

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-99/CONF.204/15  
Paris, 16 September 1999  
Original: English/French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL  
AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-third session  
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room X  
5 - 10 July 1999**

**REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR**

## Table of Contents

	Page	Annexes	Page
I. Opening Session	1	I. List of Participants	59
II. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable	1	II. Speech of the Assistant Director-General of Natural Sciences for UNESCO	75
III. Report of the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the twenty-second session of the Committee	1	III. Statement by Australia on the Great Barrier Reef	77
IV. State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List	3	IV. Statement by Mexico on El Viscaïno Sanctuary	79
V. Information on Tentative Lists and Examination of Nominations of Cultural and Natural Properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	37	V. Statement by Venezuela on Canaima National Park	81
VI. Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee	49	VI.1 - VI.5 Kakadu National Park, Australia	
VII. International Assistance	51	VI.1 Statement by the Australian Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Senator the Hon. Robert Hill	83
VIII. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention	54	VI.2 Joint ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN Statement	85
IX. Approval of the Committee's Report on its activities for 1998-99 to be submitted to the 30 <sup>th</sup> session of the General Conference of UNESCO	55	VI.3 Statement read by the Representative of ICOMOS	87
X. Preparation of the Twelfth General Assembly of States Parties	56	VI.4 Statement read by the Representative of ICCROM	88
XI. Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau (Marrakesh, Morocco, 26-27 November 1999)	57	VI.5 Report from the leader of the independent scientific panel established by ICSU, Professor Brian Wilkinson	89
XII. Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, 29 November-4 December 1999)	57	VII Draft Resolution adopted by the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee	91
XIII. Other Business	57	VIII Provisional Agenda of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, 26-27 November 1999)	93
		IX Provisional Agenda of the World Heritage Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, 29 November-4 December 1999)	94

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Paris, France, from 5 to 10 July 1999. It was attended by the following members of the Bureau: Benin, Cuba, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Morocco, and the Republic of Korea.

**I.2** The following States Parties to the Convention, who are not members of the Bureau, were represented as observers: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

**I.3** Representatives of the advisory bodies to the Convention: the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended. The meeting was also attended by a representative of the United Nations Environment Programme, and the following non-governmental organizations: Australian Conservation Foundation, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation, International Council for Science (ICSU), International Fund for Animal Welfare, Sierra Club, Survival International, United Nations Foundation, Wilderness Society and the World Archaeological Congress. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the following institutions: Australian Parliament, Namgyal Research Institute, and the US House of Representatives. The non-governmental organization, Women's International Media Group Inc., was authorised to attend the meeting only for Agenda items I and II. The full list of participants is given in Annex I.

**I.4** The Chairperson, Mr Koichiro Matsuura (Japan), opened the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee by welcoming the members of the Bureau, the advisory bodies, observers and all participants to the meeting. The Chairperson then invited the representative of the Director-General of UNESCO to deliver his opening remarks.

**I.5** Mr M. Iaccarino, Assistant Director-General of the Natural Sciences Sector, in his capacity as Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, reiterated UNESCO's support of the Convention. (His speech is included as Annex II of this report)

**I.6** The Chairperson thanked Mr Iaccarino on behalf of the Bureau members.

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE**

**II.1** Upon conclusion of the opening session, the Chairperson requested the Bureau to adopt the Agenda and Timetable. In view of the heavy workload facing the Bureau, the Chairperson proposed to hold evening sessions on Tuesday and Thursday as required. The agenda and timetable were adopted without any further suggestions for changes.

## **III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**III.1** The Chairperson then invited Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of the World Heritage Centre, to present the Secretariat's Report on activities undertaken since the last session of the World Heritage Committee.

**III.2** In his capacity as Secretary of the Committee, the Director of the Centre reported on activities carried out by the Secretariat over the last six months. In giving his presentation, Mr Bouchenaki referred to Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.3 and gave an audio-visual display of the report. He pointed to the most significant activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre.

**III.3** The Director of the World Heritage Centre began by emphasising the importance of increased co-operation between the States Parties, the advisory bodies and the Centre in view of a better implementation of the Convention. He felt that this was an essential part of the success of the Convention.

**III.4** With regard to new nominations, the Director of the Centre mentioned that 70 nominations had been received for examination by the Bureau in 1999, of which 49 proposed inscriptions are for cultural properties, 16 for natural properties and five for mixed sites. He highlighted the fact that a majority of the nominations came from Western European countries thus accentuating the imbalance of the World Heritage List. However, he specified that five of the 70 nominations were being submitted for the first time by five different States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, South Africa, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Suriname, Turkmenistan). He took the opportunity to mention the urgent need for space within the documentation unit of the Centre which is due in great part to the increase in the number of nominations received.

**III.5** The Director of the Centre presented the activities of the Secretariat in relation to the Global Strategy by referring to some of the regional thematic meetings organised since the last Committee session. He also described various regional approaches to improving regional and natural representation on the World Heritage List.

**III.6** Concerning monitoring and the state of conservation of properties, the Director of the Centre presented the new format and time frame for periodic reporting, as adopted by the twenty-second session of the Committee. He explained that a number of States Parties have already taken initiatives to facilitate the implementation of periodic reporting by organising training seminars on its application and developing periodic reporting strategies. He continued by giving a brief analysis of the number of monitoring reports examined by the Bureau since 1997 showing on the one hand, an increase in the number of reports on sites on the World Heritage List, and on the other, a stabilisation in the number of reports on sites inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. He also demonstrated the uneven regional distribution of reports to be examined by the Bureau during this session.

**III.7** The Director of the Centre highlighted several examples of sites that may be under considerable threat due to on-going public and private works. He gave the example of the site of the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) and several cases in Asia (Taxila, Pakistan; Shish Mahal of Lahore Fort, Pakistan; Hampi, India). He also reported that a number of joint IUCN/UNESCO monitoring missions had been conducted in Latin America in 1999 and that the UN Foundation had contributed US\$ 3,999,850 to finance a 4-year project on control and eradication of invasive

species in the Galapagos Islands prepared by the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the Charles Darwin Research Centre (CDRS). Furthermore, the Director expressed appreciation for the US\$ 2 million contribution by the French Agency for Development to the Provincial Government of Luang Prabang (Laos) for urban heritage protection. In Europe, the UNESCO Moscow Office organised a workshop on the Baikal Law after its adoption in May 1999 which was followed by an extraordinary meeting of the Government Baikal Commission to decide on the next steps to implement the Law. The Director also brought the attention of the Bureau to the situation in Doñana National Park (Spain) which continues to be of major concern due to the toxic spill in southern Spain.

**III.8** The Director of the Centre informed the Bureau on the dramatic rise in the number of requests for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund. Preparatory and Promotional Assistance has been completely allocated, and limited funds are available for Emergency Assistance, Technical Co-operation and Training Assistance for natural heritage. The Director further informed the Bureau that in view of the requests from Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Low Income Countries (LICs) which could not be processed due to the lack of remaining funds, the Centre had made an analysis of the international assistance granted in previous years, and provided some statistics and trends. He stated that a proposal would be made to the Bureau under Agenda Item 7 to address the issue of the allocation of funds for financing requests approved in previous years which had to be debited against the 1999 budget.

**III.9** The Director then presented some of the regional efforts undertaken with preparatory assistance to enhance the representation of natural sites on the World Heritage List and highlighted the activities of IUCN and the Centre in implementing a Strategic Action Plan for training natural heritage specialists. He also presented some of the activities undertaken to support the inscription of cultural sites in underrepresented regions. He underlined the importance of the Africa 2009 Programme for capacity-building in Africa for which a number of activities have been developed by ICCROM, the Centre and the Co-ordination Committee composed of four African experts.

**III.10** He also expressed appreciation to the Government of France for the secondment of experts to UNESCO to assist underrepresented States Parties in the preparation of nomination dossiers.

**III.11** In reporting on the World Heritage Documentation, Information, and Education activities undertaken over the past six months, the Director of the Centre brought the attention of the Bureau to the Strategic Plan adopted by the Committee in Kyoto. He reported that the activities set out in the work plan are being executed according to schedule. He briefly explained the proposed framework for the Information Management System, and confirmed that an agreement for the development of the Information Management System is being concluded with the European Space Agency.

**III.12** The Director of the Centre also informed the Bureau concerning the status of production of basic information material, including the World Heritage Review. He also referred to the success of the Centre's Internet Web site, reporting over 950,000 hits in March 1999. Furthermore, the Director of the Centre informed the Bureau of the latest results arising from the existing partnerships with the media and publishers and referred to new projects, including those related to radio broadcasting, that are being developed by outside partners in co-operation with the Centre.

**III.13** The Director of the Centre also presented the Centre's work in relation to UNESCO's Special Project: "Young People's

Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" highlighting some of the activities undertaken in 1999 such as the International Workshop on World Heritage Education held in Chartres (France) and the official launch of the World Heritage Resource Kit "World Heritage in Young Hands". He also mentioned that a second African World Heritage Youth Forum will be held in Senegal in August 1999 and the first Youth Forum in the Arab States region is scheduled in Morocco for November 1999. The Director informed the Bureau that a 14-minute information video presenting the history and activities of the Special Project had been produced and distributed to Member States and relevant organisations in June 1999.

**III.14** The Director of the Centre then briefly summarised the activities undertaken in co-operation with the advisory bodies, other sectors of UNESCO, other Convention Secretariats and other organisations such as The World Bank, UNDP, UNEP and other agencies. He also stressed the importance of co-operation among States Parties, notably the innovative linkage programme between the local authorities of European and Asian States Parties which is now being extended to other regions. The Director also mentioned co-operation between the Centre and World Heritage offices, such as the Nordic World Heritage Office and the new centres proposed to be established in Japan and Argentina.

**III.15** Regarding the follow-up of the work of the Consultative Body, the Director of the Centre recalled the background to the Management and Financial Review and highlighted some of the tasks and functions of the Centre in this regard.

**III.16** The Director of the Centre underlined the fact that 44% of contributions due to World Heritage Fund had been received from States Parties as at 31 May 1999. He strongly encouraged States Parties who had not yet settled their arrears payments to do so, in order to ensure that the status of the Fund remains healthy.

**III.17** Finally, the Director of the Centre thanked his colleagues for their hard work in preparing this meeting.

**III.18** The Chairperson thanked the Director for his report on the activities of the World Heritage Centre since the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. Before opening the floor for discussions, the Chairperson brought the attention of the Bureau to the status of funds for international assistance, emphasizing that the funds for Preparatory Assistance, Technical Co-operation and Training Assistance for cultural heritage have been completely committed, and that Emergency Assistance was almost exhausted. The Chairperson informed the Bureau that he approved international assistance requests submitted by States Parties, following the recommendations of the Secretariat and the advisory bodies. Therefore, almost no operational funds are available for the latter half of 1999. The Chairperson stressed that prioritization of limited funds from the World Heritage Fund is essential. Referring to the need for prioritization, he underlined that Paragraph 113 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* was not sufficient and there is a need for other mechanisms to ensure that international assistance is made available to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Low Income Countries (LICs), and for addressing the need to establish a balanced and representative World Heritage List. The Chairperson expressed deep concern about the situation whereby approximately 10% of 1999 funds are financing requests approved in previous years. The Chairperson informed the Bureau that this question would be discussed under Agenda Item 7 concerning requests for international assistance, when the Director of the World Heritage Centre would propose a solution. The Chairperson then opened the floor to the Bureau members.

**III.19** The Delegates of Japan, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Benin and Hungary congratulated the Director and the staff of the World Heritage Centre for their outstanding work since the twenty-second session of the Committee. The Observer of the United Kingdom also thanked the Director for his report and remarked on the staggering amount of work achieved by the Secretariat since the twenty-second session of the Committee.

**III.20** The Delegates of Japan and Benin expressed their agreement with the Chairperson for the need to emphasize the Global Strategy for a better representivity of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. In relation to this, the Delegate of Japan congratulated the efforts made by the Secretariat and States Parties for giving activities to promote the Global Strategy a higher profile in Asia and the Pacific. He expressed his gratitude to the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM for their assistance in the organization of the Nara Seminar for the Integrity and Development of Historic Cities (5-7 March 1999), whose conclusion addresses the complex issues involved in the safeguarding and development of heritage in urban areas. The Delegate of Benin stressed the difficulties faced by African States Parties in preparing nominations, and the need for further co-operation between international and national experts in the identification and preservation of African heritage.

**III.21** The Director of the World Heritage Centre responded to the interventions of the Bureau members concerning the Global Strategy and the need for better representivity of the World Heritage List. The Director informed the Bureau that the World Heritage Centre is considering the recommendations and conclusions of the various Global Strategy meetings held in the past years, for developing concrete action plans to assist States Parties whose heritage is not adequately represented.

**III.22** Referring to the Director's report on World Heritage Offices, the Delegate of Japan clarified that the World Heritage Office to be established in Nara, Japan, is a national institution for the time being, without a regional status comparable to the Nordic World Heritage Office. No formal agreement has been reached between the Government of Japan and UNESCO for establishing this office as an international or regional office. The Government of Japan considers that there has not been sufficient discussion with other Asian States Parties for the office to assume a regional status, although it wishes to leave the possibility to become regional in the future.

**III.23** With regard to the establishment of offices in general, he stated that the Government of Japan believes that the Committee needs to address the issue of decentralisation in general and scrutinise the process. While welcoming decentralisation, he stressed the need for transparency in the process of establishing World Heritage offices. While appreciating the positive gesture of the Government of Argentina to host an office, the Delegate of Japan stated that a prudent and transparent process is needed before its realisation if the proposed office is of a regional office status. The Observer of Argentina considered that such a statement resulted from a misunderstanding generated by the Director's report. In fact, the office to be created in Argentina would be a national focal point for the implementation and promotion of the World Heritage Convention, subject to Argentine legislation and which would engage in regional activities at the request of the interested countries. Consequently, such an office was not to be related to any process of decentralisation of the World Heritage Centre. In any event, the establishment of such an office was to be implemented through a transparent as well as efficient process. The Delegates of Morocco and the Republic of Korea also emphasised that sufficient time should be allowed for the careful examination of the establishment of World Heritage offices, and that proper procedure should be followed. The Chairperson stated

that it was appropriate to begin discussions concerning World Heritage Offices, following the UNESCO Executive Board's recommendation to the General Conference concerning decentralisation.

**III.24** The Delegate of Hungary referred to a recent expert mission undertaken at the request of the Government of Hungary and financed under the World Heritage Fund's Preparatory Assistance. This mission evaluated the co-operation needs of over twenty historic towns, members of the World Heritage Cities Organization, and located in Central and Eastern Europe. The Delegate of Hungary informed the Bureau that while his Government wishes to establish a regional World Heritage Office in Hungary, it will follow the procedure as proposed.

