

Distribution: limited

CC-90/CONF.003/12  
PARIS, 7 September 1990

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD  
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Fourteenth Session

Unesco Headquarters  
(Paris, 11-14 June 1990)

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The fourteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris from 11 to 14 June 1990. The following Bureau members attended: Mr A. Beschouch (Tunisia), Chairman; Ms C. Cameron (Canada), Rapporteur; and representatives of Bulgaria, Colombia, Greece, Senegal and Thailand, Vice-Chairmen.

2. Representatives of the following States Parties to the Convention attended the meeting of the Bureau as observers: Bolivia, Dominican Republic, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

## II. OPENING MEETING

4. The representative of the Director-General, Mr Henri Lopes, Assistant Director-General for Culture and Communication, welcomed the members of the Bureau, the observers and the representatives of international organizations, pointing out the important role which those organizations played in the application of the Convention. He reported that the Mongolian People's Republic had become one of the 111 States that had signed the Convention and welcomed that new State Party. He went on to say that if the world's natural and cultural heritage was to be safeguarded, people had to be mobilized in thought and deed along the lines traced out by the Convention. At a time when measures to safeguard the monuments of humanity were on the increase and when the major 1992 United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development was under preparation, the World Heritage Convention was bound to assume growing importance as it linked closely together two fields to which the ethics of conservation were equally applicable. Mr Lopes also mentioned the need to monitor the state of conservation of the properties on the World Heritage List, stressing both the importance and the difficulty of the World Heritage Committee's task in that regard. He urged the members of the Bureau to look into the serious questions to do with cultural pluralism, reconciling the requirements of growth and conservation in historic centres, and respect for the environment. He also noted that the twentieth anniversary of the Convention, in 1992, would be celebrated against the backdrop of an extraordinary series of events - Year I for Europe, the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development, the Universal Exhibition, the Five-Hundredth Anniversary of the Encounter between Two Worlds and the fourth World Congress on National Parks - to which the Convention was related not only through its philosophy but also through the spirit of international solidarity which it embodied and the ethical concerns to which it afforded a means of practical expression. In conclusion, Mr Lopes hoped that by 1992 many other States would have swelled the ranks of States Parties to the Convention and wished the members of the Bureau a successful meeting.

5. The Bureau adopted its agenda with two amendments.

III. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

6. The Secretary for the fourteenth ordinary session of the Bureau, Ms J. Robertson Vernhes, reported on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last session of the Committee held at Unesco from 11 to 15 December 1989 and briefly introduced some of the items on the agenda of the Bureau's meeting. She pointed out that though the Republic of Mongolia had become the 112th country to ratify the Convention, the total number of States Parties to the Convention remained at 111 because of the recent unification of two States Parties (Yemen and Democratic Yemen). She then highlighted the fact that monitoring the state of conservation of world heritage properties was becoming an increasingly important concern for the Bureau and the Committee and briefly introduced the documents on this topic prepared for the Bureau. For the global study the Bureau noted that this item would be presented orally.

7. Ms Robertson reported to the Bureau that a small expert group meeting would be needed to revise the global indicative list of potential geological world heritage sites (including fossil sites) already compiled in consultation with the International Union of Geological Sciences. However, she remarked that this meeting could only be organized early next year since the experts were not available at an earlier date. The Bureau noted that all international assistance projects approved by the Committee at its last session were now being implemented. Examples were given of projects approved by the Chairman of the Committee since the last session and whose implementation were also now in progress. The Bureau noted that the revisions of all the application forms for requesting international assistance, and for nominating properties to the World Heritage List had been completed and that the forms were now being circulated to States Parties. The attention of the Bureau was drawn to the fact that several promotional activities undertaken since the last session of the Committee, as well as preparatory work undertaken in relation to the commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention in 1992 were to be addressed under separate items of the provisional agenda.

8. Ms Robertson reported to the Bureau that the Permanent Delegate of Australia had requested the Secretariat, via his letter of 26 March 1989, to make an amendment to the text describing the decision of the Committee to inscribe the Tasmanian Wilderness on the World Heritage List, as it had appeared in the report of the last session of the Committee. This amendment would appear in the report of the Rapporteur of this present session of the Bureau.

9. Finally, the Secretary informed the Bureau that it had been necessary to change the dates decided for the fourteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, which had been proposed for 26-30 November 1990 in Banff (Canada) at the generous invitation of the Canadian authorities. These dates clashed with the dates of the IUCN General Assembly in Perth (Australia) and other dates convenient for all participants needed to be found.

10. The Bureau thanked the Secretary for this report. It regretted, however, that the senior staff members responsible for the implementation of the cultural and natural parts of the Convention had been called away from Headquarters on mission at the time of the opening of the session and hoped that they would join the Bureau in its work as soon as possible.

IV. MONITORING THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES AND RELATED TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

A. Natural sites

11. The Bureau examined document CC-90/CONF.003/3 and noted specific actions taken by the Secretariat and progress achieved in respect of 13 natural or mixed sites examined by the Committee at its last session. The Bureau was satisfied to note that some States Parties (e.g. Tunisia in the case of Ichkeul National Park) had taken the necessary steps to mitigate threats faced by natural heritage properties within their territories. In other cases the Bureau reconsidered the state of conservation of the properties in the light of further information provided by the Secretariat as well as the representatives of IUCN and States Parties.

12. A representative of IUCN highlighted the increasing time and resources allocated by IUCN in monitoring the state of conservation of natural and mixed world heritage sites during the last few years. He informed the Bureau that the Protected Area Data Unit (PADU) at the World Conservation Monitoring Centres, Cambridge, United Kingdom, had updated files of all but 13 of the natural and mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. This directory of data files, a copy of which was available for consultation by the Bureau, would be an important reference document for the Committee, the Secretariat and IUCN and would provide a valuable basis for monitoring the conservation state of natural and mixed properties included in the World Heritage List.

