

Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.203/6
Paris, 26 October 1995
Original : English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
Nineteenth session

Berlin, Germany
4 - 9 December 1995

Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda : Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger

a) Information on tentative lists

1. At its seventeenth session in Cartagena, December 1993, the Committee expressed its concern on the small number of Tentative Lists that meet the requirements as stipulated in the Operational Guidelines, paragraphs 7 & 8, and confirmed the importance of these Lists for planning purposes, comparative analyses of nominations and for facilitating the undertaking of the global and thematic studies. These Lists constitute also an inventory of the properties situated within the territory of each State Party, and which it considers suitable for inclusion on the World Heritage List (WHL).

Bearing in mind Article 11, para 2 of the Convention states:

"On the basis of the inventories submitted by States in para 1, the Committee shall establish, keep up to date and publish under the title "World Heritage List", a list of properties"

the Committee also confirmed that the Tentative Lists are mandatory for cultural properties which the State Party intends to nominate for inscription on the WHL during the coming five to ten years.

2. Therefore, the Committee invited the States Parties, which had not yet done so, to submit Tentative Lists in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, with the understanding that "preparatory assistance should be provided if necessary and requested by the State Party concerned". The Committee also decided that "from 1994 onwards, the Tentative Lists that meet the requirements as stipulated in the Operational Guidelines be

published and presented as an information document to the Committee at its annual meeting".

3. In September 1995, out of 142 countries which had ratified the Convention,

- ☞ only 50 States Parties had submitted Tentative Lists in accordance with the elements of presentation specified in the Operational Guidelines;
- ☞ 38 countries had submitted Tentative Lists which did not meet the requirements; and
- ☞ 54 countries had not submitted any Tentative Lists.

4. All the Tentative Lists received by the World Heritage Centre before 30 September 1995 are included in alphabetical order, as *Information Document: WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.7*.

b) Examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List

A. Natural Heritage :

During its nineteenth session, the World Heritage Bureau reviewed nine new natural nominations and was informed about two nominations which were referred back at previous sessions of the Bureau and the Committee. The Bureau recommended four sites for inscription and did not recommend two sites. Five sites were referred back to the States Parties and for IUCN for additional information.

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

Name of Property	Ident. number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Messel Pit Fossil site	720	Germany	N (i)

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (i), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as the single best site which contributes to the understanding of the middle Eocene, when mammals became firmly established in all

principal land ecosystems. The Bureau noted that a geological theme study is underway as part of the framework of a global strategy for natural heritage, which is to be completed in 1996. The Bureau, however, is of the opinion that the significance of Messel is clear and need not wait for the results of this study. Furthermore, the Bureau commended the German Government for their support of the high standards of paleontological research undertaken.

Caves of the Aggtelek Slovak Karst	725	Hungary/ Slovak Republic	N(i)
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criterion (i), considering that the site is an outstanding example of on-going geological processes and a significant geomorphic feature. The karst formations and caves contain the geologic history of the last several millions of years with an unusual combination of climatic effects and paleokarst features.

The Bureau noted : (1) that cultural values of prehistoric cultures in the caves have not been assessed, and (2) that strict control of the area is needed from surface activities such as agricultural pollution, deforestation and soil erosion. The Observer of the Slovak Republic stated that the nomination is considered as a natural one, not indicating cultural values, and that the management plan is in place. The Observer of Hungary underlined that the Hungarian part of the nomination is legally well protected as a national park and has a long history of scientific research at the site.

The Virgin Komi Forests	719	Russian Federation	N (ii)(iii)
------------------------------------	------------	-------------------------------	--------------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), considering the site among the most important natural sites in the boreal forest region. The site has pristine boreal forests and is an important site for scientific research including climate change.

The Bureau however, noted that the Committee should only inscribe 3 million ha of the site which are fully protected as a National Park, Zapovednik and buffer zone. It recommended that the national authorities be strongly encouraged to upgrade the legal status of the remaining 1 million ha and that this area be incorporated in a future nomination. The Bureau raised concerns over the possibility of releasing parts of the area to industrial forestry. It commended the national authorities for their conservation efforts as well as Greenpeace, WWF and the Swiss Government for their assistance in strengthening the management of this area.

Carlsbad Caverns National Park	721	United States of America	N(i)(iii)
---	------------	-------------------------------------	------------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i) and (iii), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value with exceptional geological features with unique reef and rock formations, and containing the world's largest cave deposits, such as accumulations of gypsum chandelier speleothems, aragonite 'christmas trees' and hydromagnesite balloons.

The Bureau noted however, that oil and gas exploration near the borders of the site may be a potential threat. It therefore requested the Centre to write to the national authorities and to encourage the State Party in its proposal for the creation of a cave protection zone to the north of the Park.

A.2 Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription in the World Heritage List

Odzala National Park (and annexes)	692	Congo
---	------------	--------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee not inscribe the nominated property, as the site is of national importance and does not possess distinguishing features of outstanding universal value.