**III.25** In expressing appreciation for the interest shown by several States Parties to promote and implement the World Heritage Convention through the establishment of regional or national offices, the Director stated that the interventions made by the Delegates of Japan, Morocco, Benin and the Republic of Korea and Hungary concerning the need for clarity and transparency have been noted with great attention. He informed the Bureau that during his recent visit to Dubrovnik (Croatia), the Mayor of Dubrovnik said that a request had been submitted to the Director-General of UNESCO to establish a World Heritage Office in Dubrovnik. He also stated that the Minister of Cultural Heritage of Hungary also expressed his hope to establish a regional World Heritage Office in Budapest covering Eastern and European World Heritage. The Director underlined the important role to be played by national World Heritage offices, which can be effective in addressing the threats to sites, especially in cases where rapid development projects threaten the integrity of sites. Finally, he assured the Bureau that a comprehensive review of each proposal for the establishment of World Heritage Offices would be carried out.

**III.26** The Observer of the United Kingdom requested clarification concerning the development of regional strategies for periodic reporting. The Director of the World Heritage Centre responded that the decision of the Committee, (see paragraph VI.7(d) of the report of the twenty-second session of the Committee) would be implemented as scheduled.

**III.27** In relation to the 90% commitment of the Emergency Assistance budgetary allocation for 1999, the Observer of Canada requested detailed information concerning the use of this Fund, to enable the Committee, at its twenty-third session, to study the allocation of this particular budget line. The Chairperson proposed that the Bureau have a first round of discussions under Agenda Item 7 for all international assistance, and requested the Secretariat to provide a proposal to address the new requests received by States Parties belonging to Least Developed Countries and Low Income Countries.

#### **IV. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

##### **A. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

##### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.1** The Bureau noted that state of conservation reports of three of the fifteen natural heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, namely Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria), the Everglades National Park and Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) are due by

15 September 1999 and will be submitted to the twenty-third ordinary session of the Committee, to be convened from 29 November to 4 December 1999 in Marrakesh, Morocco. The Bureau examined the state of conservation reports on the following twelve natural heritage sites included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.2 Manovo-Gounda-St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic (CAR))**

The Bureau recalled that uncontrolled poaching by armed groups had led to the death of four members of the Park staff in 1997, decimated more than 80% of the Park's wildlife populations and brought tourism to a halt. The Committee, at its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997), had welcomed the State Party's intention to assign site management responsibilities to a private Foundation and had requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the Government and the Foundation to prepare a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for the site. The Bureau noted with concern that the State Party has not yet responded to the letters from the Centre, transmitting the above-mentioned decision of the Committee taken in 1997, and reiterated by the Committee in 1998 (Kyoto).

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to again contact the State Party and the private Foundation responsible for site management and to field a mission to this site if invited and prepare a detailed report describing the state of conservation of the site and measures needed for its rehabilitation. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN submit such a report for review at its twenty-fourth session to be held in mid-2000.

#### **IV.3 World Heritage sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC):**

##### **Garamba National Park Kahuzi Biega National Park Okapi Faunal Reserve Virunga National Park**

The Committee and the Bureau have expressed serious concerns with regard to the state of conservation of these four sites at their annual sessions as the eastern parts of the country have become increasingly engulfed in war since 1994. Hopes for peace in the latter half of 1998 were short-lived as renewed fighting spread to all parts of eastern DRC.

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998), had requested the Centre and IUCN to consult with ICCN (Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature) and international conservation NGOs to estimate the cost of paying "motivational allowances" to staff at Virunga as an interim measure and submit a proposal for emergency assistance for the consideration of the twenty-third session of the Bureau. IUCN had informed the Committee that most of the eastern DRC is controlled by rebel forces. The Committee had suggested that the Centre and IUCN transmit its concerns on the state of conservation of the four sites to international and national NGOs and urge them to disseminate information regarding the Committee's concerns among the general public as well as specific target groups like the military.

The Bureau was informed that a representative of the International Rhino Foundation (IRF) had visited Garamba from 27 February to 5 March 1999 and found that resident guards appear to have forged a working relationship with rebel forces controlling the area. Significant poaching threats prevail in the region. Despite shortages in fuel supplies, vehicles, communications equipment and ammunition and the high-risk

security situation, resident guards are patrolling the area to the extent possible.

The Bureau learned of the outcome of a seminar, held in Naivasha, Kenya, from 12 to 16 April 1999, which brought together ICCN, concerned international conservation NGOs (e.g. IRF, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP), Diane Fossey Gorilla Fund for Europe, Gilman International Conservation and WWF), GTZ (German Technical Co-operation), UNESCO and representatives of staff from all four sites to discuss future steps that could be taken for the conservation of the four sites. The seminar reached the following principal conclusions:

- (i) populations of all flagship species, including the gorilla, elephant, northern white rhinoceros and okapi are endangered;
- (ii) Kahuzi Biega and Virunga have suffered significant deforestation;
- (iii) field equipment has been looted and available equipment is either inadequate or in poor condition;
- (iv) Okapi and Kahuzi Biega are facing threats due to illegal mineral exploitation;
- (v) lack of respect for conservation laws is widespread and is threatening the integrity of all four sites as well as the life of staff who have chosen to continue carrying on their duties; and
- (vi) a two-pronged approach focusing on diplomatic and political actions at one level and direct support to encourage performance of conservation actions by staff resident in the sites at the other, is critical to ensure the survival of the sites until peace and security conditions become normalized in eastern parts of the DRC. The report of the Naivasha Seminar includes estimates of financial support necessary for providing salaries and allowances and equipment to resident staff in all four sites.

The Seminar resulted in the establishment of a Task Force comprising the consortium of NGOs, ICCN and GTZ. The Task Force members are in the process of approaching various donors to raise the necessary funds for paying salaries and allowances to staff and provide basic equipment for staff to carry out their day-to-day functions. A project concept is being developed by this Task Force.

The Director General of ICCN addressed the Bureau on behalf of the Task Force and called upon the assistance of the Bureau and Committee for the conservation of the four sites. He informed the Bureau that in affirming its commitment to the Convention, his Government has decided to pay its dues for the years 1996, 1997 and 1998 to the World Heritage Fund despite the difficult economic and political conditions prevailing in his country.

The Bureau called upon the Centre and IUCN to:

- support the process started by the Task Force to build support for the conservation of the World Heritage sites of the DRC;
- co-operate with relevant international organizations, e.g. UN Resident Co-ordinator System, important donor countries etc., and call upon leading personalities including the Chairperson of the Committee and the Director-General of UNESCO, to intervene in the diplomatic and political arena at the international, regional, national and local levels in order to draw attention to the need to respect the World Heritage status of the four sites and create an environment in which ICCN and its staff resident in the four sites could carry out necessary conservation actions;
- co-operate with the Task Force with a view to approaching private foundations, bi- and multilateral donors and organizations in order to develop a package of international assistance targeted directly to meet livelihood, equipment and other essential needs of the resident staff to enable staff

to carry out their duties and responsibilities in an effective manner; and

- work together with the Task Force members attending the session of the Bureau, to prepare a package of emergency and technical assistance to provide support to the staff of the four sites from the World Heritage Fund which the Bureau could consider under the agenda item on international assistance (Item 7 of the provisional agenda item of the twenty-third session of the Bureau).

The Bureau agreed with the view expressed by IUCN that special efforts are needed to ensure the conservation of the four sites located in a zone of intense armed conflict. In addition, the Bureau endorsed IUCN's position that successful interventions to protect these four sites could provide important lessons that may be applicable elsewhere in the world for the protection World Heritage sites in times of armed conflict. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain all of the four sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau also recalled that the two four-wheel drive vehicles purchased in 1998 for Kahuzi Biega and Garamba are still stored in Kenya since the two vehicles could not be delivered to the sites due to the on-going war in the eastern parts of the DRC. The Bureau was informed that a neighbouring State Party to the Convention (i.e. United Republic of Tanzania) has requested financial assistance for the purchase of two vehicles to strengthen protection of two of its World Heritage sites. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN discuss this matter with ICCN and Task Force representatives with a view to transferring the two vehicles currently stored in Kenya to the Tanzanian sites, and submit a proposal to effect this transfer for the consideration of the Bureau under the agenda item dealing with international assistance.

#### **IV.4 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998) was informed that the construction of the Guamoto-Macos road was the main threat to this Park and an EIA had not been conducted. Construction has been slow but very destructive of the environment. Only a small section of the road is inside the World Heritage site; the remainder of the road forms the Park's southern boundary. The Committee noted that, in the latter half of 1998, economic constraints had led to a halt in road construction activities and some positive developments with regard to the state of conservation of Sangay National Park were evident: colonization and small-scale mining activities had stopped since 1997; and a 5-year, US\$ 1.6 million conservation project, financed by the Government of the Netherlands and jointly implemented by WWF and Fundacion Natura, had begun. The Delegate of Ecuador informed the Committee that his Government had submitted to the Centre several new documents, including the "Strategic Management Plan for the Sangay National Park" and it had not issued any permits for oil exploration in Sangay. The Delegate welcomed a Centre/IUCN mission to Sangay in 1999.

The Bureau was informed that in response to an invitation from the Government of Ecuador, via its letter of 4 March 1999 to the Centre, a mission led by IUCN experts and comprising participants from WWF, Fundacion Natura and the Ministry for the Environment of Ecuador had visited Sangay National Park from 10 to 14 June 1999. The report of the mission was tabled as Information Document INF.17. This report noted a number of positive developments at this site, but considered that it should stay on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau noted that the mission report has been made available only at the time of its session and that the State Party needed time to review the report and respond to the findings and recommendations of the report.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit its response to the findings and recommendations of the mission report to the Centre before 15 September 1999. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to review the response from the State Party and submit a set of recommendations on the state of conservation of Sangay, including whether or not Sangay should be retained in the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the Committee at its twenty-third session in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 29 November to 4 December 1999.

#### **IV.5 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Bureau recalled that the regional authorities in Bahir Dar, where this site is located, disagreed with the Committee's decision to include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996. Since then the Department of Wildlife and National Parks of Ethiopia, UNESCO Office in Addis Ababa and the Centre have continued to inform the Bahir Dar authorities on the meaning and implications of the Committee's decision to include Simen National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger. At its last session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee noted that the responsibilities for the management of the Park had been transferred from the central authorities to the region. A stakeholders' meeting had been convened and had led to the formation of a 'dialogue-group' of various national and regional offices to discuss follow-up activities for the conservation of the Park. The meeting had called for the organization of a second stakeholders' seminar, before June 1999, in collaboration with UNDP, Austria, UNESCO, UNCDF, Bahir Dar Regional Heads and donors. The second stakeholders' seminar is expected to establish a strategy to: (i) minimize the human population in the Park; (ii) rehabilitate the Park and re-establish populations of selected species including the Walia Ibex; (iii) create an alternative to a road which currently goes through the Park; and (iv) establish a framework for co-ordination, including the possible setting up of an Inter-Agency Committee with the participation of donors, for the sustainable development of the Simen Mountains ecosystem. As suggested by the Committee, the Centre has informed the Ethiopian authorities that the US\$ 30,000 approved by the Committee in 1996 and which still remains unused, could be made available as a contribution for the organization of the second stakeholders' meeting.

The Bureau expressed its concern over the lack of adequate communication between the Centre and the regional authorities in Bahir Dar on the state of conservation of this site. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to consult with the UN Resident Co-ordinator for Ethiopia and the Central Government of Ethiopia to develop a strategy to improve communications with the regional authorities in Bahir Dar. IUCN informed the Bureau that it is assisting the national Government of Ethiopia on environmental conservation projects and will try to use its contacts to improve communications between the Centre and the regional authorities in Bahir Dar. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit a report on the outcome of their efforts in this regard and recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.6 Mount Nimba Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d' Ivoire)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998), had observed that despite a 2-3 year effort, the establishment of a foundation or a trust fund for the conservation of Mt. Nimba appeared increasingly unlikely to succeed in the near future. The Committee had noted that the Permanent Executive Secretary of the MAB National Committee for Guinea had informed the Centre that the Nimba Mining Company (NIMCO) had been dissolved by the Government and no other enterprise had been created to replace it. Agreeing with IUCN's observation that information on the state of conservation of this site needs to be updated, the Committee accepted IUCN's offer

to arrange for its Regional Office for West Africa in Burkina Faso to undertake a mission, if invited by the States Parties concerned, in order to prepare a state of conservation report for submission to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the relevant authorities in the two States Parties and encourage them to extend an invitation to IUCN's Regional Office for West Africa to field a site visit and provide a detailed report on the state of conservation of Mt. Nimba to the twenty-third session of the Committee. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.7 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998), had recalled that the State Party is in the process of implementing an eleven-point corrective action plan for this site since 1996. A management plan for the site is being elaborated as part of a project financed by GTZ-KFW (Germany) and supported by a contribution of US\$ 30,000 from the Fund. The Committee learned that a proposed hydroelectric development project (Patuca II), to be implemented near the Reserve, could open new access roads to the Reserve, reduce downstream water flow and quality, and result in the loss of scenic and bio-diversity values. The Committee noted that indigenous peoples living in and around the Reserve had complained to IUCN about the Government's efforts to expedite the implementation of this project, the lack of consultation and transparency in the preparation of an EIA for the project and a plan for opening a new road. The Committee was concerned that communications with Honduran authorities had become difficult due to damage caused to the country's infrastructure by Hurricane Mitch and information on the extent of hurricane damage to this site was urgently needed. Moreover, the Committee had requested that the State Party invite a site visit by IUCN and the Centre to prepare a detailed state of conservation report on Rio Platano for submission to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

The Bureau was informed that the flooding of the Patuca River, at the time when Hurricane Mitch impacted the site, has destroyed a great deal of vegetation and wildlife as well as settlements. However, more precise information on impacts on the natural heritage values of the site is needed to plan rehabilitation measures. IUCN's Regional Office for Meso-America is promoting a project to assess the impact of Hurricane Mitch on protected areas in the region, including World Heritage sites, with a view to obtaining baseline data necessary to prepare and implement restoration plans. The Bureau noted that the Centre is in contact with the staff of the GTZ-KFW conservation project for Rio Platano and with the Permanent Delegation of Honduras to UNESCO to obtain more information on the Patuca II project and the extent of damage caused to Rio Platano by Hurricane Mitch.