13. The representatives of IUCN circulated an information document on the state of conservation of 11 sites, including four on which the Secretariat had also submitted brief progress reports as part of document CC-90/CONF.003/3. The Bureau discussed problems facing the conservation of the following sites, requesting the Secretariat to take a series of follow-up actions in each case.

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

14. The Bureau noted that, following the distribution of the report of the thirteenth session of the Committee, the Secretariat had received advice by the Australian authorities that, although it was not strictly correct to say that legislation had been passed to revoke all mining rights within the World Heritage site, they guaranteed that no activity would take place which might threaten the world heritage values of the Tasmanian Wilderness.

La Amistad/Talamanca (Costa Rica)

15. The Bureau noted the need to review the original boundaries of this site. Several Indian Reserves, included in the original nomination had since then been degraded by coal mining and road construction projects and were not being managed for conservation objectives. The lack of definition of conservation areas had resulted in a native resident, who attempted to prevent illegal hunting, being recently shot and killed. The Bureau recommended that the Chairman contact the Costa Rican authorities to express condolences to the affected family on behalf of the Committee. The Bureau also requested the Costa Rican authorities to contact IUCN to define the boundaries of the World Heritage portion of the site excluding areas which were not of outstanding universal value. Furthermore, the Bureau suggested that if the La Amistad National Park of Panama, nominated by Panama in 1989, is inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1990, then the Costa Rican authorities co-operate with their counterparts in Panama in proposing the listing of this transborder park as a single site.

Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

16. The Bureau noted that the Chairman had approved US \$7,500 under preparatory assistance for drawing up a technical co-operation project for buffer zone development which could benefit local people resident around this park. In the meantime, however, the Bureau was concerned about reports of heavy commercial poaching in the area, particularly on Maxwell's duikers. The Bureau was informed that a meeting is scheduled to be held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, on 27 June 1990, with Unesco, UNDP and several national agencies, at which proposals for launching a pilot project for the conservation of this site would be discussed. Depending on the outcome of this meeting the Bureau requested that the Secretariat contact the Ivoirian authorities to encourage them to nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Galapagos (Ecuador)

17. The Bureau was specifically concerned with the capturing of about 40,000 sharks, using locally captured sea-lions as baits, in the marine waters surrounding the Galapagos world heritage site. Although the capture of sharks had been temporarily halted following protests from international agencies, the effectiveness of the ban was uncertain. The Bureau recalled that preparatory assistance from the World Heritage Fund had been provided in 1987 for nominating the marine areas surrounding the Galapagos National Park for inclusion as part of the world heritage site but noted that no such nomination has thus far been received by the Committee. The Bureau was also concerned that the number of tourists using the area is 100 per cent greater than the estimated carrying capacity for the area and is likely to continue to increase. The Bureau noted that the Chairman of the Committee had approved US \$14,000 during April 1990 for a technical co-operation project to study the problem of excessive frequentation of this site by tourists. The Bureau recommended that the Secretariat request the Ecuadorian authorities to (a) extend the boundaries of the world heritage site to include the surrounding marine areas; and (b) submit a technical report on the study of over-visiting of the site for the consideration of the Committee at its fourteenth session in December 1990.

Olympic National Park (United States)

18. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that, as requested by the Committee at the time of the inscription of this site in 1981, the American authorities had completed amendments to the legislation and added a coastal strip and a number of offshore rocks and islands to the park. The Bureau commended the American authorities for their effective implementation of the recommendations of the Committee and requested that the extensions to the park be formally proposed for inclusion in the World Heritage List. The Bureau, however, noted with concern the negative impacts of the 'Nestucca Oil Spill' which had occurred 90 km from the park's coastal zone and expressed the wish that the American authorities be prepared for similar events in the future with contingency plans to mitigate their negative impacts.

Mont Saint Michel and its Bay (France)

19. The IUCN Regional Councillor for Europe informed the Bureau that the series of measures to prevent the increasing siltation of the Bay, as announced by President Mitterrand in 1983, had not yet been taken. The salt marshes were currently encroaching upon the Bay at a rate of 30 ha per year which, according to previous studies, could mean that Mont Saint Michel would no longer be an island by the end of 1991, thereby degrading the natural setting of the cultural monuments of Mont Saint Michel. In addition, the authorities responsible for the development of the region, namely the two departments and the townships on the coastline, which were not all included in

the area included in the List, did not always perceive the natural and cultural values of this site. In consequence, there were increasing threats of activities which were incompatible with the maintenance of its integrity such as the construction of pig farms and large-scale amusement parks.

20. The Bureau accordingly requested the Secretariat to contact the French authorities in order to remind them of their national obligation under the Convention to ensure the protection of the natural and cultural values of the site, which included not only the Mount but also the Bay.

21. In particular, the Bureau expressed the wish that the necessary technical measures to halt siltation be taken to maintain the insularity of the site and furthermore recommended that the boundaries of the inscribed area be re-examined to include the townships along the coastline in order to create a peripheral area where only activities compatible with the world heritage state of the site would be permitted. Finally, the Bureau noted with satisfaction the invitation extended to Unesco, ICOMOS and IUCN by the observer from France to participate in a round-table meeting on 26 June 1990 at which all the partners concerned with the conservation of Mont Saint Michel and its Bay would be present to study the various technical operations required to safeguard the site. The Bureau expressed the wish that this complex matter be also studied by international experts and requested the French authorities to report back to the Committee on the results of that meeting and on all the measures that had been planned to meet its concerns.

#### Mount Nimba (Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire)

22. The Bureau recalled that at the time of the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List in 1981, the Committee was aware of the pending threat to exploit the rich iron ore deposit situated in the northern part of the Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve in Guinea. A project now existed which was of great interest to the steel industry for Europe, Japan and the United States, and which was to be financed essentially by mining consortia from France, Japan and the United States. It would involve the extension of an existing railway from the Liberian side of Mount Nimba, the construction of a moving pavement to transport the ore from the summits of the northern part of Mount Nimba and an open cast mine with a surface area of some 200 ha. The World Bank, which was also involved in the financial support of the project, was conscious of the world heritage status of the site and had drawn up terms of reference for an environmental impact assessment. IUCN, on its part, had refused to take the leadership of this assessment since the mining activity would obviously seriously jeopardize the integrity of the natural ecosystems for which this site was included in the World Heritage List. The Bureau was further informed of the recent launching, at the request of the Guinean Government, of a Unesco/UNDP project aimed at studying the ecosystems of the site in view of improving protection and management. It was certain that the data collected from this study could provide a basis for an environmental impact assessment.

