee session to examine the criteria concerning historic cities and to make recommendations on nominations Nos. 300 and 309. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to organise, in cooperation with the Argentinian authorities, such a meeting of the Bureau at an appropriate time in Buenos-Aires.

IX OTHER BUSINESS

38. The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the forthcoming First World Conference on Cultural Parks, organised by the National Parks Service of the United States at Mesa Verde, 16-21 September 1984. About ten participants from developing countries were to attend with support from the World Heritage Fund and the Director of the National Parks Service had requested whether mention could be made of the World Heritage Committee as a sponsor of this Conference on the conference documents. The Bureau welcomed this initiative to make the Convention and Unesco's efforts in heritage conservation better known and accepted that the Conference documents indicate sponsorship by the Unesco World Heritage Committee.

39. The Bureau noted that the Australian authorities had requested that the judgement of the High Court regarding Western Tasmania National Parks be brought to the attention of the Committee in order to inform interested State Parties having a similar federal system of government and to help States Parties in the implementation of conventions in general. The Bureau invited the Australian authorities to prepare a brief, clear commentary of this judgement which could be presented to the Committee under item 10 of the provisional agenda.

40. The Secretariat informed the Bureau of invitations so far received for holding the 9th session of the World Heritage Committee from Cyprus and from Turkey. The Bureau recalled that the decision on the venue of the 9th session would be taken by the Committee at its forthcoming 8th session.

41. On behalf of the Bureau, the representative of Australia thanked Mme Vlad-Borrelli for the elegance and skill with which she had conducted the session of the Bureau. After thanking all participants, the Chairman closed the meeting.

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL /
BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Huitième session / Eighth session

Paris, 4-7 juin 1984

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

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

ALGERIE/ALGERIA

M. Sid Ahmed KERZABI
Directeur de l'Office du Parc National du Tassili

M. Sid Ahmed BAGHLI
Ministre plénipotentiaire, Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

H.E. The Honourable E.G. WHITLAM
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. David MACINTYRE
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

BRESIL/BRAZIL

M. Augusto Carlos DA SILVA TELLES
Directeur au Sous-Secrétariat du Patrimoine Historique et Artistique national

M. Carlos Alberto LOPES ASFORA
Deuxième secrétaire d'Ambassade, membre de la Délégation
permanente auprès de l'Unesco

GUINEE/GUINEA

M. Youssouf DIARE
Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

ITALIE/ITALY

Mme. Licia VLAD-BORRELLI
Inspecteur central pour l'archéologie

NORVEGE/NORWAY

Mr. Stephan TSCHUDI-MADSEN
Directeur des Monuments historiques

Ms. Oda Helen SLETNES
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

SRI LANKA

H. E. Mr. Bandu DE SILVA
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
of Sri Lanka to France

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

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

M. Michel PARENT
Président

M. Jorge GAZANEO
Délégué général aux finances

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE
Professeur à l'Université de Paris I

Mme. Delphine LAPEYRE
Directrice du secrétariat international

UNION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE ET DE SES RESSOURCES (UICN) /
INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL SITES (IUCN)

Mr. James THORSELL
Executive Officer, CNPPA

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION ET LA RESTAURATION DES BIENS
CULTURELS (ICCROM) / INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND
THE RESTORATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY (ICCROM)

M. Jean TARALON

III. ETATS PARTIES PRESENTS EN TANT QU'OBSERVATEURS/STATES PARTIES ATTENDING AS OBSERVER

CANADA

Mr. Bruce LEESON
Special Advisor, Parks Canada

CHYPRE/CYPRUS

H. E. Mr. Constantinos LEVENTIS
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. Christos CASSIMATIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

INDE/INDIA

H. E. Mr. Inam RAHMAN
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Ms. Banashri BOSE
Deuxième Secrétaire

JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE/LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Mr. Abdul-Hamid ZOUBI
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

IV. SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO/UNESCO SECRETARIAT

M. Makaminan MAKAGIANSAR
Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture

M. Michel BATISSE
Sous-Directeur général
(Secteur des Sciences)

M. Bernd VON DROSTE
Directeur p.i.
Division des Sciences écologiques

Mme. Anne RAIDL
Chef, Section des Normes internationales
Division du Patrimoine culturel

Mme. Jane ROBERTSON-VERNHEES
Division des Sciences écologiques

M. Richard BILL
Consultant
Division des Sciences écologiques

M. François-Bernard HUGHES
Consultant
Division du Patrimoine culturel