The Bureau reiterated the Committee's request to the State Party to consider inviting a Centre/IUCN mission to the site in 1999. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN continue to co-operate with the State Party to obtain detailed information concerning the Patuca II project and baseline data on the damage caused by Hurricane Mitch in order to plan rehabilitation measures. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.8 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session (Kyoto, 1998), had learnt that the implementation of the rehabilitation plan was progressing satisfactorily. The Committee also learned that the construction of ranger posts and staff housing

using the second instalment of US\$ 90,000 had been delayed due to adverse climatic conditions in the area throughout 1998. The Committee was informed that, while security conditions in and around Manas had improved, the threat of insurgency still prevailed and that militants often traversed the Sanctuary. Nevertheless, the Committee noted that conditions for site protection and the relationship with local villagers were gradually improving. The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) had provided US\$ 400,000 to strengthen the conservation of Manas during 1997-98, and an additional US\$ 100,000 in 1998. MOEF will consider making further contributions as soon as the funds provided so far are utilized in accordance with plans agreed upon by MOEF, the State Government of Assam, site management and the Bureau in 1997. The Committee had also requested the Director-General of UNESCO to invite the Government of Bhutan to ratify the World Heritage Convention and to consider nominating the Royal Manas National Park of Bhutan for consideration by the Committee for World Heritage status. The Committee noted that this could help to strengthen the overall protection of the trans-border Manas ecosystem.

The Bureau was satisfied to receive confirmation from the Centre that all equipment purchased and delivered using the first instalment of US\$ 75,000 is now operational and in use. With regard to the use of the second instalment of US\$ 90,000, plans for the purchase of two additional wooden fiber boats and 400 units of patrolling gear for US\$ 20,000 remain unchanged and are being implemented. The use of the balance of US\$ 70,000 for the construction of ranger posts and staff housing, however is being reviewed due to the fact that not all parts of the Sanctuary are fully secure for staff to be resident. Furthermore, site management seems eager to support some activities that would benefit local villages and enhance trust-building between management and the local community. MOEF has submitted to the Centre a revised budget, comprising sixteen activities, for the use of the US\$ 70,000. The Centre, after consulting with IUCN, had sought clarification from the Indian authorities on conservation benefits expected to derive from six of the sixteen activities that are intended to cater to the needs of local villagers. The Bureau was informed that MOEF has transmitted via its letter of 21 June 1999, a detailed report on the state of conservation of Manas that included clarifications requested by the Centre. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report to IUCN for review.

The Bureau was informed that the WWF Office of Bhutan has offered the Centre its assistance in reviewing detailed documentation on the Convention, with a view to advising the Royal Government of Bhutan on the implications of Bhutan's ratification of the World Heritage Convention and the nomination of the Royal Manas National Park as a World Heritage site. The Bureau noted that the Centre has transmitted all relevant information to the WWF Office in Bhutan. The Bureau encouraged the Centre and IUCN to continue their co-operation with WWF and other international conservation organizations resident in Bhutan to urge the Royal Government of Bhutan to ratify the Convention and nominate the Royal Manas National Park for consideration as World Heritage as soon as possible.

The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN to finalize the revision of the budget for the use of the US\$ 70,000 and expedite the rate of implementation of the rehabilitation plan that appears to have slowed down during 1998. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.9 Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)**

The Bureau recalled that the Committee had recommended (Naples, 1997), a mission to this site to evaluate the state of conservation and to determine whether the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. At its last session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee had noted the findings of the



Centre/State Party/IUCN site mission (September-October 1998), and of previous missions of IUCN-Niger which indicated that the numbers of most wildlife species are recovering. The flora, except in some valleys where they seem to be over-used by local people, is mostly intact. Species like the ostrich however, are seriously threatened by poaching and international trade in live animals and its by-products; the ostrich population in the Reserves had dropped to less than 10% of 1990-91 estimates. The Peace Agreement between the Government and rebels appears to be effective and the impact of rebel activities on the site has been less severe than previously expected.

The Committee learned of the State Party's efforts to elaborate an emergency rehabilitation programme for the site, focused to: (i) restore sites used as bases by the rebels in the past; (ii) strengthen surveillance and protection capacity; (iii) promote ostrich breeding in partial enclosures; (iv) carry out rapid evaluation of impacts on populations of key faunal species; (v) establish a committee for development and management of the site; and (vi) conduct training workshops on threats to natural heritage for selected target groups like border police, customs officers etc.

The Bureau examined the emergency rehabilitation plan presented in Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.12 and noted that the Chairperson had approved a grant for supporting a training seminar for border police and customs officers. The Bureau was informed that IUCN's Country Office for Niger has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife of Niger for launching a programme entitled « Air 2000 », in co-operation with other donors like SDC, DANIDA and GEF. The signing of this MOU has resulted in some modifications to the component of the emergency rehabilitation plan activities, indicated in the Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.12 and which were to be submitted for financial support from the World Heritage Fund. Following the request of the Observer of Niger, the Bureau asked the Centre and IUCN to explore ways and means to finance the implementation of the rehabilitation plan, including the submission of projects for financial assistance to the consideration of the Chairperson and the twenty-third session of the Committee (29 November to 4 December 1999). The Bureau agreed with the recommendation of IUCN that the decision on whether or not the Committee should consider removing the Air and Ténéré Reserves from the List of World Heritage in Danger should be deferred until 2000, when the monitoring results of the impact of the implementation of the rehabilitation plan would be available. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee retain Air and Ténéré in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.10 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**

The Bureau recalled that, at its last session (June 1998), while being concerned about the feasibility of the effective rehabilitation of Ichkeul, it had urged the State Party to take all necessary measures to ensure rapid and effective implementation of the rehabilitation programme for Ichkeul. The Bureau had also recommended an expert mission to the site. The mission was intended to give due consideration to the possibility for developing an improved rehabilitation programme for Ichkeul to retain its status as a World Heritage site and to allow the State Party sufficient time for the implementation of the rehabilitation programme.

The Bureau examined Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.11 containing the report of the mission of experts from IUCN, the Ramsar Convention Secretariat and the Centre to Ichkeul, fielded in February 1999. The Bureau noted that the experts recognized the uncertainty linked to the feasibility of rehabilitating Ichkeul to conditions that existed at the time of its inscription (1980). However, the Bureau was satisfied to note that the State Party is committed and taking significant efforts to mitigate threats to the

site and ensure effective and timely rehabilitation. The Bureau was in agreement with the mission that the monitoring of the effectiveness of the rehabilitation would have to be based on a reasonable time frame. Inter-linked indicators such as salinity, availability of preferred species of food plants of birds, and the number of wintering birds arriving in Ichkeul could fluctuate significantly, based on annual variations in rainfall and evapotranspiration which affect water levels in the Lake. The Bureau concurred with the view of mission that the Committee should defer its judgement on the success or failure of the rehabilitation of Ichkeul until such time when possible improvements to the ecology of the Lake could be detectable.

The Tunisian Observer informed the Bureau that three of the six dams that would have diverted waters coming into the Lake (see page 12 of the Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.11) have been suspended and plans for the provision of fresh water to Lake would become operational by the year 2001. The Delegate agreed with the mission recommendation concerning the longer time frame needed for the ecological monitoring of restoration of wetland ecosystems such as the Ichkeul. He furthermore pointed out that considerable data existed to set up a monitoring programme as recommended by the expert mission, but implementation of a rigorous monitoring programme would require assistance for national capacity-building.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a threat mitigation status report to the twenty-third session of the Committee in accordance with the outline proposed by the expert mission report. The proposed outline invited the State Party to define current and expected values for a set of indicators, e.g. water salinity levels, counts of a selected number of endangered species of birds and the availability of preferred food plants of birds etc. This could provide the basis for a monitoring programme during a 5 year-period from 2000 to 2004. IUCN stressed the need that the selection of parameters for the monitoring programme be related to the values for which the site was originally inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980. The Bureau recommended that the State Party undertakes necessary studies and analysis needed for developing the region's economy based on ecotourism and similar non-extractive resource uses so that local people who are dependent on grazing their livestock on the Ichkeul marshes could be provided with alternative livelihood options. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**IV.11** The Bureau examined the state of conservation of two cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of Working Document WHC-99/CONF.204/4 and additional information provided during its session by the Secretariat, the advisory bodies and States Parties' delegations. The Bureau noted that substantive reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger will be submitted to the Committee at its twenty-third session.

#### **IV.12 Angkor (Cambodia)**

The Bureau, having examined the state of conservation report of the site and upon considering the additional information provided by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and members of the Bureau, commended the exemplary work being carried out by the Authority for the Protection of the Site and Development of the Region of Angkor (APSARA) and the International Co-ordination Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Area of Angkor (ICC).

The Bureau noted that some one hundred on-going projects are being implemented by more than a dozen countries and agencies,

including large scale infrastructural projects such as road and bridge constructions, airport extension and public utilities upgrading of The World Bank, Asian Development Bank, Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA) and other bilateral and multilateral financial and development co-operation agencies, as well as privately-funded projects, notably for the construction of tourism facilities. To ensure that such works, necessary for the socio-economic welfare of the population, do not undermine the World Heritage values of the site, the Bureau requested the strengthening of international co-ordination efforts by APSARA and ICC to review all public and private works affecting the site in addition to the monumental conservation projects. Recalling paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, the Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Committee, through the Secretariat, of major restorations or new constructions which they intend to undertake or to authorize which may affect the World Heritage values of the site, before the drafting of basic documents of the specific projects and before granting authorization.

As a management tool to record and monitor the various development works, the Delegate of Hungary stressed the need to update the Geographical Information System (GIS) of Angkor developed in 1993, and to make this consolidated data available to all concerned parties.

Concerning the conservation projects, the Bureau, while expressing its appreciation for the high quality of the standards applied in the on-going projects, stressed the necessity to ensure the transfer of knowledge and skills to the national and local experts through training. In this regard, ICCROM, recognized by the Committee as the principal partner for training in cultural heritage conservation, reiterated its readiness to evaluate the training aspects of the on-going projects and to improve, as appropriate, the effectiveness of such endeavours.

The Bureau, furthermore expressed its deep concern over the alarming reports on the continued looting and illicit traffic of cultural properties in Angkor and other cultural sites on the Tentative List of Cambodia. Referring to the report presented by the Secretariat on this matter and stating that although his country is not yet a signatory to the 1970 Convention, the Observer of Thailand expressed his satisfaction with the measures taken by the Thai authorities, following the seizure by the Thai police of more than one hundred objects from a temple in Cambodia. Recalling the request of the Committee at its twenty-first session for the recording and documentation of these sites, the Bureau called upon the Secretariat to strengthen support to the State Party in this regard. The Bureau also urged the State Party to take further action to enhance the protection of the site against looting and the national frontiers against illicit export of cultural properties and requested the signatories of the 1970 Convention to take all measures possible to prevent the importation and sales of Khmer cultural objects of uncertain provenance.

The Bureau requested the State Party to prepare an updated state of conservation report with the support of the UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh and the Division of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO of the actions being undertaken in addressing the concerns expressed above. The Bureau invited the Chairperson of the Committee to write to the Co-chairpersons of the ICC requesting them to also assist the State Party in the preparation of this report. This report should include information concerning the on-going and planned major public and private works in the region of Angkor, as well as the status of measures being undertaken at the national and local levels to control looting and illicit traffic of cultural properties from Angkor and other sites on the Tentative List of Cambodia. The Bureau requested that this report be provided to the Secretariat by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-third session.

#### IV.13 Bahla Fort (Oman)

The Bureau took note of the progress made in the preparation of the five-year conservation plan. It will evaluate the progress after two years in order to assess if it can recommend the Committee to delete the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau recommended that the Committee at its twenty-third session, endorse this procedure. Moreover, the Bureau invited the Omani authorities to increase their financial contribution for the missions to enable the team of experts to continue assisting the national authorities at the site in implementing the five-year conservation plan.

### B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

**IV.14** The Bureau examined the state of conservation of seventy-two properties inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of Working Document WHC-99/CONF.204/5 and additional information provided during its session by the Secretariat, the advisory bodies and States Parties' delegations.

#### WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES IN CENTRAL AMERICA

**IV.15** ICOMOS presented a report on the conditions of the cultural World Heritage properties in Central America following the passage of Hurricane Mitch in October/November 1998. The report was prepared by an ICOMOS expert following a recent mission to the sites. ICOMOS provided information on five cultural sites:

**Joya de Ceren (El Salvador):** The protective roofs proved to be inadequate to protect the excavated areas of this site. Prolonged soaking of the volcanic soil resulted in rapid plant and fungal growth on the excavated structures. The expert recommended preventive action and the full incorporation of risk preparedness in the management plan that is under preparation with support of the Getty Conservation Institute.

**Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala):** Widespread flooding occurred up to one meter high, particularly in the Alameda del Calvario. Decisive action was taken immediately by the authorities, the city was cleaned and most of the damage has already been repaired.

**Archaeological Park and Ruins of Quirigua (Guatemala):** This was the most heavily damaged site visited by the expert. Canals and water management systems of the surrounding banana plantations were destroyed, causing mud and water to flood the site and impregnating the structures and sculptures with agricultural chemicals. Cleaning of the stone requires a long and expensive process. Most of the infrastructure at the site, storage facilities, fences etc. were also destroyed. There is a need for a management plan with risk preparedness provisions.

**Maya Site of Copan (Honduras):** The Copan River overflowed and retook its original course, destroying archaeological remains (Las Sepulturas) as well as a retention wall. Excavation tunnels in the pyramids that were not stabilised were affected. In ICOMOS's opinion these should be immediately backfilled once the research and documentation concluded. A thorough review of the excavation policy for Copan should be undertaken.

**The Ruins of Leon Viejo (Nicaragua):** This site was nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List some years ago and recognised as having World Heritage values. The site was very seriously affected by a hurricane in 1982. As a consequence of

Hurricane Mitch, the stream that was canalised at that time, overflowed and returned to its original course. The site was covered with mud and walls were destabilised. Cleaning and repair were immediately undertaken. The construction of protective walls and dredging of the stream will be required.

**IV.16** IUCN referred to the discussions on **Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)** that had taken place when the Bureau examined the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It confirmed that damages occurred to vegetation, wildlife and settlements in the area. It reported on its intention to further assess the damages to the natural heritage in Central America and that it was seeking funding for this action.

**IV.17** The Bureau commended ICOMOS and IUCN on the thorough reporting on the state of conservation of the properties in Central America and requested the Secretariat to transmit the reports to the States Parties concerned for comments and observations. The Bureau commended the States Parties for the immediate response they had given to the damage caused by Hurricane Mitch. The Bureau noted that World Heritage emergency assistance had been approved by the Chairperson and had been delivered immediately to most of the States Parties concerned. It offered its assistance in securing additional funding and requested donors and international organizations to support States Parties in taking appropriate remedial action. The Bureau stressed the need for risk preparedness and its inclusion in the management planning for World Heritage properties.

## NATURAL HERITAGE

**IV.18** The Chairperson recalled that at the twenty-second session of the Bureau (June 1998) the former Chairperson, Professor Francioni, recommended the establishment of an informal contact group on mining and World Heritage sites during the annual sessions of the Committee and the Bureau. In this regard, and as requested by the Bureau and Committee at its sessions in Kyoto in December 1998, IUCN has transmitted to the Centre the Position Statement on Mining and Associated Activities in Relation to Protected Areas issued by the World Commission of Protected Areas (WCPA). The WCPA Position Statement has been made available, as requested by the Bureau sessions at Kyoto, in Information Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.14.