23. The Bureau was informed that following a private visit of the French mining company concerned, the Secretariat had addressed a letter dated 8 June 1990 to the Permanent Delegate of France to Unesco informing him of the situation and recalling France's obligation under Article 6.3 of the Convention to avoid taking any measures which would damage a world heritage site located in another State Party. A similar letter had been addressed on 8 June 1990 to the Permanent Delegate for Guinea, recalling the responsibility of Guinea to protect its world heritage site.

24. The observer from France informed the Committee that he would take up this matter with the competent authorities in his country. The Bureau expressed its concern over this threat which clearly highlighted the economic factors involved in safeguarding world heritage properties. The Bureau,

conscious of the fact that the Guinean Government would in fact receive relatively little income from the exploitation of the iron ore of Mount Nimba (as had been indicated by the World Bank at the time of the last Committee session), requested the Secretariat to contact the Guinean authorities as well as the other States Parties concerned, to ask them to forgo this project in the light of their obligations under the World Heritage Convention, and to review the economic consequences.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

25. The Bureau recalled that this site had been invaded by people belonging to the Bodo tribe about a year ago and was concerned to note that the reserve was still occupied and that illegal removal of vegetation and poaching of animals continued. The local staff also seemed to have abandoned the park. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to continue its efforts to obtain a report on the state of conservation of this site from the Indian authorities before the forthcoming session of the World Heritage Committee. On the basis of the information received the Committee may wish to recommend that the Indian authorities nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)

26. The Bureau was informed that a US \$30 million irrigation project, to be implemented with the assistance of a Japanese company and the Asian Development Bank, could divert about 75 per cent of the waters of the Rapti River which forms the northern boundary of the park and that no study on the environmental impact of this irrigation project had so far been undertaken. The Bureau recalled that a sum of US \$80,000 had been provided during 1988-1989 from the World Heritage Fund for this site and was concerned whether the implementation of these projects was effectively ensuring the conservation of this national park. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to (a) contact the Nepalese authorities as well as the Asian Development Bank to express its concerns regarding the negative impacts which the proposed irrigation project could have on the integrity of this site; (b) seek necessary clarifications about the implementation of world heritage technical co-operation projects; and (c) encourage the State Party to nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Manovo-Gounda Saint Floris National Park (Central African Republic)

27. The Bureau recalled that when this site was entered on the World Heritage List at the twelfth session of the Committee, in Brasilia (Brazil), in December 1988, the Committee had noted that the integrity of the site was under serious threat but had definite prospects of rapid amelioration through the implementation of a 10-year project costing US \$27 million to be financed by EEC. Hence, the Committee, at its twelfth session requested IUCN to monitor progress in the implementation of the EEC project and report on the extent to which the protection of the integrity of this site had improved. The Bureau was deeply concerned to note that despite the availability of EEC funds and the expressed commitment of the Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting, Fishing and Tourism to improve the state of conservation of this site, project implementation had been very slow and heavy commercial poaching and conflicts between local people and a commercial hunting operator continued to threaten the park. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting, Fishing and Tourism to register its concern and encourage it to explore ways and means of accelerating the implementation of a management scheme for the park and arrest any further decline in the values for which this park had been included in the World Heritage List.

Niokola Koba National Park (Senegal)

28. The Bureau recalled that during 1989, both the Bureau and the Committee had expressed concern regarding the proposed construction of a major highway, based on an existing track, across the park, which could greatly jeopardize its natural values. Following the Committee session in December, President Diouf of Senegal had written to the Director-General of Unesco assuring Senegal's commitment to safeguarding the natural heritage of this site. The representative of Senegal informed the Bureau that since President Diouf's letter, a decree had been promulgated creating a technical committee which would undertake a comparative ecological and socio-economic study of the proposed route across the park and of the alternative route to the north outside the park boundaries (which had been recently marked out by the national park service). The terms of reference and the list of members of this technical committee had been drawn up. The Bureau welcomed the invitation of the representative of Senegal that Unesco and IUCN should send representatives to a meeting in July 1990 in Dakar to launch the comparative study. The Bureau requested that the Unesco and IUCN representatives at this meeting ensure that the Committee's concerns were taken into account and eventually help identify potential funding sources for the additional costs of the route outside the park.

Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)

29. The Bureau was concerned that the site was being degraded by unregulated tourism and water pollution and hence requested the Secretariat to contact the Turkish authorities and request them to (a) declare this site a national park as soon as possible, as the Committee had recommended at the time of its being listed in 1988; and (b) host a national workshop for discussing the various threats faced by this site in order to develop a management plan for the site.

30. The Bureau also noted information pertaining to the state of conservation of Hawaiian Volcanoes National Park (United States), Canadian Rockies National Park (Canada), Keoladeo National Park (India), Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia), Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) and Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada).

31. The Bureau noted that for most of the sites, the reported threats to integrity originated from national agencies with interests other than conservation. The Bureau therefore encouraged States Parties to ensure greater inter-agency co-ordination to ensure the conservation of sites. The Bureau stressed that the impacts of tourism, particularly nature-tourism, needed special attention. The Bureau also requested that the Secretariat and IUCN should continuously monitor international assistance provided from the World Heritage Fund to ensure that funds are used for the most urgent conservation needs of world heritage sites.

B. Cultural properties

32. After considering document CC-90/CONF.003/2, which had been prepared for it, the Bureau, endorsing the Secretariat's views, noted that the system of sending information update forms on the state of conservation of cultural properties entered on the World Heritage List did not allow the Committee to perform its monitoring role to the full, that is, to see to it that the integrity of sites included in the List was respected. Several members of the Bureau and some observers believed, however, that such monitoring was one of the Committee's most important tasks, failing which the mere inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List would cease to have any point.