The Bureau recommends that the World Heritage Committee encourage the State Party to consider nomination of a larger area to the north of the Park, the Ndoki National Park, which forms a part of a proposed tri-national park.

Wildlife Reserve of Conkouati	693	Congo
--	------------	--------------

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee not inscribe the nominated property, as the site is of national importance and does not possess distinguishing features of universal value. It noted furthermore, that the site has been degraded over the past ten years.

A.3 Properties for which nominations were referred back to the national authorities for further information

Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park	716	Chile
---	------------	--------------

The Bureau recognized that the site fulfils natural criterion (iv) for its high biodiversity and significant natural habitats for threatened species, including the high degree of endemic

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

Gough Island

740

United Kingdom

The Bureau recommended that World Heritage Committee inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv), considering that the site is of outstanding universal value as one of the least disturbed major cool-temperate island ecosystems in the South Atlantic Ocean, with one of the most important seabird colonies of the world, high scenic qualities and spectacular sea-cliffs and coastline.

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

**Okapi Wildlife
Reserve**

718

Zaire

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

The Bureau noted however, that the cultural values of the site and the living culture of the Pygmies population living in harmony with the forest within the site has not been assessed. The Bureau furthermore noted that the management plan has not been formally approved and raised concern about the integrity of the site. The Bureau therefore, requested the Centre to contact the Ambassador of Zaire and to ask him for the following information for 1 October 1995, to be provided for the outgoing

Bureau: (1) when the management plan will be approved; (2) to inform the Bureau about activities underway to halt human intrusion into the site, and (3) to give assurance for operational and financial support of the staff at the site (salaries). At the time of the preparation of this document, no further information has been received.

A.4 Extension to a World Heritage site

Galapagos National Ibis Ecuador
Park Marine
Extension

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session recognized that the Galapagos Marine Reserve met natural criteria. It deferred, however the inclusion of the Galapagos Marine Reserve as an extension of Galapagos Islands to be included on the World Heritage List due to recognition of serious threats to the site and in accordance with the IUCN recommendation and the wish of the Observer of Ecuador. The Committee, requested the Centre and IUCN to report back to the nineteenth session of the Bureau. The Centre provided the Ecuadorian Authorities by letter of 1 February 1995 with details of the Committee's decision. No reply was received so far.

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

A.5 Deferred or referred natural nomination for which additional information has been received

Glacier and Waterton 354Rev Canada / United
States Waterton Lakes of
America
International Peace
Park

The Bureau recalled that at its eighteenth session it had decided to defer the examination of this nomination and to request that IUCN undertake a thorough evaluation of the nomination and provide to the Bureau at its nineteenth session a more comprehensive evaluation on which the Committee could base its decision.

The Bureau at its eighteenth session further endorsed a suggestion that the States Parties, in cooperation with IUCN, organize a working group to examine the possibility of an "association of management units" or a series nomination.

The Centre and IUCN informed the Bureau that the working group met in Calgary, Alberta on 28 March 1995 and that copies of the full report of the meeting had been provided to Bureau members. The report supplements the "criteria" of the amended 1994 nomination and further responds to the conditions of integrity.

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

The conclusion of the Bureau was that a full evaluation was required before a decision is made. IUCN was therefore requested to prepare the evaluation for the next meeting of the outgoing Bureau in December. At the time of the preparation of this document, no further information has been received.

B. Cultural Heritage

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

B.1 Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List (in July 1995)

Name of Property	Ident. number	State Party having submitted the nomination (in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention)	Criteria
Rapa Nui National Park	715	Chile	C(i) (iii) (v)
The Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox	742	Colombia	C(iv) (v)

National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro	743	Colombia	C(iii)
San Agustin Archaeological Park	744	Colombia	C(iii)
Kutná Hora: The Historical Town Centre with the Church of St Barbara and the Cathedral of Our Lady at Sedlec	732	Czech Republic	C(ii) (iv)
Ferrara: City of the Renaissance	733	Italy	C(ii) (iv) (vi)
The Historic Centre of Naples	726	Italy	C(ii) (iv)
The Historic Centre of Siena	717	Italy	C(i) (ii) (iv)
Historic Villages of Shirakawa-go and Gokayama	734	Japan	C(iv) (v)
The Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras	722	Philippines	C(iii) (iv) (v)
The Serra and Town of Sintra	723	Portugal	C(ii) (iv) (v)
<p>The Bureau recommended that the State Party be invited to change the name of the site to "The Cultural Landscape of Sintra".</p>			
Sokkuram Buddhist Grotto	736	Republic of Korea	C(i) (iv)

The Bureau recommended that this nomination, extended to include the Pulguksa Temple, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv) as a masterpiece of Far Eastern Buddhist art, and the complex that it forms with Pulguksa Temple as an outstanding example of the religious architecture of the region and of the material expression of Buddhist belief.