**IV.19** The Chairperson noted that the Bureau may wish to reflect on the relevance of WCPA's Position Statement in the light of its deliberations on mining threats to specific sites, whose state of conservation are reported during this Bureau session. He suggested that the WCPA Position Statement be submitted as a working document to the twenty-third session of the Committee (Marrakesh, Morocco, November/December 1999).

**IV.20** IUCN reported that WCPA is one of the six commissions and networks of IUCN. It has more than 1,400 members in 140 countries. The Position Statement on mining has been developed within the network. Mining is a key issue in many countries and this statement has been developed for the world's protected areas in general, rather than World Heritage sites specifically. However, the principles in the Position Statement are equally applicable. The aims of the statement are (a) to provide a clear position with regard to mining and protected areas and a global framework statement which recognizes that clear rules are easier to understand and to defend than ones which depend too much on interpretation; (b) to provide a framework for countries to consider and adapt as needed in local circumstances; (c) to set a framework based on the IUCN protected area categories system which is focused on the objectives of protected area management. Finally it has to be

noted that mining is not considered to be compatible with any of the Categories I to IV, and for V to VI only under certain conditions. IUCN is prepared to continue consultations on this issue, including with the mining industry and its Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME).

## IV.21 Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997), the Committee was informed by the Australian authorities of the rigorous environmental conditions set for the development activities in the Hinchinbrook region and of other measures implemented to strengthen the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. At its twenty-second session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee noted that the Australian authorities had acted on the findings of the financial review of the GBRMPA (Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority) to further strengthen the conservation of the site. In addition, the Committee requested the Centre to transmit the reports from the Australian Committee of IUCN (ACICUN) and other Australian NGOs to the State Party for review and comments and recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

IUCN underlined that the ACIUCN has started a process for monitoring Australian sites. The aim is to bring IUCN members together to discuss key issues at each site and recommend actions. This process, although not perfect, has to be encouraged. In the ACIUCN report that IUCN transmitted to the Centre and has been forwarded to the State Party for review and comment, are a number of key points:

- (a) the scale and complexity of this World Heritage site has to be recognized as a key issue relating to assessing management effectiveness;
- (b) the range of threats, including catchment management and impacts from on-shore activities on the adjoining reef complex needs a co-ordinated approach to management between a range of different stakeholders and agencies;
- (c) the need for an effective and representative system of protected areas within this very large World Heritage site; and
- (d) the importance of a strong, effective and dedicated authority for management.

ACIUCN indicated strong support for the GBRMPA but noted that the organization needs to have organisational stability and long-term adequate funding. IUCN noted a number of other threats, including fishing, oil spills and oil shale mining and noted that ACIUCN recommended that no oil shale mining and prospecting should be permitted within the GBR World Heritage area and adjacent zones. IUCN recognizes that the GBRMPA has a challenging, complex and very difficult task in managing the Reef. IUCN feels that the state of the GBR World Heritage area should be looked at in conjunction with the IUCN report and the implementation of the strategic plan for the GBR. IUCN feels that the state of the GBR World Heritage area should be looked at in conjunction with the IUCN report and the implementation of the strategic plan for the GBR. IUCN supports stakeholder-Government consultation as part of the periodic reporting process.

The Bureau noted that the Australian authorities had submitted their comments on the ACIUCN Report entitled: "Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area: Condition, Management and Threats". They have annexed a description of recent management initiatives addressing threats to the integrity of the GBR World Heritage Area to that letter. The letter and the annex were transmitted to IUCN for review. Furthermore, the Centre also received a copy of the letter from Mr. Victor Kuss, to the Executive Director of ACIUCN, expressing his disagreement

concerning the recommendation of the ACIUCN report on oil shale mining in the World Heritage area and in the adjacent intertidal zone (Recommendation No: 22 of the ACIUCN report).

The Bureau welcomed the two-step process adopted by IUCN to review the state of conservation of the Great Barrier Reef for the purpose of its reporting to the Bureau, i.e. an initial in-depth review by ACIUCN in full consultation with all stakeholders to report to IUCN Headquarters, followed by an IUCN Headquarters review of the ACIUCN report and other relevant information to provide inputs to the Centre's preparation of the working document on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites.

The Bureau requested ACIUCN and the State Party to review the 29 recommendations listed in the ACIUCN report, to elaborate a more focused set of recommendations and a detailed plan for implementation and monitoring those recommendations. Such a plan should, to the extent possible, be built on consensus view of all stakeholders concerned with the long-term conservation of the GBR World Heritage area. This plan should be provided to the Centre and IUCN before 15 September 1999 so that a report can be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Committee to be held in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 29 November to 4 December 1999.

The Australian Observer agreed with the recommendation of the Bureau and made a set of observations on the ACIUCN report's recommendations and proposed follow up actions. The full text of the statement made by the Australian Observer is included in Annex III.

#### **IV.22 Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia)**

At its twenty-second session the Bureau was informed that a petroleum exploration permit had been granted by the State Government of West Australia (WA) for an area located within the World Heritage site. The Australian Observer assured the Bureau that no development that threatened the World Heritage values of the site would be allowed to take place. But IUCN was concerned about the granting of prospecting licences by State Governments for locations within World Heritage areas, and urged closer liaison between Commonwealth and State Governments on this matter. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998) the Bureau was informed that a mining lease of the Shark Bay Salt Joint Venture (SBSJV) had attracted public comment but is outside of the property. Levee construction occurred outside the World Heritage area and approval for the levee construction was granted under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act of 1986 and construction works complied with the environmental requirements set by the Minister for the Environment. The Western Australian Department of Environment was satisfied with the compliance of SBSJV with the environmental conditions set for the construction phase. In accordance with a post-construction environmental requirement, SBSJV, with professional assistance from the Department of Conservation and Land Management, successfully transferred marine mega-fauna, trapped behind the levee, to open marine waters. IUCN had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from ACIUCN, and is in the process of reviewing that report. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report of ACIUCN to the State Party for review and recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

IUCN informed the Centre that it has received information indicating that potential threats due to existing and proposed mining activities, such as shell mining, expansion of salt extraction, gypsum leases and mineral sands mining are key concerns for the conservation of this area. Other concerns

include: inappropriate tourism development, visitor access to environmentally sensitive locations and the need to finalise an overall management plan for the site. ACIUCN has established a process involving key stakeholders to finalise its report on the conservation status for the Shark Bay World Heritage site.

The Bureau requested IUCN to submit an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site to its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

#### **IV.23 Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)**

The Bureau, at its twenty-second session learned that the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment had determined that clearing of vegetation that may have occurred within this property did not place the World Heritage values of the site at risk. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998), the Bureau was informed that the arrangements for the management of this site were fully effective and met with the full confidence of the Commonwealth Government of Australia. The Management Plan, effective as of 1 September 1998, had been prepared with the full involvement of all stakeholders, including Aboriginal groups, and provides the Wet Tropics Management Authority with a full suite of powers to act in the interests of the World Heritage values of the property. The Bureau noted that IUCN had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from ACIUCN and was in the process of reviewing it. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from ACIUCN to the State Party for review and recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

IUCN informed the Centre that preliminary advice it has received indicates that the central issue is the effectiveness of implementation of the management plan, in relation to issues such as invasive species, water extraction, fire management, tourism development and the effective involvement of Aboriginal people. IUCN has informed the Centre that ACIUCN has established a collaborative process to finalise its report on the conservation status of the Wet Tropics. This report will be ready for submission to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

#### **IV.24 Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)**

The Committee, when it inscribed this property on the World Heritage List (Naples, 1997), had requested documentation on the marine resources surrounding this property. The Australian authorities informed the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (Kyoto, 1998) that the Australian Antarctic Division had granted funding to collate and analyse existing data on the benthic environments surrounding this property, including the territorial sea. In accordance with Australia's plans to establish a marine protected area in the region, the project aims to assess whether the 12 nautical miles territorial sea provides a representative sample of marine biodiversity in the region. To enable such an assessment, a comprehensive research programme is to be undertaken to clearly identify the marine values of the area. The Bureau had invited the State Party to submit a report, before 15 April 1999, on the findings of the project to establish a marine protected area so as to enable it to review the report at its twenty-third session.

The Australian authorities had informed the Centre that the Heard Island and McDonald Island (HIMI) benthic project to establish a marine protected area includes a desktop study and a field survey. The desktop study commenced in January 1999 and was due to be completed in June 1999. It aims to document the distribution and abundance of different types of benthic habitats on the continental shelf around Heard Island, including an evaluation of the differences between benthic habitats in the

territorial waters (0-12 nautical miles) and the remainder of the Australian (200 nautical miles) EEZ surrounding the Island. The field survey will examine the effect of trawling on these types of habitats and develop management options to protect environmental values of the benthic environments. The second stage, i.e. the field survey, is intended to be a pilot study to provide indicative results on habitats. Dependent upon the availability of the necessary ship transport, the Australian authorities estimate that the earliest opportunity for beginning the second stage will be in the summer of 2000/2001. The letter of 12 April 1999 from the Australian authorities has been transmitted to IUCN for comments.

IUCN commended the process to create a marine protected area around HIMI which it saw as essential to more effectively protect marine biodiversity.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party submits a report on the desktop study, due to be completed in June 1999, to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999. The Australian Observer informed the Bureau that the report of the desktop study is being finalised and will be submitted to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.25 The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) Sundarbans National Park (India)**

The Committee when it inscribed «The Sundarbans» of Bangladesh in the World Heritage List (Naples, 1997) encouraged the authorities of Bangladesh and India to discuss the possibility of creating a trans-frontier site with the adjoining Sundarbans National Park and World Heritage site (India). The Ministry of Environment and Forests of Bangladesh with support from the Asian Development Bank, is undertaking a multi-million dollar project, entitled the "Sundarbans Biodiversity Conservation Project". The Sundarbans World Heritage site is considered to be one of the main components of this project under which a management plan will be developed and implemented. IUCN Bangladesh will be involved as an independent agency assisting with the implementation of this project. A meeting held in Bangladesh in February 1999 informally discussed amongst other items the possibility of having The Sundarbans World Heritage site of Bangladesh and the Sundarbans National Park World Heritage site of India combined into a single site inscription.

In a separate initiative, WWF-International is launching a study financed by a SFR 50,000 grant for investigating transborder ecological and conservation aspects of the tiger population inhabiting the Sundarbans ecosystem. The two World Heritage sites together support the largest and the most viable wild tiger population in the world. The WWF-project intends to promote co-operation between the Bangladesh and Indian site staff and scientists for the conservation and management of tiger populations, as a first step that could lead towards discussions to consider the joint inscription of the two sites as a single entry in the World Heritage List. The Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Government of Bangladesh, via their fax of 22 June 1999 informed the Centre that they accept the suggestion made by the Centre (with the agreement of the relevant authorities of the Ministry of Environment and Forests of India) to host a meeting in Bangladesh to discuss co-operation between the two sites. The Government of Bangladesh has indicated that they would inform the Centre of the venue, timing and financial requirements of organising such a planning meeting in due course.

IUCN supported the efforts of the Government of Bangladesh to strengthen the management at this site. IUCN Bangladesh country office is assisting with this project. IUCN reiterated its recommendation for the desirability of combining the

Sundarbans World Heritage sites of Bangladesh and India into one single site, which is effectively managed in a co-ordinated way. IUCN highlighted the "Parks for Peace" initiative, which works on transboundary protected areas and may be applicable in this case.

The Bureau commended the Government of Bangladesh and the Asian Development Bank for their efforts to strengthen the management of The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) and WWF-International in launching a study on transborder aspects of tiger ecology and conservation. The Bureau thanked the Government of Bangladesh for agreeing to host a planning meeting to build co-operation between the management of these two sites. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to extend their fullest co-operation to the Governments of Bangladesh and India, and to all other international, regional and national organisations who may wish to participate in building a programme of co-operation which could result in the eventual joint inscription of the two sites as a single entry on the World Heritage List.

#### **IV.26 Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/ Poland)**

At its twenty-second extraordinary session (Kyoto, 1998) the Bureau commended the Polish authorities for submitting an extension of the Bialowieza Forest and reiterated its previous request that the two States Parties co-operate to prepare a management plan for the Belarus part and consider removing the fence separating the two parts. IUCN informed the Bureau that the IUCN evaluation of the extension of the Bialowieza Forest of Poland would be submitted to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau. At that time IUCN, will also provide an analysis of transborder management issues in this site and associated recommendations for consideration by the Bureau.

The Bureau requested IUCN to provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site to its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

#### **IV.27 Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

Since 1997, the Bureau and the Committee have repeatedly called for the permanent closure of the 18 km road traversing this Park which had been illegally opened by local people. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau requested a Centre/IUCN mission to review the situation and to assist the State Party to mitigate threats to the Park. The twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1998) was informed of a new threat to Iguacu's integrity, arising from plans to fill a hydropower reservoir in southwest Brazil that would divert a considerable volume of Iguacu's waters for seven to eight weeks per year. The Bureau reiterated its request that the State Party provides information on the two above-mentioned items and on plans for the hydropower reservoir project. The Bureau noted that a possible Centre/IUCN mission to the site in March 1999 should determine whether the site needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

An IUCN/UNESCO mission visited the site in March 1999 and discussed the state of conservation with all the stakeholders including local residents and local Government officials. The mission identified the following four issues as most threatening to the integrity of this site:

(1) The Colon Road which was illegally reopened in May 1997. The Federal Public Prosecutor is presently prosecuting the local communities of the area for reopening the road and the Federal and State agencies for not enforcing the closure of the road. The majority of the local people favour the continued use of the road as it shortens the distance between communities in the northern and southern sides of the Park by about 130 km. The north-south road dissects the Park into two and has resulted in the opening of

the forest canopy along most of its length. The road has led to the destruction of parts of the forest, interrupted wildlife movement between the eastern and western sections of the Park and has severely impacted the site's World Heritage value. Research and academic personnel have expressed particular concerns regarding the preservation of the jaguar that may be threatened with extinction in the region, as its habitat has been dissected by this road. The road is leading to an increase in silting of the creeks and rivers and alteration of drainage patterns, further exacerbating the impact on World Heritage values. The road has also opened up the Park for illegal extraction of timber and poaching.

(2) Helicopter flights originating from Brazil and Argentina began in 1972. Following recommendations from the World Heritage Committee in 1994, flights on the Argentinean side have been stopped, but have continued on the Brazilian side. In 1996, growing concern on this matter led to a discussion between the Presidents of Brazil and Argentina. In 1997 Brazil, in agreement with Argentina, recommenced helicopter flights which are restricted to Brazilian territory, operate between 0900 and 1700 hours, and maintain a minimum altitude of 1600 feet (i.e. 500 metres). The heliport was to be relocated from a site adjacent to the Falls to outside of the National Park. But a suitable location for the heliport outside of the Park has yet to be found and up to 20-25 flights per day, each of 7 to 11 minutes, continue to originate from within the Park. A study of the Environment Institute of Paraná has found that most visitors believe that the flights are interfering with their enjoyment of the Falls. The study however did not investigate the impact of the flights on the fauna.