33. It was acknowledged that replies to the questionnaires sometimes provided valuable information - for example on recent archaeological finds, the completion of restoration operations, new publications on sites or the



extension of buffer zones through government acquisition of land. However, most of the replies received, which were often elliptical in nature, provided no information on vital questions such as the difficulties encountered in maintaining the integrity of the environment or a change in the use to which a site was being put, as in the establishment of site museums which tended to supplant the site itself, or the problems created by tourism and over-frequented sites, which led to the development of hotel facilities, parking lots, etc.

34. In an effort to clarify the objectives of monitoring, one member of the Bureau said that monitoring was by no means an inspection activity but a form of basic assistance whose purpose was to detect site problems in time or prevent them from happening. The co-ordinator of the regional project for the preservation of the cultural heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean said that monitoring should be made an integral part of international assistance, especially through the use of pre-project assistance to make diagnostic studies of sites and to prepare such technical co-operation projects as might prove necessary. Emergency assistance procedures could also be used; for example, experts could be sent to a site to identify hazards and to propose safeguarding measures. The co-ordinator for Latin America said that he was prepared to co-operate in whatever way was best in the implementation of such a site monitoring system in Latin America and the Caribbean.

35. Several delegates stressed the need to define the basic principles which should govern the effective implementation of the system for monitoring cultural properties. The representative of ICGROM said that there was an urgent need to clarify the concepts of conservation and monitoring. He said that theory and practice in the field of conservation should be more closely matched, pointing out that there were 'operational guidelines' for the management of cultural properties, including the conservation of ruins, which had been drawn up at a joint ICOMOS-ICGROM-Unesco meeting. He believed that those guidelines, which were close to being finalized, could serve as a good starting-point for a practical line of approach to the monitoring system. He also stressed that training programmes in conservation were important as they could be instrumental in the development of a highly useful common language.

36. The special problem of urban centres was raised and the point was made that basic problems such as urban poverty were responsible for the degeneration of urban centres. The seminar on the conservation of historic centres scheduled to take place in Quito in November 1990 and the conference on world heritage cities planned in Quebec in July 1991 would no doubt be occasions for the formulation of guidelines for the conservation of this type of property.

37. Lastly, several members suggested that provision might be made for striking a property off the World Heritage List if it were found that there were changes in its state of conservation and that the cultural values and authentic qualities on the basis of which it had been included in the List had not been maintained.

#### CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE MONITORING OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES

38. First of all, the Bureau recommended that the Committee send out a third series of questionnaires in 1991, as it considered that the information contained in the replies to the first two series had been useful in the updating of technical files on cultural sites.

39. The Bureau also recommended that two measures be taken on an experimental basis in order to keep the Committee better informed of the state of conservation of sites. Firstly, it asked ICOMOS to submit to the Committee at

its next session a report on the lines of the IUCN reports on natural sites, describing the state of conservation of sites where problems had come to its attention. Secondly, it requested the Secretariat to report to the Committee at its next session on the missions that were to be carried out during the coming months by experts sent by Unesco to endangered sites.

40. The Bureau also asked ICCROM to provide its members with copies of the operational guidelines for the management of cultural properties as soon as the guidelines were finalized. At its fifteenth session in 1991 the Bureau might wish to recommend that those guidelines be adopted by the World Heritage Committee so that they could be used by States Parties to the Convention in their conservation work.

41. Lastly, the Bureau recommended that the Committee encourage States Parties to the Convention to establish in all countries national committees for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Such national committees, made up of both representatives of government agencies and independent experts specializing in the protection of the heritage, would no doubt prove very useful in the development of the monitoring system.

42. At its thirteenth session, in December 1989, the Committee had expressed concern regarding the felling of trees in the park of Versailles Palace. The French observer informed the Bureau that, since that time, violent storms had devastated the park, bringing down more than 1,200 trees which, most fortunately, had not damaged in their fall any of the sculptures or buildings. The French observer added that the administration of both the park and the buildings at Versailles was now under the responsibility of a single department, which, together with all the other parties concerned, was giving serious thought to ways of repairing the damage and restoring the estate without spoiling the historical and aesthetic character of Versailles; the aim was to devise a management plan that would be satisfactory to all those concerned.

43. In the course of its fourteenth session the Bureau was informed of the Italian authorities' decision not to confirm the proposal to have Venice selected as the site of the Universal Exhibition for the year 2000. The members of the Bureau welcomed the news and expressed great satisfaction at the decisive role played by the Committee in that regard.

44. One member of the Bureau expressed concern about the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley monuments. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that assistance had been granted as a matter of urgency to the Nepalese authorities so that they could carry out the necessary conservation works, which had already been started. The Bureau asked for a report to be made to it on that site in December, in the context of the monitoring report.

45. One member of the Bureau expressed concern regarding the project for the development of the Pyramids Plateau in Egypt, which included the building of a great wall between the archaeological area and a village settlement and the fitting out of an open-air 'Son et Lumière' theatre. The Bureau shared the concern expressed that the construction works might endanger that unique site; it therefore asked the Secretary to send a letter to the Egyptian Minister of Culture drawing his attention to the need to preserve the integrity of that site, which had been included in the World Heritage List. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee keep itself informed of developments and take a firm stand against any project that might be detrimental to the site. Finally, the Bureau asked that all relevant reports received by the Secretariat should be brought to the attention of the Committee in December.

## V. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

46. The Bureau examined document CC-90/CONF.003/5 containing requests for technical co-operation to be financed from the World Heritage Fund.

47. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve a request for technical assistance submitted by Yugoslavia for the purchase of computer and photographic equipment and equipment for the restoration of the mural paintings of the Monastery of Studenica, at a total cost of US \$51,000. Concerning that same site, the Bureau asked the Yugoslav authorities to give it their formal assurance that the project to build a dam near the monastery had been abandoned.