Haeinsa Temple Changgyong P'ango, the Depositories for the Tripitaka Koreana Woodblocks	737	Republic of Korea	C(iv) (vi)
Chongmyo Shrine	738	Republic of Korea	C(iv)
The Hanseatic Town of Visby	731	Sweden	C(iv) (v)
Edinburgh	728	United Kingdom	C(ii) (iv)
The Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento	747	Uruguay	C(iv)

B.2 Properties for which nominations were referred back by the Bureau (July 1995) to the national authorities for further information

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

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to allow it to give precise boundaries for the area proposed for inscription. On the condition that this information is provided by 1 October 1995, in time for the next session of the Bureau, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the nominated property on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv).

At the time of the preparation of this document, the national authorities have not sent any complementary information to the Centre.

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

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

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

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

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

Schokland and its surroundings

739

Netherlands

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

Savannah City Plan

746

United States of America

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

B.3 Property for which the Bureau decided to adjourn the debate to the outgoing session of the Bureau in December 1995

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

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

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

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

B.4 Previous deferred nomination for which additional information has been received which will be examined by the Bureau in Berlin and which might be examined by the Committee

**Roskilde
Cathedral**

695 rev.

Denmark

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

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

STATE PARTY	DATE OF PRESENTATION OF TENTATIVE LIST	A= LIST MEETS REQUIREMENTS OF OP. GUIDELINES B= LIST DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS
ALGERIA	12-04-85	B
ARGENTINA	26.10.95	A
ARMENIA (Rep. of)	07.95	A
AUSTRALIA	19-09-91	B
AUSTRIA	30-08-94	A
BANGLADESH	30-09-93	B
BENIN	01-87	B
BOLIVIA	03/87	B
BRAZIL	12/82 rev. 11.86	A
BULGARIA	18-10-84	A
BURKINA FASO	1987	B
CAMBODIA	09-92	A
CANADA	REV. 29-09-94	A
CHILE	Rev. 30.3.94	A
CHINA (People's Republic of)	REV. 16.11.94	A
COLOMBIA	REV. 29-10-93	A
COSTA RICA	REV.12.6.95	A
CROATIA (Republic of)	28.09.94	A
CUBA	19-05-88	B
CYPRUS	12-84	B
CZECH REPUBLIC	30-06-93	A
DENMARK	01-09-93	A
EGYPT	10-94	A
EL SALVADOR	21-09-92	A
FIJI	25.11.94	B
FINLAND	01-10-90	A
FRANCE	REV. 09.1995	A
GAMBIA	22.9.95	A
GEORGIA	28-10-93	A
GERMANY	8.93	A
GREECE	10-85	B

STATE PARTY	DATE OF PRESENTATION OF TENTATIVE LIST	A= LIST MEETS REQUIREMENTS OF OP. GUIDELINES
		B= LIST DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS
GUYANA	08-02-85	B
HUNGARY	08-93	A
INDIA	02-81 16-04-86 12-87	B B B
IRAQ	UNDATED	B
IRELAND	09.1992	A
ITALY	1994	B
JAMAICA	REV. 22-07-88	B
JAPAN	09-92	A
JORDAN	18-11-93	B
KENYA	01/84	B
LAO PEOPLE'S DEM. REPUBLIC	12-03-92	A
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA	09-01-84	B
LUXEMBOURG	01-10-93	A
MADAGASCAR	10-12-85	B
MALDIVES	12-87	B
MALI	14-12-87	B
MAURITANIA	03.95	A
MEXICO	07.95	A
MOROCCO	Rev. 07/95	A
MOZAMBIQUE	1990	B
NETHERLANDS	26-09-95	A
NEW ZEALAND	17-11-93	A
NICARAGUA	Rev.19.6.95	A
NIGERIA	22-07-88	B
NORWAY	19-12-84	B
OMAN	04-07-88	B
PAKISTAN	14-12-93	B
PANAMA	4.10.95	A
PARAGUAY	05-10-93	A
PERU	17-12-84	B
PHILIPPINES	13-08-93	A
POLAND	Rev.9.93	A
PORTUGAL	8.94	B

STATE PARTY TIVE LIST	DATE OF PRESENTATION OF TENTA OF OP. GUIDELINES	A: LIST MEETS REQUIREMENTS B: LIST DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	09-94	A
REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA	10-08-93	A
ROMANIA	03-91	A
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	28-09-92	A
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	19-10-93	A
SLOVENIA	09.12.94	A
SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM	15-07-91	B
SPAIN	Rev. 27.2.95	A
SRI LANKA	Rev. 12-87	B
SUDAN	05-09-94	A
SWEDEN	9.95	A
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	UNDATED	B
THAILAND	06-89	B
TUNISIA	18-12-84 (06-88)	B
TURKEY	06-84	B
UKRAINE	05-89	A
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND	8.89	A
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	30-01-89	B
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Rev. 05-09-90	A
URUGUAY	Rev. 24-10-94	B
UZBEKISTAN	01-10-94	A
VENEZUELA	21-09-93	B
YEMEN REPUBLIC	7.9.89	B
YUGOSLAVIA	10-85	A