(3) The Salto Caixas Dam on the Iguacu River was built recently but is located upstream of the National Park and at present there is no evidence of any impact on the World Heritage values of the Park. The proposal for another dam, Capanema, has been abandoned, as it would have had a direct impact on the Park. The new Management Plan for Iguacu National Park was to be completed by May 1999.

This management plan will aim to address all of the above-mentioned problems. It is clear that the management of the two World Heritage sites, i.e. Iguacu National Park (Brazil) and the Iguazu National Park (Argentina) would benefit from closer liaison and co-ordination between their respective management authorities. IUCN stressed that sufficient time should be given to the State Parties for implementing the recommendations of the mission.

The Centre informed the Bureau that the Ministers of both the Environment and Tourism, and the Governor of the State of Parana met on 13 April 1999 and agreed that the situation of the Colon Road is not acceptable. They defined a number of measures to solve this problem, including the recuperation of degraded areas, and consultation with local authorities to ensure a peaceful solution to close the road. The Observer of Brazil informed the Bureau that the new management plan has been finalized and recommends the closure of the illegal road and evaluates damage and establishes a series of recommendations for the restoration of this area. The plan also defines a new zoning of the Park. A dialogue with the Argentinian National Park Service towards a common programme of research, monitoring and protection of the two World Heritage sites has been started.

The Bureau requested the State Party to immediately close the Colon Road and initiate a recovery plan to increase canopy closure and re-vegetation of ground cover and stabilise soils and control erosion. In the absence of satisfactory progress with regard to the permanent closure of the road and the implementation of the recovery plan by the time of its twenty-third extraordinary session, the Bureau may recommend that the Committee include Iguacu National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the State

Party to: (i) immediately halt helicopter flights pending a thorough evaluation of their impact on the fauna, particularly the avifauna; and (ii) provide a copy of the new management plan to IUCN for review to enable an assessment of the effectiveness of the plan to address prevailing threats to the integrity of the site.

#### **IV.28 Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

At its twenty-first session, the Committee had expressed its serious concerns over the potential threats posed by the Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 2.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this site. The Bureau noted that Parks Canada, informed the Centre of a Federal Court of Canada hearing from 1 to 3 March 1999 on this case that had rendered its decision on 8 April 1999. The Federal Court quashed the Federal Fisheries Act authorisation of August 1998 to allow work to start on the access road and railway and concluded that the environmental assessment did not comply with the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (LCEE). Furthermore, the Federal Court stated that the Project could not proceed until the Joint Review Panel's environmental assessment is conducted in compliance with the LCEE. The proponent of the Cheviot Mine Project, Lusar Coal Ltd, announced, on 10 March 1999, that it was delaying decisions on the construction of the mine for at least a year. Progress has been made with regard to preparing an Integrated Framework for the Conservation of Grizzly Bears. A document incorporating results of the consultations undertaken with regard to the preparation of the Framework is to be sent to stakeholder groups in May 1999. IUCN welcomed the decision that the proposed mine has been put on hold for at least one year.

The Bureau welcomed these developments and thanked the State Party for the actions taken and for regularly providing information on the proposed mine. The Bureau commended the members of the environmental coalition for their efforts in promoting the protection of the site.

#### **IV.29 Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

In November 1997, IUCN was informed that conflicts between armed groups had rendered a significant portion of the Park off-limits to staff and that tourism to the area had come to a halt. The twenty-second session of the Bureau requested IUCN to review a report from the Colombian authorities to the Centre and submit its findings to its twenty-second extraordinary session. IUCN informed the Bureau in November 1998 that a major restructuring of Colombia's conservation administration was underway for devolving responsibilities for the site management to the provincial level. However, IUCN was of the view that the site was under serious threat and should be considered for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger. A second report from the Colombian authorities informed the Bureau that the Park was affected by the confrontation between guerrilla and paramilitary groups and that four sectors of the Park received only limited attention from the staff. However, in 1997 and 1998 activities to strengthen protection of the Park through control units and other activities such as inter-institutional meetings, collaboration with local communities, definition of the buffer zone and the elaboration of the management plan, had been undertaken. Support for the creation and consolidation of the Darien Special Management Area (DSMA) to co-ordinate the management of the two World Heritage sites (Darien of Panama and Los Katios of Colombia) has been provided and actions to create a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve were being considered. The Bureau noted the State Party's conclusion that, although there have been impacts, the Park has not been invaded by colonists and pressure on the Park and its natural resources had reduced considerably. Preventive measures had been taken for the security of the personnel and the Park had returned to a certain normalcy and calm, allowing the staff to control the area

and to implement operations. The State Party did not see any need for inclusion of Los Katios in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to remain in contact with the State Party to monitor progress and to report back to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau reiterated the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site, to establish a single World Heritage site linking Darien (Panama) and Los Katios (Colombia).

In its review of the November 1998 report submitted by the State Party, IUCN has acknowledged progress made in the preparation of the management plan. IUCN has also noted improvements in co-operation with the local communities, promoting transboundary co-operation with Panama and preventing illegal extraction of resources in areas of the Park controlled by the staff. IUCN recommended that the Bureau compliment the State Party for these efforts despite the difficult situation facing this site. However, IUCN has reiterated its concern about the serious threats facing Los Katios and its integrity, highlighting that:

- (a) the Park is not fully under the control of the management agency;
- (b) the proposal to grant collective land ownership over 100,000 ha of the Park should be assessed; and
- (c) the impacts on wetlands from forest fires need to be reviewed. IUCN recommended that a joint IUCN/Centre mission be carried out to the site.

The Observer of Colombia underlined the actions taken by his Government, in particular concerning:

- (1) community participation; (2) inter-institutional co-operation among local authorities, NGO's and communities; (3) progress made with the second phase of the management plan; and (4) with transfrontier co-operation with Darien National Park in Panama. He emphasized the commitment of his Government to the protection of the site and did not support the recommendation to include it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He welcomed a technical mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the site.

The Bureau considered new information provided by the Government of Colombia and IUCN and requested the Centre and IUCN to keep in contact with the State Party to monitor progress made and to report back to the twenty-third session of the Committee, as well as concerning the organization of the proposed mission. The Bureau commended the States Party for progress made with regard to transfrontier management and reiterated the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site to establish a single World Heritage site linking Darien (Panama) and Los Katios (Colombia) World Heritage sites.

#### **IV.30 Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC))**

The Centre informed the Bureau that Salonga National Park is the only one of the five sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo that has not been included in the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the site is located in the more central part of the country and hence is relatively less impacted by on-going armed conflicts in the eastern part of the country. However, the Centre proposed to the Bureau that Salonga National Park should be included with the other four sites of DRC in the List of World Heritage in Danger. In this way, Salonga would be part of all efforts to be undertaken by the Task Force at the Naivasha Seminar, Kenya, (see Chapter VII, page 53) to support conservation of World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN received a report (February 1999) on this site from the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN). The status of the habitats and

abundance of elephants and the Bonobo chimpanzees seem satisfactory. Human activity within the Park, however, is a concern and poaching and human settlements threaten the integrity of the site. There are too few guards and they are ill equipped to deal effectively with poachers. The dire need for boats to better control the waterways, which are the main arteries for the transport of weapons and poached wildlife products, has been stressed and crackdown on arms traffic within the Park has been called for. IUCN commended ICCN for its comprehensive report and supported the following recommendations made by ICCN:

- (i) the need to encourage active participation and education of local populations;
- (ii) improvement of infrastructure and communications;
- (iii) development of sustainable tourism around the Bonobo; and
- (iv) improved management of scientific research.

Lack of vehicular transport, funds and monitoring equipment, and limited communication facilities are also issues requiring urgent attention.

The Bureau took note of the information provided and recommended that the State Party submit to the Centre before 1 September 1999, a detailed list of equipment and other assistance required to strengthen site management. The Bureau further requested the Centre and IUCN to determine the costs of equipment and other site management needs and propose, to the twenty-third session of the Committee, a plan to finance the costs and identify priority activities that could be supported by contributions from World Heritage Fund. The Bureau recommended that the Committee consider including this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.31 Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed of a cable car construction project that would traverse this Park, proposed by a private individual concerned with tourism development. The feasibility of the project was questionable due to the heavy rains, high winds and the steep terrain that characterises this site. The Bureau noted that construction of such major access facilities was not consistent with the management plan of the Park and agreed with IUCN that the Dominican authorities need to exercise great caution when evaluating the feasibility of this proposal. At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau noted that the Government of Dominica has prepared the terms of reference (TOR) for an EIA of the proposal. The proposal and the TOR for the EIA have been reviewed by the Natural Resource Management Unit of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States and the TOR has been forwarded to the proponent of the cable car system.

Recent communications from the State Party indicated that the proposed alignment of the cable car will not enter into the Park, but will terminate on State Lands, 500 m from the boundaries of the World Heritage site. The State Party has assured UNESCO that the Government intends to maintain these adjoining State Lands as a buffer zone, limiting the activities to be undertaken there. IUCN noted: (a) that the cable car will be outside of the Park and that there will be no construction within the Park; (b) was concerned about the cable car development, as there needs to be effective planning to ensure that the increased visitation does not increase impacts on the World Heritage values; and (c) that the EIA should give more consideration to the aesthetic and visual impacts of the cable car on the site and to seek to minimise visual impacts.

The Bureau noted that the cable car would be located outside the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide more detailed information on the operational plan, the

location of the cable car in relation to the site, the potential visitor impact and the time frame for the implementation of this project. The Bureau furthermore requested the State Party to provide this information, as well as a report on the state of conservation of the site and the management planning, by 15 September 1999 in time for the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### IV.32 Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

At its last session, the Committee commended the State Party for ensuring the passage of the «Special Law on the Galapagos» on 18 March 1998, by the Official Registry of Ecuador as Law No. 278, and decided not to include Galapagos in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Law provides for the extension of the outer boundary of the marine reserve from 24 to 64 km offshore and for the establishment of a significant 130,000 km<sup>2</sup> Reserve for the conservation of marine biodiversity where only tourism and artisanal fisheries will be permitted. Furthermore, the Law addresses most of the key issues relating to conservation and sustainable development of Galapagos, including those five issues which had been described in the reports of the Bureau and Committee sessions in 1998.

Information received by IUCN indicated that positive actions have been taken to enhance the integrity of this site. The general regulation to implement the Special Law for Galapagos has been approved. However, the various special regulations have yet to be developed and thus many sections of the law are yet to be enforced. The greatest concern is that there is still no regulation governing the application of the various provisions of the law dealing with the control of introduced species, environmental impact assessment, environmental auditing and other environmental protection tools. There are pressing needs for fisheries regulations, co-ordinated with the marine reserve management planning and for tourism regulations. In relation to tourism, a specific concern is that the combination of environmental and tourism regulations should tightly regulate the application of the fourth Transitory Disposition of the Special Law for Galapagos, which exempts Isabela Island and its residents from certain constraints on tourism expansion. This Special Law could, if misapplied, open-up loopholes for undesirable development with negative effects on Galapagos conservation. In August 1998 a new Constitution came into force in Ecuador. With respect to the Galapagos, the new Constitution reaffirms the special status of the Archipelago.

Despite the delays in developing regulations, activities are moving rapidly towards the establishment of the quarantine inspection system for the Galapagos. Inspections should start in ports and airports, both on the mainland and in the islands, by mid-1999. The Charles Darwin Research Station (CDRS) is helping to co-ordinate activities in the Islands, providing some technical assistance and running an intensive awareness programme. There are prospects for funding a large part of the quarantine inspection infrastructure, training and expert services through two projects of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The Bureau noted that, in relation to the eradication of alien species from the Islands, the Ministry of Environment has prepared a request to the Global Environment Facility for funding to protect the terrestrial biodiversity of Galapagos. It complements other parts of the conservation strategy for the Galapagos Islands that aim to control the spread of invasive species belonging to other animal and plant taxa. A proposal by UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the CDRS, for funding from the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP) and the UN Foundation (UNF) has been approved for an amount of US\$ 3,999,850. The project is entitled Control and Eradication of Invasive Species: A Necessary Condition for Conserving Endemic Biodiversity of the

Galapagos World Heritage site. Of the amount approved, US\$ 2,000,000 will be used to set up an Endowment Fund to provide long-term support for the control and eradication of invasive species in Galapagos Islands.

The Management Plan for the Marine Reserve was approved on 18 March 1999, despite complications caused by the lack of a General Regulation to the Special Law. The approval of the Management Plan should mark the end of commercial fishing in the Marine Reserve and the establishment of the Participatory Management Group for the Reserve. Essential for the implementation of the Management Plan is a clear definition of management zones, especially no-take zones. The details of artisanal fisheries regulations, including the definition of "artisanal" in the Galapagos context, are also to be decided through a technical exercise, which has been initiated with the co-operation of the National Fisheries Institute, but would benefit greatly from international technical expertise in fisheries. A third issue to be considered in implementing the management plan is the establishment of mechanisms to regulate total fishing capacity in the Islands.

Despite all these positive developments, the decision to reopen the sea cucumber fisheries for two months raised serious concern among national and international conservation NGOs. The two fundamental concerns are the status of the resource itself and the capability to effectively manage fisheries activities. A report received from the Charles Darwin Foundation indicates that the reopening of sea cucumber fisheries, follows an assessment of the populations in the fishing zones. A joint monitoring and patrolling programme between GNPS, CDRS and the Ecuadorian Navy has been established using six patrol boats. Thanks to the support of the Frankfurt Zoological Society, the marine patrol is supported by an aerial patrol. This patrolling system is proving to be an effective enforcement mechanism. The current situation relating to the number of boats and fishermen is still unclear and this is an issue of concern. Monitoring indicates that the level of the catches is extremely low in comparison with that of 1994 and that the divers are now harvesting sea cucumbers in deeper waters. Results to date indicate that this activity is unsustainable and could have additional impact on the overall marine life of the Reserve.

IUCN noted the importance of quickly developing special regulations to enable sections of the special law to be applied (particularly related to fisheries and tourism). IUCN raised concerns about the re-opening of the sea-cucumber fisheries in relation to the impact on the resource, and the capability to effectively manage fishery activities. IUCN looks forward to reviewing the recently approved Management Plan for the Marine Reserve to examine it in relation to the possible re-nomination of the Marine Reserve as an extension to the World Heritage site. IUCN underlined the progress made and that the Galapagos Islands provide a model for other countries with regard to the management of World Heritage sites.