48. The Bureau considered a request by the United Republic of Tanzania for the purchase of a Land Rover and radio equipment at a cost of US \$49,782 for use at the archaeological and palaeontological site of Olduvai in the Ngorongoro conservation area. The Bureau agreed in principle to make a favourable recommendation to the Committee concerning that request. However, before finalizing its recommendation, the Bureau asked the Tanzanian authorities to provide it with information, in time for it to be considered before the next session of the Committee, concerning the comprehensive plan to safeguard and develop the palaeontological site of Olduvai and concerning the purposes for which the requested vehicle would be used in the context of the comprehensive development plan. In addition, the Bureau asked that it be informed of any funds that might be granted by other international institutions or organizations specifically for the conservation of the Olduvai site.

## VI. SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

49. The Secretary introduced document CC-90/CONF.003/6 giving the status of the mandatory and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund and of the budget approved by the Committee at its thirteenth session for 1990, as at 15 May 1990.

50. As concerns mandatory contributions for the previous financial periods, the Bureau noted that the amounts outstanding were about the same as at the time of the last Committee session, with, for example, some \$200,000 still to be paid by States Parties for the period 1988-1989. As was often the case at the beginning of a biennium, very few mandatory contributions had yet been made for the period 1990-1991. The Bureau noted also that as at 15 May 1990, no voluntary contributions had yet been made to the Fund. The United States, by letter dated 18 December 1989, had informed the Secretariat of its pledge to pay the sum of \$200,000 as its voluntary contribution to the Fund for 1990.

51. The Bureau was informed that a non-State Party, Austria, had paid the sum of 204,000 Austrian schillings to the Fund, i.e. about \$17,000.

52. The Secretary reported on the use of the budget approved by the Committee at its last session and updated the figures for the amounts approved or already spent for international assistance projects and promotion, for which approximately 50 per cent of the allocations approved by the Committee had been used up. The Bureau noted that the budget also included the provisions made by the Committee for the global study (\$50,000) and for the travel of experts from less developed countries which were members of the Committee (Tanzania and Yemen).

53. The Bureau thanked the Secretariat for this information. It requested that in future, if at all possible, the document on the World Heritage Fund be

distributed to the Bureau before the meeting to allow Bureau members to study it in detail. Also, the Bureau suggested that the Secretariat send out another series of reminder letters to States Parties urging them to pay their contributions regularly and in full in order for the Committee to be able to plan its operations effectively, in accordance with Article 16.4 of the Convention.

VII. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

54. The Bureau considered 33 proposals for the inclusion of cultural properties and natural sites in the World Heritage List. It recommended that 11 properties be included and that one property not be considered for the List; it referred seven files back to the nominating States Parties pending receipt of further information/documentation and deferred consideration of 12 nominations. Furthermore, evaluations were not available with respect to two properties.

A. Properties recommended for inclusion in the World Heritage List

Name of property	Identification No.	Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Mount Huangshan	547	People's Republic of China	N(iii)(iv) C(ii)

The Bureau recommended that this site be included in the List and wished to commend the three levels of government responsible for the management of the site for their co-operative efforts in addressing the problems caused by intense recreational use. The Bureau encouraged the Chinese authorities to implement the management plan which had been drawn up and which aims at reducing excessive human impacts on the natural scenery. As concerns the cultural heritage, the Bureau requested the Chinese authorities to provide, if possible in time for the fourteenth session of the Committee, a list of the cultural monuments within this site.

Delos	530	Greece	C(ii)(iii) (iv)(vi)
Monasteries Daphni, Hossios Luckas and Nea Moni of Chios	537	Greece	C(i)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that these properties be included in the List and that the Greek authorities continue to take all necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of these properties and their environment.

Tsingy de Bemaraha Strict Nature Reserve	494 Rev	Madagascar	N(iii)(iv)
---	---------	------------	------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be listed. It noted IUCN's report on the current lack of infrastructure to properly manage and protect the integrity of this site and was glad to learn of the recent launching of a three-year Unesco/UNDP project aimed at preparing a management plan and building up the capacity of the Malagasy authorities to safeguard this site. The funds -

\$1.2 million - were being provided by another State Party, the Federal Republic of Germany, which thereby was fulfilling its responsibility under the Convention to protect the heritage of another State Party. The project aimed also at making Tsingy de Bemahara part of a larger biosphere reserve which would address the needs of local populations, and which came within the framework of an overall Unesco/UNDP project on biosphere reserves in Madagascar, supported by the Federal Republic of Germany with assistance from Canada and France. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to prepare a progress report with the Malagasy authorities on this project, with particular attention to the measures taken to ensure the integrity of the site, to be submitted to the Committee for its next session.

South-west New Zealand (Te Wahiponamu)	551	New Zealand	N(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
---	-----	-------------	-----------------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be entered on the List. It noted that the nomination included two existing world heritage sites, i.e. Westland/Mount Cook National Parks and the Fiordland National Park, both listed in 1986. The New Zealand authorities had nominated an additional 1.2 million ha of land between the two sites, thereby doubling the size of the listed area. The Bureau also noted the strong protective measures taken by the New Zealand authorities, particularly the cancellation of all logging and mining rights in the entire nominated area. The Bureau recommended that the area to be entered exclude the seven small outliers in the vicinity of the town of Te Anau. It also suggested that the New Zealand authorities undertake a public awareness campaign for local people in the area on the meaning of the world heritage and propose a more descriptive name for this site.

La Amistad	552	Panama	N(ii)(iv)
------------	-----	--------	-----------

The Bureau recalled that when the Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves of Costa Rica were included in the World Heritage List in 1983 the Committee expressed the wish that the contiguous La Amistad National Park of Panama be also nominated and hence was satisfied to note that the Panamanian authorities had taken necessary action to implement the decision of the Committee.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee enter La Amistad National Park of Panama on the World Heritage List and request the Panamanian authorities to redefine the boundaries of the nomination to exclude the Volcan Baru National Park. The Bureau suggested that the Committee request the Panamanian authorities to allocate significantly more resources to the management authority (RENARE) and to adopt the 'Regional Strategy for Sustainable Development for Bocas del Toro' as a general framework to guide international support for the park. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee encourage the Costa Rican and Panamanian authorities to take necessary action so that it may be included as a single site in the World Heritage List. In this regard, the Bureau noted that in 1979 the Presidents of Costa Rica and Panama had already signed an agreement to recognize this site as an international friendship park.