The Observer of Ecuador expressed his appreciation to all donors assisting in the protection of the site and stated that his Government carried out all the requests made by the Committee. He hoped that all difficulties in the implementation of the law and the re-nomination of the Marine Reserve could be overcome.

The Bureau complimented the State Party for its efforts to improve the conservation of the Galapagos Islands World Heritage site, particularly during difficult economic times. The Bureau recognised the support provided by USAID, Frankfurt Zoological Society, The Barbara Delano Foundation, WWF, and The David and Lucille Packard Foundation to strengthen management of this site, as well as UNF/UNFIP for the approval of the project on control and eradication of invasive species. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide copies of the recently



approved Management Plan for the Marine Reserve to the Centre and IUCN for review. The Bureau also requested IUCN to determine whether the plan provides a satisfactory basis for the re-nomination of the marine reserve as an extension to the World Heritage site and submit its findings to its next session in November 1999. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit the first of its annual reports on the state of conservation of Galapagos to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

#### **IV.33 Kaziranga National Park (India)**

This site supports the largest population of the greater Indian one-horned rhinoceros; a 1993 census revealed 1164 animals in the Park. Other important species in the Park include the swamp deer, the tiger, the elephant and the water buffalo. Record rainfall in mid-1998 resulted in exceptional flooding of the Brahmaputra River and parts of the Park were under 6 metres of water. More than a square kilometre area of the floodplain was lost and the Director of the Park informed IUCN that an estimated 652 animals, including 42 rhinoceroses, were lost due to the flood. During the floods, WWF-India provided material assistance and the Indian army constructed ten islands on high ground for wildlife to take refuge. The rain had delayed the beginning of the construction of the five upland wildlife refuges using the financial assistance approved by the Committee in December 1997. A staff member from UNESCO Office in New Delhi, India, visited Kaziranga from 7 to 9 March 1999 and reported that work on the construction of the five upland refuges and other aspects of the World Heritage funded project had begun and are progressing satisfactorily. IUCN has noted that 44 km<sup>2</sup> of new land had been added to the Park, which now covers a total area of 470 km<sup>2</sup>.

The Bureau recognised the support provided by WWF-India and the Indian Army for wildlife protection during the 1998 floods. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a detailed report on wildlife censuses that may have been undertaken after the 1998 floods and on long-term measures which are currently being implemented to mitigate future flood damage to Kaziranga. The Bureau requested the State Party to clarify whether it intends to propose the inclusion of the recent extension (44 sq. km<sup>2</sup>) of the Park into the World Heritage site.

#### **IV.34 Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

Since the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1991, the site has benefited from financial assistance from the Fund for the purchase of boats and for training staff in marine protected area management in Queensland, Australia. A monitoring report on the site was provided via the UNESCO Office, Jakarta, to the Centre in 1995. IUCN informed the Centre that it has received a report indicating an increase in illegal dynamite and cyanide fishing in coastal waters which has had a serious impact on large areas of coral in the northern half of the marine component of the Park. The Nature Conservancy has provided two speedboats for patrolling the coastal waters but destructive fishing techniques have had a major impact. Immigration to the islands is increasing bringing more pressure on fishery resources.

The Bureau requested the State Party to consider inviting a monitoring mission to the site to assess the damage caused by destructive fishing practices and to jointly review management issues and identify priority measures needed to build management capacity and for international assistance. IUCN noted that funding should be provided for any additional monitoring missions foreseen by the Bureau.

#### **IV.35 Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)**

At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau recalled that during 1996-97 the State Party had established a Scientific Committee that set up stringent environmental conditions on the proponents of an industrial salt production facility, and successfully averted threats which the construction of that facility would have posed to the integrity of this site. The Bureau was informed that renewed consideration of the construction project was once again threatening the site and some conservation organisations had called for the designation of El Viscaïno as a World Heritage site in Danger. IUCN understood that new settlements were occurring in the area and that increasing pollution and over-fishing were impacting on endangered and endemic species. There were indications of a decline in the populations of various marine mammals, shellfish, and sea turtles unique to the area. IUCN recommended a mission in 1999 to evaluate threats to the integrity of the site and assess whether or not this site should be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed that a report submitted by the State Party on 26 November 1998 indicated that the State Party did not consider the site to be in danger. A representative of the Mexican Environmental Agency (SEMARNAP) informed the Bureau that there were no indications of a decline in the populations of various mammals, shellfish or sea turtles in the area. He noted that the El Viscaïno Lagoons were not in danger and that Mexico has a strong environmental legal framework that regulates any activities in the site. His Government continues to take actions to reinforce environmental regulations to preserve the marine resources of the site and that the reserve is included in the Global Environmental Fund (GEF) programme for ten Mexican priority conservation areas. In his view the grey whale population is recovering and has not been affected by the salt extraction. He stressed that his Government has not authorised any project to construct a new or extend the existing salt production facility. The International Scientific Committee established by SEMARNAP that, during 1997-98, had averted threats concerning the proposal to construct a salt production facility, will review the EIA as soon as it is completed. Hence, the Mexican Government will not authorise any proposal that would jeopardise the conservation of the site and that there was no reason to include the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the new report submitted by the State Party on 26 November 1998 to IUCN for review. The Bureau was pleased to note that the State Party, upon receipt of IUCN's comments on the report, would invite a mission to the site as soon as possible. The Bureau requested that the mission prepares an up-to-date state of conservation report on the site and submit it to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

The Bureau was informed that the Centre had transmitted the TOR to the Mexican authorities and that the Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO proposed, via its letter of 7 May 1999, a revised set of TOR and an invitation for the mission.

IUCN noted that a monitoring mission will be held to the site later this year and that the TOR for this mission have been discussed and agreed upon. IUCN sees this as essential as there is contradictory information in relation to the problems facing the area. IUCN noted the issues to be addressed adequately by the mission should include: (a) the scope and extent of projects associated with salt production and potential impacts on World Heritage values of the site; (b) the status of the Pacific grey whale population (CITES Appendix I); and (c) impacts of other activities, including new settlements, pollution and over-fishing on the site. Any conclusions to be drawn regarding the conservation status of the site should be based on scientific evidence and await the findings from this mission.

The Observer of Mexico reiterated the invitation by the Mexican authorities for the mission to the site and that the mission's mandate should be the one agreed upon by the World Heritage Bureau in Kyoto. His full statement is included in Annex IV.

The Bureau thanked the Government of Mexico for the invitation to the Centre to carry out the mission to the Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno in co-operation with IUCN. The Bureau reiterated its request expressed at its twenty-second extraordinary session, that the mission should prepare an up-to-date state of conservation report on the Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno, and submit it to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

#### **IV.36 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

The Bureau recalled that in 1997, the authorities of Oman submitted an interim zoning plan that foresaw a new outer boundary, and provisional boundaries for five management zones. In addition, they provided brief descriptions of their plans for implementing several projects and a report on the population status of the Arabian Oryx in the Sanctuary. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau agreed with IUCN's position that it would be better to review the zoning plan and other associated proposals after the overall management plan and the boundaries for the site are finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre about progress with regard to the finalisation of the management plan and submit the plan to IUCN and the Centre for review. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau had noted with concern that the boundaries of the site remain undefined since the inscription of the site in 1994 and that the management plan has yet to be finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to submit the final plan for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999 and requested the Centre and IUCN to submit the findings of their review to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

The Centre informed the Bureau that a letter dated 30 June 1999 addressed to the Centre from the Office of the Adviser for Conservation of the Environment, the Diwan Royal Court, the office responsible for the reintroduction of the Arabian Oryx in the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary, indicated that the oryx population has dropped drastically in the last three years due to heavy poaching. IUCN informed the Bureau that they have been alerted by recent reports to the fact that the Arabian oryx could be threatened with extinction in the wild in Oman for the second time in the last thirty years, and that data indicates that the numbers of wild Arabian oryx in Oman have fallen from 400 (in October 1996) to 100. With the successful re-introduction since 1982, and the increase in the number of oryx, poachers were attracted back.

IUCN further informed the Bureau that recommendations from a recent conference in Abu Dhabi suggested the creation of a co-ordinating body, with a permanent secretariat, in one of the range states, to enhance co-operation and exchange of experience among concerned countries of the Arabian Peninsula in order to prevent illegal transboundary movement of poaching and trade in the Arabian oryx. IUCN also reported that an Environmental Impact Assessment for oil exploration within the Sanctuary was recently undertaken.

The Bureau agreed that, in addition to the final management plan, including the boundaries of the site and its management zones, the State Party be requested to produce a report on the status of the Arabian oryx within the Sanctuary and the proposed oil exploration for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999 and that the findings of the Centre/IUCN review of this information be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

#### **IV.37 Huascarán National Park (Peru)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a Canadian/Peruvian mining consortium was in the final stages of obtaining approval to develop one of the world's largest copper and zinc deposits found at Antamina, located 20 km east of this Park. Mining will commence in 2001 and proceed for 20 years. The Bureau noted that the concentrates may be transported from the mining site to the coast, either via a Central Road that traverses the Park, or an alternative Southern Road encircling the Park. The mining company had agreed to use the Southern Road, which is outside the Park, but traverses the buffer zone of the Huascarán World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve. No EIA has been carried out for the use of the Southern Road so far. The Central Road would, however, be used for bringing heavy equipment to the mining area for approximately one year, until the construction of a by-pass along the Southern Road is completed to allow for the transport of such equipment along that road. IUCN underlined the importance of monitoring all impacts of the use of the Central Road during the one-year period. The Bureau took note of the different options for accessing the mining area and the preference of INRENA to use the Southern Road. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational.

In November 1998 the Bureau was informed that a «Working Group» on the management of the site had been established by INRENA and representatives from the IUCN Office in Peru had participated in its meetings. This «Working Group» on the management of the site, particularly to oversee the use of the Central Road, will work independently from the Antamina Mining Company and will invite local participation. Antamina has confirmed that it will complete the construction of the bypass along the Southern Road by July 1999, provide traffic estimates and expressed an interest in the use of the Central and Northern Roads for vehicles transporting personnel.

The Bureau, while commending the Government of Peru for establishing a «Working Group», was however concerned over the permanent use of the Central and Northern Road for the transport of the mine personnel.

IUCN noted that the Antamina Mining Project is progressing rapidly and that there is renewed discussion of developing a pipeline for mineral transport. No specific route has been chosen for the pipeline. However, it poses another serious potential environmental threat to the Park. NGOs have raised their strong concerns with IUCN about the effectiveness of the «Working Group» and have encouraged the fielding of an IUCN/UNESCO mission to the site to ascertain current status and to derive clear recommendations to the Committee and the Bureau. IUCN informed the Bureau of the efforts of the State Party in examining solutions to minimise impacts of the road through the Park. The key issue is increased visitation associated with the road and IUCN recommended the preparation of a visitor management plan for the Park. The reports from the State Party indicate areas for immediate restoration and also key issues that need attention. These provide an excellent basis for a prioritised action plan. Considering uncertainties expressed recently about the impact and the use of the Central Road, IUCN recommended a joint IUCN/Centre mission to the site, noting at the same time that not all missions recommended by the Bureau could be carried out in 1999.

The Director of INRENA provided, via letter of 9 June 1999, two information documents: (a) on the temporary use of the Pachacoto-Yanashallay Route across Huascarán National Park (November 1998 to May 1999) and (b) information on the

Working Group, prepared by the Mountain Institute (1 June 1999). Both have been transmitted to IUCN for review.

The Observer of Peru stated that her Government is trying to minimize all impacts related to the use of the Central Road and that by the end of the month the new road may be in use. She welcomed the proposal of the Bureau to field a mission and reiterated her Government's will to work closely with UNESCO and IUCN to protect the very special natural resources of the site. She also informed the Bureau that a glaciology unit has been created in INRENA, to prevent any threat to the highest mountains, which have permanent snow.

Following the review of the new information provided, the Bureau acknowledged the efforts by the State Party and recognised the willingness of authorities in seeking solutions to minimise the impacts on the Park from the temporary use of the Central Road. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to give high priority to the preparation and implementation of a restoration programme and to submit a request for technical assistance. The Bureau furthermore encouraged the State Party to give priority attention to implement key actions as proposed by IUCN and to provide regular progress reports on its implementation, including progress achieved in the implementation of key priorities identified by the working group established on the use of the Pachacoto-Yanashallay road. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit the first of these reports by 15 September 1999 and IUCN and the Centre to prepare a mission to be carried out in 1999/2000.

#### **IV.38 Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a number of laws for the national protection of the Lake existed and that the Duma had adopted the Federal Law on «The Protection of the Baikal Lake» which was, however, vetoed by the President. The Federal Law had been tabled for a third reading in the Duma, taking into account comments made by the President's intervention. The Russian authorities had not come to any conclusions regarding the re-profiling of the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill at Baikalsk, one of the main polluters of the Lake. The Observer of the Russian Delegation was of the view that the unresolved legal status, continuing and increasing pollution, lack of resources for management and monitoring, and logging and other negative factors seriously threatened Lake Baikal. He was of the view that the State Party would not oppose the site's declaration as World Heritage in Danger.

At its twenty-second extraordinary session in November 1998, the Bureau was informed that the Baikal Law was being revised due to the need to include financial measures to implement the Law. Both the Region of Irkutsk and the Buryat Republic were contributing to the revision of the Law and the revised draft was due to be approved by the Duma by the end of 1999. The Minister for Economy had proposed that international bids might have to be called for transforming the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill. However, no solution had been finalised yet and closing the mill would aggravate the social problems of the region. Despite financial problems monitoring of the site was underway. IUCN informed the Bureau that it does not recommend the inclusion of Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present. The Committee, at its last session noted the Bureau's deliberations and recommendations on Lake Baikal described above. It expressed its serious concerns about the problems facing the site and reiterated its requests made at the time of the inscription of the site, particularly the urgent need to re-profile the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and adopt the Baikal Law.

The Bureau noted that the UNESCO Office Moscow, in consultation with the Centre and the Division for Ecological Sciences, organized on 9 March 1999 a workshop on the Baikal

Law. Meanwhile, the Law was passed by the Duma, has been signed by the President of the Russian Federation and entered into force with its publication beginning May 1999. The Governmental Baikal Commission held an extraordinary meeting on 13 May 1999 to decide on next steps to be taken to implement the law. At the same occasion, the Commission made the request to the Federal Government that the Director of the UNESCO Moscow Office becomes a member of the Commission, referring to the World Heritage status of Lake Baikal. The UNESCO Moscow Office informed the Centre that the 14<sup>th</sup> session of the Baikal Commission met on 28 June 1999 with 28 representatives from regional authorities, scientific institutions and NGOs. The Commission discussed (a) threats to the Baikal ecosystem in relation to the law; (b) the water level of the lake and (c) the GEF Biodiversity project. The item of the Pulp and Paper Mill was postponed to await a report ordered by the Irkutsk region. The Centre has received information from Greenpeace, that the "Irkutsk administration is trying to reduce the area of Baikal National Park". This proposed reduction would be 110,000 ha, which would be 25% of this portion of the site.

IUCN commended the adoption of the Baikal Law by the Duma and the President of the Russia Federation. However, IUCN raised concerns that some important conservation issues are not contained in the latest version. IUCN noted the need for a clearer focus on what are prohibited or reduced activities. IUCN welcomed the special fund for Lake Baikal and the need to allocate funds for the management of the site. IUCN continued to be concerned about impacts of the pulp and paper mill operating in proximity of the site and noted that it should be reprofiled. Recent reports on a proposed reduction of the total area of the World Heritage site should be verified.

The Observer of Finland informed the Bureau, that contrary to some reports from NGOs, the Paper Mill is not owned by a Finnish company.

The Centre informed the Bureau that information was received on 5 July from the UNESCO Moscow Office that the Ministry of Federal Property has acted to keep 49 % of the ownership of the Paper Mill in the hands of the State. This could, given the present situation of the Russian economy and Federal budget, block any further development of an ecologically and socially acceptable solution of the problem of the Mill and may lead to unforeseeable consequences.

The Bureau reiterated its concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal, including the issue of reducing the size of the area. While complimenting the State Party on its efforts to adopt the Baikal Law, the Bureau emphasised that the State Party expedites the process of the implementation of the Law with all the legal provisions essential for the effective conservation and management of Lake Baikal. The Bureau requested the State Party to give particular consideration to the legal, financial and other prerequisites needed for re-profiling the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and other enterprises that continue to pollute Lake Baikal. The Bureau expressed concerns about the recent developments with regard to the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and urged the State Party to provide full information on this situation. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a detailed report, by 15 September 1999, on measures to mitigate the pollution threats to Lake Baikal, as well as on the implementation of the Baikal Law.

#### **IV.39 Doñana National Park (Spain)**

At its twenty-second session the Bureau was informed that a giant holding pool of the Aznalcollar mine owned by the Canadian-Swedish Boliden-Apirsa Company burst resulting in an ecological disaster. Although the main toxic flow had been diverted away from the National Park, the adjoining areas have

been badly damaged. The Bureau was informed that the spill could spread into the World Heritage area as pollutants dispersed more widely. The State Party had submitted a number of technical reports on the situation and on actions taken to mitigate the threats. The President of the Spanish MAB Committee had proposed the organisation of an international conference to review actions taken and rehabilitation plans elaborated for the conservation of the site and provided an outline for a project entitled «Doñana 2005». The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns on the long-term restoration of the property and urged the State Party to undertake all possible measures to mitigate the threats. Furthermore, the Bureau had requested the State Party to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to prepare an international expert conference to develop a long-term vision and to compile a detailed report in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

At its twenty-second extraordinary session the Bureau reviewed the findings of a Centre mission to the site from 10 to 13 November 1998. The Centre received a number of documents presented by the Spanish authorities on the actions undertaken since the June 1998 session of the Bureau.

The Bureau noted that the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve are currently little affected whereas the Natural Park around the site has been impacted by the toxic spill. The Bureau and the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) while noting and commending the substantial actions taken by the Spanish authorities, suggested that the State Party proceed with great caution in re-starting mining activities and requested that EIAs be carried out for each step. The Committee requested that the long-term impacts of mining on both the World Heritage site and the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve be monitored.

The Minister for the Environment of Spain, via a letter to the Director-General of UNESCO, has proposed that the conference on the future of Doñana be organized during May – June 1999. The Director of the Centre, via his letter to the Minister has suggested that more time should be given for collaboration between the State Party, UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention in preparing such an important conference for developing a long-term vision for Doñana. Furthermore, the Ambassador of Spain by letter of 3 May to the Director of the Centre, has submitted the following documents which were requested by the Bureau in June 1998: (a) «Doñana 2005 - hydrological regeneration of the watersheds and river channels flowing towards Doñana National Park» and its development; (b) copy of the decree, i.e. the Law 7/1999 concerning Doñana 2005; and (c) information on the accident that occurred in 1998 and its implications for the conservation of the site as of 23 April 1999. These documents were transmitted to IUCN for review.

IUCN informed the Bureau that a WCPA representative visited the site from 6 to 10 June 1999. IUCN noted that restoration activities were successful and that monitoring programmes have been set up. The State Party should be commended for these initiatives. Due to these measures, the World Heritage site has not been directly affected, however there are important wetland areas surrounding the site, which may have been affected, and which form part of the ecosystem. IUCN raised concerns about the reopening of the Aznalcollar mine and noted that three issues need consideration: (a) to make the dam for the collection of waste water fully impermeable; (b) the need for a hydrological study for monitoring potential infiltration of waste water to the aquifers of the area and (c) the need for consultation with all stakeholders. IUCN also noted the need for co-ordinated and effective buffer zone management.

Following the review of new information provided by IUCN, the Bureau requested the State Party, the Centre and IUCN to collaborate in the organization of the conference on the future of

Doñana. The Bureau furthermore expressed serious concerns regarding the possible reopening of the Aznalcollar mine, and the tailings dam which should be fully impermeable and for which a hydrological study should be performed. The Bureau furthermore encouraged the State Party to give priority attention to implement key actions as proposed by IUCN and to provide regularly progress reports on implementation, including progress achieved in the implementation of these priorities. The Bureau requested IUCN and the Centre to provide an up-to-date report including results of the conference to the extraordinary session of the Bureau, and the State Party to submit a progress report by 15 September 1999.

#### **IV.40 Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)**

At its twenty-second extraordinary session, the Bureau was informed of fires that had affected Thailand and other countries in the region. The Bureau learned that the Chairperson had approved a sum of US\$ 20,000 for a project on research, training and raising awareness of local people on forest fire prevention and control in and around this site. The project foresees the implementation of joint activities by site staff and representatives of local communities in forest fire prevention and control during the dry season that would begin after November 1998. The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate to ensure the timely implementation of the project to review and revise the forest fire management policy of this site with a view to soliciting the co-operation of local people.

The Observer of Thailand pointed out an error in the working document, drawing attention to the fact that this site has never received emergency assistance from the Fund in the past and that the Thailand site that received such assistance was the cultural site of Ayutthaya. He continued by informing the Bureau that the beginning of the project to revise the fire management policy for the site was delayed due to late receipt of funds. Project implementation has been sub-contracted to Kaesetsart University of Thailand and a preliminary report describing the background and history of problems to be addressed by the project has been received by the National World Heritage Committee of Thailand. A second report on the progress in the implementation of the project is due in October 1999; the project is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year with the final report due by December 1999. A representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that IUCN's Forestry Programme is launching a special initiative on forest fire management and that IUCN will explore opportunities to facilitate Thailand's efforts to review fire management policy in this World Heritage site.

The Representative of Thailand informed the Bureau that he would report on the progress in project implementation at the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

#### **IV.41 Bwindi Impenetrable Forest (Uganda)**

The Bureau recalled the insecurity situation prevailing in this site which resulted in the killing of eight tourists visiting the site to view mountain gorillas and four camp staff members in March 1999. The Centre informed the Bureau that Bwindi Forest has also been impacted due to armed conflicts in the African Great Lakes Region, similar to the sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger. Bwindi too needs special efforts of the Centre and IUCN in any campaigns to raise awareness of the needs of biodiversity conservation in times of armed conflict and civil unrest. On the other hand, the Bureau learned that a letter from the Uganda Wildlife Authority dated 14 May 1999 indicated that Bwindi is returning to its normal operation and that tourism in the site is now open and conservation activities are going on.

Having considered the information at hand, the Bureau recommended that the State Party submit to the Centre, before 15 September 1999, a report on measures taken to enhance security conditions in this site and to ensure the recovery of visitor numbers to pre-March 1999 levels. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit their analysis of the report and recommendations to the consideration of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

#### **IV.42 Rwenzori Mountains (Uganda)**

The Bureau at its twenty-third ordinary session, was informed by the Centre on the continued and worsening rebel activity and insecurity in the districts of Kasese and Bundibugyo, which surround the Rwenzori Mountains. In a letter dated 14 May 1999, the Uganda Wildlife Authority informed the Centre that the Rwenzori Mountains National Park has been insecure since June 1997 and the Park has therefore been closed and no meaningful conservation activities have been taking place. The long term negative impact on the flora and fauna and the general environment cannot be predicted, nor is it possible to predict when the conflict will end. The Bureau therefore was informed that Rwenzori also needs special efforts of the Centre and IUCN in any campaigns to raise awareness of the needs of biodiversity conservation in times of armed conflict and civil unrest.

The Bureau expressed its serious concerns regarding the worsening security conditions in the site and invited the State Party to submit to the Centre, before 15 September 1999, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to analyse that report and submit their findings and recommendations to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

Furthermore, the Bureau in accordance with the wish of the Chief Executive Officer of the Uganda Wildlife Authority, recommended that the World Heritage Committee include the Rwenzori Mountains in the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-third session to be held in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 29 November to 4 December 1999.

#### **IV.43 St. Kilda (United Kingdom)**

The Bureau, at its twenty-second extraordinary session, was informed that the Centre had transmitted the report entitled «Threats to St. Kilda World Heritage Site from Proposed Oil Exploration and Production in the Atlantic Frontier», prepared by Greenpeace International, to IUCN for review. This report had raised serious concerns on potential impacts to this site, particularly in the event of a possible oil spill that may result from the use of the Floating Production, Storage and Offloading Facilities (FPSOs). There are important threats associated with pollution derived from by-products of oil exploration and drilling activities. IUCN had informed the Centre that the State Party is currently considering the establishment of a Special Area for Conservation of the seas of the St. Kilda Archipelago under the European Union's Habitats and Species Directive. IUCN had welcomed this initiative and expressed the hope that it would lead to the eventual extension of the World Heritage site to include the seas of the St. Kilda Archipelago. The Observer of the United Kingdom had informed the Bureau that his Government was in the process of preparing a detailed response on the issues raised. Any licence would be subject to a thorough review, which is co-ordinated by Scottish Nature. The decision on the blocks offered for petroleum licensing was agreed with the Joint Nature Conservation Committee who co-ordinated their response with Scottish Nature. The Bureau invited the State Party to take all possible measures to protect St. Kilda from potential adverse impacts of oil exploration and production in the Atlantic Frontier and to consult with all interested parties before proceeding with such activities. The Bureau welcomed the State

Party's initiative to consider extending the boundaries of the site to include the seas of the St. Kilda Archipelago.

The Bureau noted that the Scottish Office, Agriculture, Environment and Fisheries Department, had informed the Centre of the responses of the authorities with regard to threats arising from the proposed oil exploration and production at the Atlantic Frontier. This information has been transmitted to IUCN for review. The authorities indicated that they are satisfied with the implementation of various oil and gas round licensing procedures and that the risks to St. Kilda are minimal. They are firmly of the opinion that there is no case for inclusion of St. Kilda in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN informed the Bureau that it had received new information since the conclusion of the last session of the Committee, which suggested that threats to this site have become greater. This information suggested that more than 150 blocks have now been licensed for oil development, including one located 120 km from St. Kilda. Seismic testing continues to be carried out over hundreds of thousands of square kilometres of the Atlantic Frontier, with allegedly inadequate consideration of either the importance of the area for whales and dolphins or the effects of acoustic disturbance on these species. The Atlantic Frontier is the most important place in the UK, and possibly in Europe, for large whales and dolphins and the threat of negative impacts of seismic testing on cetaceans is becoming stronger. IUCN noted that the UK marine environment has experienced some of the worst oil pollution incidents in the world in recent years. New oil developments in the Atlantic Frontier increase the pollution potential. A significant increase in shuttle tanker traffic is expected as the new oil fields develop. Should a spill occur, it is by no means certain that the capacity exists within the region to deal adequately with contingency actions. The potential for increased oil pollution presents serious threats to the bird and marine life around St. Kilda and throughout the Atlantic Frontier. IUCN noted conflicting information, and the need for clarity and suggested a round table meeting with a delay in granting any licenses until the round table meeting.

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that his Government's response was provided to the Centre by 12 April 1999 and has reached IUCN. His Government refutes any suggestions that threats to St. Kilda have become greater since the last Committee meeting. He emphasised that no additional sites had been licenced for oil exploration. Licences cover 80 blocks (not 150), and the nearest block to St. Kilda is 70 km away, the furthest 350 km. In offering blocks for petroleum licensing, the Government took full account of the views of the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC). His Government would take full account of environmental, safety and legislative requirements before allowing any development. Much of the information relates to potential threats from possible developments, which are a very long way from the World Heritage site. His Government would be happy to set up round table discussions among the interested parties.

In view of the need to clarify and consolidate information on the offshore oil issues in relation to this site, the Bureau suggested that the State Party, in co-operation with the Centre and IUCN, initiate a round table process involving all interested parties. Following this meeting, a state of conservation report should be prepared and provided to the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

#### **IV.44 Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

At its twenty-first session (Naples, 1997) the Committee expressed its concern over threats due to a proposal to erect a series of power transmission lines across this Park. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau learned that the President

of Venezuela had re-affirmed his Government's commitment to protect the site and had welcomed the possibility of a UNESCO mission to evaluate the power-line construction project and to determine the boundaries of the site. At its last session (Kyoto, 1998), the Committee called upon the Centre and IUCN to field a mission to Canaima as soon as security clearance from the UN Resident Co-ordinator for Venezuela was obtainable. The Committee requested that the findings of the mission and its recommendation concerning whether Canaima needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999.

A Centre/IUCN expert mission has been carried out to Caracas and Canaima National Park from 19 to 24 May 1999. The Terms of Reference for the mission had been derived from the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1994. The mission consulted with the Government and other stakeholders to determine the boundaries of the World Heritage site in order to strengthen the conservation of the Tepui portion of the nomination. In addition, the mission assessed threats to the site's integrity arising from the proposed power line construction project. The mission report was presented to the Bureau in information document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.18.

IUCN informed the Bureau of the conclusions of the mission:

- (a) posts rather than transmission line towers were installed to minimise impacts. IUCN however considers that the transmission line should not have been allowed to penetrate into the Park, but recognised that this was not possible because of an area under dispute between Venezuela and Guyana; although the transmission line is not compatible with the objectives of Canaima National Park, it constitutes a localised impact, is distant from tourism areas and does not have any significant impact on the outstanding universal value of the site;
- (b) some expansion of mining activities outside Las Claritas remain a potential threat;
- (c) there is no evidence of deforestation; and
- (d) tourism impacts, especially around Canaima Lake need a plan for sustainable tourism.

IUCN recommended that the boundaries of the World Heritage area should be the same as those of Canaima National Park and as there are strong ecological links between the Tepuis and the Gran Sabana. IUCN also drew the attention of the Bureau to the Short Term Action Plan as developed by the mission and the State Party.