Palaces and Gardens of Potsdam	532	German Democratic Republic	C(i)(ii) (iv)
-----------------------------------	-----	----------------------------------	------------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and noted with satisfaction the intention expressed by the Governments of the Federal

Republic of Germany and of the German Democratic Republic to submit a joint nomination concerning the entire site of Potsdam-Sanssouci.

Leningrad	540	USSR	C(i)(ii) (iv)(vi)
-----------	-----	------	----------------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and that the Soviet authorities reinforce control over the development of polluting industries and ensure a better balance between industrial and listed areas.

Itchan Kala	543	USSR	C(iii)(iv)(v)
-------------	-----	------	---------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and that the Soviet authorities safeguard a large buffer-zone corresponding to the area of Dichan-Kala, and respect very strict urban standards to the north of Itchan-Kala, in the area corresponding to the new urban centre of Khiva, where buildings of an excessive height have already been constructed.

Kizhi Pogost	544	USSR	C(i)(iv)(v)
--------------	-----	------	-------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and that the responsible authorities maintain the present balance between the natural and built environment. Adding homes or wooden churches to the southern end of the island of Kizhi would alter the historical and visual characteristics of the site.

Moscow Kremlin ensemble and Red Square	545	USSR	C(i)(ii)(iii) (iv)(vi)
---	-----	------	---------------------------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and expressed the wish to receive from the Soviet authorities further details on alterations, either completed or planned, to the interiors of palaces not open to the public.

B. Property which the Bureau did not recommend for inclusion in the World Heritage List

Dresden (Baroque ensemble)	533	German Democratic Republic
-------------------------------	-----	----------------------------

Although the Bureau recognized the importance of this property for the cultural heritage of the German Democratic Republic, it considered that this site did not meet the criteria for entry on the World Heritage List, as defined for the purpose of implementing the Convention.

C. Properties for which nominations have been referred back to the nominating States for further information/documentation

Jesuit Missions of the Chiquitos	529	Bolivia
-------------------------------------	-----	---------

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List on condition that the Bolivian authorities provide assurances as to the adequate protection of the environment of the six properties nominated, before the next session of the Committee.

Historic Centre of                    550                    Italy  
San Gimignano

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the List and requested the Italian authorities to provide, before the next session of the Committee, assurances concerning the global conservation plan of the city and the safeguarding of the surrounding landscape. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the Italian authorities continue to combat the effects of increased tourism.

Rio Abiseo                            548                    Peru  
National Park

The Bureau recommended that this property be entered under natural criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) and under cultural criterion (iii), and requested the Peruvian authorities to provide, before the next session of the Committee, additional information concerning the archaeological sites included in the nominated area. Furthermore, the Bureau expressed the wish that the representative of IUCN visit the site in the near future to monitor its development and to report thereon to the Committee.

Saint Sophia                         527                    Ukrainian SSR  
Cathedral of Kiev

The Bureau recommended that this property be included in the World Heritage List. It suggested, however, that the Ukrainian authorities draw up a nomination concerning not only Cathedral Saint Sophia, but also the Kïev-Pechersk Lavra, and submit this overall file, showing the complementarity of the two properties, before the next session of the Committee.

State Reserve of                    528                    Ukrainian SSR  
Kievo Pechersk in Kiev  
(see Saint Sophia  
Cathedral of Kiev)

Vilnius                                541                    USSR

The Bureau referred this file back to the Soviet authorities to provide, before the next session of the Committee, additional information on the town planning schemes which exist in the immediate vicinity of the historic centre, until such time as ICOMOS has provided an additional evaluation of this property.

Old Nissa                             542                    USSR

The Bureau referred this file back to the Soviet authorities with the request that they provide, before the next session of the Committee, additional information on the archaeological and historical data concerning Nissa, and indicate clearly, with the support of maps, the boundaries of the area nominated to the World Heritage List as well as the measures for its protection.

D. Deferred nominations

Maulbronn Monastery                546                    Federal Republic of Germany

The Bureau recommended that examination of this nomination be deferred until the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany have included in the present nomination all the parts outside the enclosure that are representative of the activities engaged in on the estate and, in particular, the fisheries and hydraulic works. The Bureau also expressed the wish that a global study highlight the most significant monuments of Cistercian architecture.

Lorsch Monastery                      515 Rev.                      Federal Republic of Germany

The Bureau noted the progress made in examining this file as a result of the latest information provided by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany. However, it wished to obtain additional information on the protection extended to the area situated to the north of the Nibelungenstrasse, and confirmation of the exact boundaries of the site nominated to the World Heritage List, with accompanying maps. The Bureau thus recommended that the examination of this nomination be deferred.

Tonglushan                              531                              People's Republic of China

Although it recognized the outstanding historical importance of Tonglushan, the Bureau recommended that the examination of this file be deferred and invited the Chinese authorities to submit a revised nomination, taking into account the recommendations made by ICOMOS. Furthermore, the Bureau expressed the wish that the Secretariat and ICOMOS continue to show interest to this site and its complex situation. Finally, the Bureau suggested that the Chinese authorities request preparatory assistance under the World Heritage Fund in order to draw up a revised nomination and a request for emergency assistance so that this property may be considered for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Habitats of the                      435 Rev                      People's Republic of China  
Giant Panda (Wolong,  
Wanglang and Tangjiahe  
Nature Reserves)

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this nomination again be deferred. Indeed, while the Bureau expressed the desire to include the Giant Panda Habitat in the World Heritage List, due to the fact that the giant panda is a highly endangered species and a symbol of nature protection throughout the world, the nomination dossier in its current form was still lacking certain elements. The Bureau recommended that the Chinese authorities (a) define the core area of the Wolong Nature Reserve; (b) formally adopt the management plan for the giant panda which had already been prepared; and (c) revise the nomination taking account of the recent publication on an optimal network of panda reserves in China prepared jointly by the Ministry of Forestry of China and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). In the meantime, the Bureau wished to encourage the Chinese authorities to take all possible measures to ensure the survival of the giant panda.

Royal Palace of Caserta      549                      Italy

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this nomination be deferred, and invited the Italian authorities to submit a fully revised nomination that would answer ICOMOS queries regarding the boundaries and protection measures.

El Vizcaino Biosphere      554                      Mexico  
Reserve

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this nomination be deferred. It noted that the nominated site as a whole corresponded well to the biosphere reserve concept of Unesco's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) programme and encouraged the Mexican authorities to propose it for official inclusion in the international biosphere reserve network.

As concerns world heritage values, the Bureau noted that only the two major coastal lagoons and their associated shorelines were of outstanding universal





Orkney Islands                      514 Rev                      United Kingdom

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this nomination be deferred until the authorities of the United Kingdom have nominated to the World Heritage List an area defined by less restrictive boundaries.

E. Nominations for which evaluations were not available

Tongariro National                      421                      New Zealand  
Park

The Bureau recalled that the inclusion of this property in the List had been deferred pending the availability of a revised management plan. The New Zealand authorities had informed the Secretariat and IUCN that such a plan had been prepared and requested the re-examination of this nomination in 1990. The documents had been transmitted only recently and hence IUCN was not in a position to provide an evaluation. The Bureau therefore requested IUCN to prepare its evaluation for submission to the Bureau during the fourteenth session of the Committee in December 1990.

Sjaunia                                      533                      Sweden

The Bureau noted that there were a number of issues with respect to this nomination which required clarification and that IUCN would not be able to undertake a field visit to the site until the latter part of June 1990. The Bureau requested IUCN to submit a complete evaluation and recommendations in the light of the additional information that would be gathered during IUCN's field visit at the forthcoming session of the Committee in December 1990.

VIII. GLOBAL STUDY

55. The Bureau, after expressing deep regret that the Secretariat had not prepared a working document on the global study and considering it imperative for a document to be prepared in time to be submitted to the Committee at its fourteenth session, decided to convene a Steering Committee on 12 and 13 October 1990 in Paris to consider a basic document prepared by the Secretariat in the meantime. The Bureau decided that experts not only from States represented on the World Heritage Committee but also from other States Parties to the Convention that had declared an interest in taking part in the preparation of the global study, could participate in the meeting.

IX. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

56. The Bureau took note of the short report on promotional activities (CC-90/CONF.003/9) and of the further information presented orally by the Secretariat. It noted in particular that the study on the production and distribution of video cassettes through private channels was under way and that the Secretariat had consulted in that connection two private companies which produced television series on the world heritage. It was also noted that each issue of the Unesco Courier would carry a regular column on the Convention. Lastly, the Bureau was informed of the various promotional activities (exhibition, television competition) which would be organized, in co-operation with the Secretariat, by Quebec City, the Museum of Civilization and Radio Canada on the occasion of the Conference on World Heritage Cities (1991).

57. The delegation of Greece lodged a protest concerning the children's book on Ancient Greece co-published by Unesco, INCAFO and Bordas: not only did the map on page 15 reveal serious inaccuracies but the text itself was totally unacceptable to its country on account of both the errors it contained and the offensive image that it presented of Greek civilization. Consequently, the delegation requested that the distribution of the copies currently in stock be suspended and that a new text be prepared to replace the present text in future editions of the book.

58. The Bureau endorsed that request and recommended that the distribution and production of the book entitled La Grèce Antique in French and La Antigua Grecia in Spanish with the present text (which the Secretariat had not had the opportunity to go over) should be halted immediately and that another text should be prepared in its place, instructing the Secretariat to see to it with the Director-General that that recommendation was put into effect.

59. At a more general level, the Bureau expressed deep concern at the uneven quality of the whole series, as other major errors had also been pointed out by the Chairman. It declared that the situation was detrimental to Unesco's image as well and noted that most of the texts had not been submitted to the Committee's Secretariat. The Bureau therefore recommended that the other titles already issued should be carefully reviewed and that, for future publications, whether in this series or any other co-published work on the cultural heritage, the Secretariat of the Committee should receive the texts and illustrations in sufficient time to have them reviewed by a specialist and to consult the State Party concerned; failing which, the Bureau believed that the series in question should be discontinued. It also requested the Secretariat to inform the Director-General of that recommendation.

#### X. PREPARATIONS FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CONVENTION

60. The Bureau took note of the preliminary proposals contained in document CC-90/CONF.003/10 on the evaluation proposed with a view to an expanded session of the Committee in 1992 and on the various promotional events which could be organized in the States Parties and at Unesco Headquarters. The Bureau did not have time to discuss that item, but noted that the States Parties would very shortly be asked in writing to say what their intentions were concerning the evaluation and the promotional activities. At the next session of the Committee, the Secretariat should thus be in a position to specify how the review concerning the application of the Convention would be prepared (national reviews, case-studies, external opinions, study by the Secretariat) and what promotional activities could be launched.

#### XI. DATES AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FOURTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

61. The Bureau recalled that at its last session, the Committee had decided to hold its fourteenth session in the Banff National Park in the Canadian Rockies. In order to fit in with the schedules of IUCN and ICOMOS, it was decided to hold the session between 7 and 12 December 1990 (Sunday, 9 December being a free day).

62. The Bureau considered the matter of the provisional agenda of the fourteenth session of the Committee and decided that, as an exceptional measure and for logistic reasons, examination of nominations of cultural properties would take place at the beginning of the session.

XII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

63. The Chairman thanked the members of the Bureau and all those who had contributed to the success of the session and declared the session closed.

ANNEXE I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

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

**Bulgarie/Bulgaria**

Mme Magdalena STANTSHEVA  
Professeur à l'Université de Sofia  
Sofia

**Canada/Canada**

Mr. James COLLINSON  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Canadian Parks Service  
Environment Canada

Mme Christina CAMERON  
Rapporteur  
Directeur général  
Canadian Parks Service  
Environment Canada

**Colombie/Colombia**

Mme Liliana BONILLA  
Directeur de l'Institut COLCULTURA

**Grèce/Greece**

M. Isidoros KAKOURIS  
Chef de section  
Ministère de la culture

Mme Androniki MILTIADOU  
Conseiller aux affaires de la culture  
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'Unesco

**Sénégal/Senegal**

M. Seydina Issa SYLLA  
Directeur des Parcs nationaux  
Dakar

**Thaïlande/Thailand**

Dr. Adul WICHIENTHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee for the Protection of Cultural  
and Natural Heritage  
Bangkok

M. Chalerm Sak WANICH SOMBAT  
National Environment Board  
Bangkok

M. Suvat SINGHAPANT  
National Park Division  
Royal Forest Department  
Bangkok

Mme Srinoi POVATONG  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la Thaïlande auprès de l'Unesco

**Tunisie/Tunisia**

M. Azedine BESCHAOUCH  
Président/Chairman  
Président  
Fondation de Carthage  
Carthage

M. Béchir MAHJOUR  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la Tunisie auprès de l'Unesco

Mlle Mounira BACCAR  
Conseiller culturel  
Délégation permanente de la Tunisie auprès de l'Unesco

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

Alliance mondiale pour la nature (UICN)/  
World Conservation Union (IUCN)

M. Jim THORSELL  
Senior Advisor

M. Jean-Claude LEFEUVRE  
Conseiller pour l'Europe

M. James Robert PAINE  
World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Centre international d'études pour la conservation et la restauration des biens culturels (ICGROM)/  
International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICGROM)

M. Jukka JOKILEHTO  
Assistant to the Director  
Rome

Conseil international des monuments et des sites (ICOMOS)/  
International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

M. Helmut STELZER  
Secrétaire général

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE  
Coordonnateur pour la Convention du patrimoine mondial

Mme Régina DURIGHELLO  
Documentaliste  
Chargé de mission

### III. OBERVATEURS/OBSERVERS

#### A. ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL/ STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

**Allemagne (République fédérale d')/Federal Republic of Germany**

M. Wolfgang LERKE  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de la République fédérale d'Allemagne  
auprès de l'Unesco

**Bolivie/Bolivia**

M. Salvador ROMERO  
Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent de la Bolivie auprès de l'Unesco

**France/France**

M. François ENAUD  
Inspecteur général honoraire des monuments historiques  
Ministère de la culture et de la communication

M. Jean-Pierre BOYER  
Conseiller technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'Unesco

M. Marcel JOUVE  
Chargé de la mission internationale  
Secrétariat d'Etat à l'environnement D.P.N.

Mme Muriel de RAISSAC  
Chargé de mission  
Direction du patrimoine  
Ministère de la culture et de la communication

**Hongrie/Hungary**

M. Béla KOVACSI  
Conseiller  
Ministère des transports, des télécommunications et de la  
construction

**Italie/Italy**

Mme Brunella BORZI  
Délégué permanent adjoint de l'Italie auprès de l'Unesco

Mme Marina MISITANO  
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'Unesco

**Mexique/Mexico**

M. Alonso GOMEZ-ROBLEDO  
Chargé des affaires culturelles  
Délégation permanente du Mexique auprès de l'Unesco

**Panama/Panama**

M. Jorge PATINO  
Chargé d'affaires a.i.  
Délégation permanente de Panama auprès de l'Unesco

**République arabe syrienne/Syrian Arab Republic**

M. Abd Elkarim M'SAOUD  
Ministre plénipotentiaire  
Délégué permanent de la Syrie auprès de l'Unesco

**République démocratique allemande/German Democratic Republic**

M. Martin MUSCHTER  
Conservateur  
Institut pour la préservation des monuments historiques  
Berlin

M. Andreas GREIM  
Deuxième Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de la République démocratique allemande  
auprès de l'Unesco



**République dominicaine/Dominican Republic**

M. Ivan BAEZ  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la République dominicaine  
auprès de l'Unesco

M. Esteban PRIETO  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel  
Saint-Domingue

**République socialiste soviétique d'Ukraine/Ukrainian SSR**

M. Vladimir SKOFENKO  
Ministre plénipotentiaire  
Délégué permanent de la RSS d'Ukraine auprès de l'Unesco

**Suisse/Switzerland**

M. Daniel AVIOLAT  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la Suisse auprès de l'Unesco

**Turquie/Turkey**

M. Engin TURKER  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente de la Turquie auprès de l'Unesco

**Union des Républiques socialistes soviétiques/USSR**

M. Igor DANILOV  
Conseiller  
Commission nationale de l'URSS pour l'Unesco

M. Evgueni IAGODKINE  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de l'URSS auprès de l'Unesco

**B. ORGANISATION DU SYSTEME DES NATIONS UNIES/UNITED NATIONS AGENCY**

**ONU/PNUD**

Mr. Sylvio MUTAL  
Chief Technical Adviser  
and Regional Coordinator  
UNDP/Unesco Regional Project on Cultural  
Heritage and Development  
Lima

IV. SECRETARIAT/SECRETARIAT

M. Henri LOPES  
Sous-Directeur général pour la culture et la communication

M. Berndt von DROSTE  
Directeur  
Division des sciences écologiques

Mme Anne RAIDL  
Directeur  
Division du patrimoine culturel

M. Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Division du patrimoine culturel

M. Daniel de SAN  
Chef, Division des normes internationales  
Office des normes internationales  
et des affaires juridiques

M. M. SKOURI  
Division des sciences écologiques

M. Hector ARENA  
Division du patrimoine culturel

M. David KABALA  
Division des sciences écologiques

Mme Jane ROBERTSON  
Division des sciences écologiques

M. Natarajan ISHWARAN  
Division des sciences écologiques

Mlle Mireille JARDIN  
Division des sciences écologiques

Mlle Chantal LYARD  
Division du patrimoine culturel