The Observer of Venezuela thanked the Centre and IUCN for the mission to the site and expressed the commitment of her Government to fully protect the outstanding universal values of the site. Her statement is included in Annex V.

The Bureau noted and endorsed the recommendations made by the mission team as contained in the information document, in particular:

- (1) to encourage the State Party to submit a request for technical assistance to organise and implement a national workshop on Canaima National Park;
- (2) to request the Government to provide increased support to the National Park Institute (INPARQUES) and the Ministry for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (MARNR) and to explore ways to enhance the institutional capacity of these institutions;
- (3) that MARNR and INPARQUES should give maximum priority to establishing a buffer zone around Canaima National Park, including Sierra de Lema;
- (4) to recommend that an adequate follow-up to the implementation of the missions Short Term Action Plan, including the possible revision of the boundaries of the site;

- (5) to invite the State Party to submit annual progress reports on the state of conservation of this site;

- (6) to recommend that the State Party creates mechanisms to promote dialogue between all relevant stakeholders interested in the conservation and management of this area.

#### IV.45 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau had noted that the Government of Vietnam/JICA study on environmental management for Ha Long Bay had commenced in February 1998 and was to be completed in October 1999. The Bureau was informed of the loan agreement signed (March 1998) by the Government of Vietnam and OECF, Japan, for the construction of the Bai Chay Bridge, to link Bai Chay Beach to Ha Long City across the Bai Chay Bay. The agreement foresaw a feasibility study as well as an environmental impact assessment of the bridge construction project. At its twenty-second extraordinary session the Bureau noted that the State Party had provided the Centre with several documents relevant to the consideration of the impacts of the various construction projects proposed for implementation in coastal and marine areas in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay. The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN to undertake a thorough review of the information provided by the State Party and due to be generated via on-going and proposed donor financed studies and conferences. The Observer of Vietnam informed the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998) that his Government considers that the preservation and conservation of the World Heritage site should proceed in harmony with the socio-economic development of the area. He noted that initial results of the JICA Environmental Management Study indicated no serious environmental impacts in the World Heritage area and that final results are likely to provide a clearer picture.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN Vietnam and the Centre participated in a seminar, hosted by the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) and the World Bank Office of Vietnam, in Hanoi and Ha Long City, Vietnam, from 6 to 8 April 1999. The seminar was organized with the co-operation of the Hai Phong and Quang Ninh Provincial Governments. It reviewed options for the comprehensive development of the Haiphong-Quang Ninh coastal zone that includes the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area. As part of the seminar, a visit to the World Heritage area was arranged for all participants, including representatives of bi- and multilateral donor agencies. The field visit helped to raise the awareness of the international conservation significance of the site and drew attention of the donors to the need to address a range of potential threats to the integrity of the site arising from the rapid socio-economic development of the surrounding region.

Representatives of the Government of Vietnam, including those from the two Provincial Governments, made commitments concerning the comprehensive development of the Hai Phong-Quang Ninh coastal zone. They voiced their intent to protect and manage the environment of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area in accordance with international norms. Ha Long City, Hai Phong and Hanoi form the most important growth triangle in northern Vietnam. Development of the region is influenced by the growing affluence of the population in southern China for whom Ha Long Bay is becoming an important tourist destination. The Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone is expected to experience rapid growth in infrastructure development, particularly in transport, shipping, coal mining and tourism sectors. The key development issues that will impact the future management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area and possible ways to mitigate them, include:

- (a) Coal loading and transport operations;
- (b) Fishing communities living in 'floating villages' within the World Heritage area itself;

- (c) Brick manufacturing industries in coastal areas in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay with potential impacts;
- (d) Urban development in the Ha Long City area impacts the waters of Ha Long Bay;
- (e) Deepwater ports are planned for Cai Lan and Cua Ong. Port development will increase shipping traffic and this will increase the risk of environmental damage;
- (f) The development of Cai Lan and other deepwater ports in northern Vietnam must be seen as complementary to parallel efforts to restore the port in Hai Phong which is Vietnam's second largest port. In connection with the development of the Cai Lan port, dredging activities should be avoided; dredging should be strictly prohibited within the World Heritage area;
- (g) Tourism development within the World Heritage area must be co-ordinated with the overall tourism development strategy for the Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone.

The key to effective mitigation of all potential threats to the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area is a fully professional and well-resourced management agency. The satisfactory management of shipping and tourism would also greatly reduce potential threats to the World Heritage site. When the mandate, objectives, tasks, and organisational issues required to manage the World Heritage site are compared with the current structure of the management department, it is clear that the Department does not have the resources or the status to develop strategically. IUCN Vietnam has prepared a project proposal to improve the capacity of the management department, and is now looking for possible funding sources. Several recent initiatives that have occurred to guide developments and to control pollution in Ha Long Bay could also be expanded in ways by which they could contribute towards strengthening the management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area.

- (a) The Government of Vietnam and the Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA) have commissioned a comprehensive environmental study of the World Heritage site and the coastal area adjacent to Ha Long town. The study is investigating a range of pollution sources and indicators and is to be concluded in October 1999. The possibility of building a second phase to the study whereby the international norms for the environmental management of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area are determined and the capacity to monitor them is established, is worth exploring.
- (b) The project «Capacity Building for Environmental Management in Vietnam» is developing a GIS database for Quang Ninh province, which includes the World Heritage site. However, the effective management of the Ha Long Bay environment in the future clearly needs further research and studies in a number of areas, particularly biodiversity, cave morphology, visitor rates and destinations, role of fishing «villagers» resident within the Bay in environmental management and social impact of developments.
- (c) IUCN Vietnam has received funding from the Royal Netherlands Embassy to develop a checklist of selected plants in Ha Long Bay. This will be included in a visitor brochure that can be used to raise awareness about the need to conserve the biodiversity of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau was also informed that the Centre has received from the UNESCO National Commission of Vietnam a very detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Cai Lan Port Expansion Project that will be reviewed by the Centre and IUCN.

IUCN noted many threats to the site, including increase in tourism; the infrastructure developed may have potential to impact adversely on the site; the coal loading operations through the inshore waters of the Bay; large fishing presence in the Bay, and urban and industrial development. IUCN highlighted the need for effective management strategies, in particular

concerning fishing and tourism and the need to strengthen the capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department to assist it to strategically address these issues. IUCN Vietnam has proposed a project proposal for this.

The Rapporteur suggested that co-ordination among the various donor agencies and conservation organizations active in the Ha Long Bay area would be advisable. The Delegate of Japan underlined that it is the responsibility of the Vietnam Government to co-ordinate all projects concerning Ha Long Bay.

The Bureau welcomed the expression of the National and Provincial Governments' commitment and willingness to manage the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area in accordance with international norms befitting a coastal and marine protected area located in a region of intense economic development. The Bureau commended the efforts of The World Bank and the State Party in placing the conservation of the World Heritage area as a central theme in their efforts to manage the environment and conserve nature in the comprehensive development of the Quang Ninh-Hai Phong coastal zone. The Bureau invited the Government of Vietnam to consider upgrading the profile, status and capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department so that it can fully meet its responsibilities to effectively manage the World Heritage area. The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate, including to develop a list of critical projects essential for building the capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Department and for establishing internationally acceptable standards and norms for monitoring the environment of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area. This list of projects, if approved by the Committee at its twenty-third session, could serve as a basis for negotiations between the State Party and suitable donors for supporting the conservation of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage area. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Centre to contact The World Bank Office in Hanoi, and concerned authorities of the Government of Vietnam to explore possibilities for co-ordinating the work of the numerous development and conservation organizations active in the Ha Long Bay area.

#### IV.46 Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)

The Bureau recalled that at, twenty-second extraordinary session, it was informed of IUCN's review of the "Scoping Report: Potential impacts associated with the proposed development of the Mosi-oa-Tunya Hotel Complex", commissioned by Sun International, the company that would like to develop this hotel complex on the Zambian side of this transborder site. IUCN had raised the following key issues of concern:

- (a) the proposed development site is within the World Heritage area and particularly close to the river banks;
- (b) institutional support to be provided by the Zambian Government to address environmental problems is not defined; and
- (c) the Government of Zambia needs to discuss the project with the Government of Zimbabwe to seek the latter's agreement on implementation policies, procedures and schedules. The Zimbabwean Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (ZDNPWLM) had emphasised the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and stressed that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures that invite full public involvement. Since it lacked detailed information on the hotel development proposal, ZDNPWLM had been unable to make specific and constructive comments or endorse the development proposal.

The Bureau had requested the Centre to co-operate with the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa bringing representatives from the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe together in a bi-national meeting. This meeting was to be designed and organised in such a manner as to clarify issues

concerning this development project in accordance with the joint responsibility of the two States Parties to conserve and properly manage this transborder World Heritage property. The Bureau supported the ZDNPWLM's position to preserve the site as a global asset and to subject any development proposal to EIA procedures with full public involvement. The response of ZDNPWLM was included in Annex IV of the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto 1998) in which the Delegate of Zimbabwe stressed that the bi-national meeting be organised within the existing framework for co-operation between the Governments of the two countries.

At its twenty-third session, the Bureau was informed by the Centre that a bi-national meeting was being planned. A mission to review the situation at the Victoria Falls site recommended that the bilateral meeting be preceded by individual country meetings with the aim of establishing a basis for improved joint management of the site. The Delegate of Zimbabwe informed the Bureau that the Regional Office of IUCN had assisted the States Parties concerned and that a bilateral meeting will be held on 28 July 1999.

The Bureau invited the two States Parties to fully co-operate with IUCN and the Centre to organize the proposed bi-national meeting and report on the findings and recommendations to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

## **MIXED (CULTURAL AND NATURAL) HERITAGE**

### **IV.47 Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

The Secretariat introduced the discussion by referring to the summary of recent deliberations by the Committee and its Bureau concerning Kakadu National Park contained in WHC-99/CONF.204/5 that also provided information concerning the implementation of the decisions of the twenty-second session of the Committee up until the date of finalization of the document at the end of May. The subsequent decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session in Kyoto in December 1998 are included in their entirety in the same working document.

In accordance with the reporting process outlined in the decisions of the twenty-second session of the Committee, a detailed report was provided to the World Heritage Centre by the Australian Government on 15 April 1999. The report is entitled "Australia's Kakadu – Protecting World Heritage. Response by the Government of Australia to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee regarding Kakadu National Park (April 1999)" (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9B). The report responds to the concerns and recommendations identified in the World Heritage mission report (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9A). The Secretariat thanked the Australian authorities for having arranged for the translation and production of this report in sufficient numbers for the Bureau session and the third extraordinary session of the Committee.

A review of the scientific issues was performed by the Australian Supervising Scientist and a report entitled "Assessment of the Jabiluka Project: Report of the Supervising Scientist to the World Heritage Committee (April 1999)" was provided to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on 15 April 1999 (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9C). The Secretariat thanked the Australian authorities for having arranged for the translation of the executive summary and production of sufficient copies of this report.

The World Heritage Centre provided copies of the report included in WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9B to ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM for their review. The joint and separate statements of

IUCN and ICOMOS and a report provided by ICCROM were made available to the Bureau as WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9D.

The World Heritage Centre provided copies of the report included in WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9C to ICSU (the International Council for Science) for review by an independent scientific panel. The panel's written review was provided to the World Heritage Centre on 14 May 1999 (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9E). The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the presence of a representative of ICSU and the leader of ICSU's independent scientific panel (ISP), Professor Brian Wilkinson.

The Chairperson thanked the Australian Government and the Australian Supervising Scientist, together with the advisory bodies, ICSU and members of the Independent Scientific panel for having provided their reports according to the very tight timeframe set by the Committee in Kyoto.

Since the preparation of the working document at the end of May, the World Heritage Centre had continued to receive further information and comments concerning the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park. The Secretariat then proceeded to briefly summarize these for the benefit of Bureau members. In doing so, the Secretariat again noted that all correspondence and reports received by the Centre concerning Kakadu National Park were transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO for their comment. Copies were also sent to the advisory bodies and to the Chairperson for their information. In addition, many letters calling on the Committee to inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger have been received from individuals and organisations from around the world.

From the end of May the Centre had been informed of contacts made between the Australian Supervising Scientist, the Environmental Research Institute (ERISS) and the independent scientific panel established by ICSU. Records of phone conversations between these parties were forwarded to the Centre.

On 2 June 1999 the Chairperson of the Committee received a letter from the Chief Executive of ERA in which the Chief Executive sought to provide his perspectives on claims made by the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation concerning both the physical and the cultural environment, including sites claimed by the Mirrar Aboriginal people as sacred.

On 9 June a revised submission was received from scientists from the Australian National University who responded to the Report of the Supervising Scientist. The report presents eight detailed conclusions some of which concede that some of the scientists' concerns were met in the report of the Australian Supervising Scientist. Other conclusions made by the scientists include reference to continuing concerns.

The Chairperson of the Committee wrote to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage in Australia on a number of occasions, each time urging the voluntary suspension of the construction of the mine decline at Jabiluka as had been requested by the Committee at its twenty-second session in Kyoto. On 16 June 1999 the Chairperson provided copies of the exchange of correspondence between himself and the Minister to all members of the Committee. A summary of that exchange of correspondence is included in WHC-99/CONF.204/5.

On 25 June the Secretary of Environment Australia wrote to the Director of the Centre with reference to a letter from the Colong Foundation for Wilderness that had been received by the Centre on 22 June and which referred to some 29 mineral leases over which the Colong Foundation claimed that Kakadu's Plan of



Management does not operate. The Secretary's detailed letter of response referred to a High Court of Australia decision in 1997 stating that Australia continues to exercise its responsibilities under the Convention and domestic World Heritage legislation in relation to these mineral lease areas and "the Minister for Environment and Heritage has stated very clearly that there will not be mining in these leases".

Also on 25 June, the Secretary of Environment Australia provided details concerning applications for protection lodged by the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation under the provisions of the Commonwealth *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984* over an area at Jabiluka. The letter refers to Senator Hill as having been "unable to make a Section 9 emergency declaration for the specified area, on the basis of available evidence". The letter goes on to state that "The Minister is now giving consideration to the application under Section 10 of the Act. This part of the Act provides for long term protection of an area". The letter also provides details of the processes required for consideration of the Section 10 application.

On 29 June the Chairperson received a letter from Professor Nicholas Robinson, from the Center for Environmental Legal Studies at the School of Law at Pace University in New York. The letter refers to legal issues and concerns relating to the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park.

On 30 June an extract of the Report of the Australian Senate Inquiry into the Jabiluka Uranium Mine Project entitled «Jabiluka: The Undermining of Process» was received. The Report was prepared by the Senate Environment, Communications, Information Technology and the Arts References Committee.

Also on 30 June, the Centre received a further report from the Australian authorities entitled "Response to the ICSU Review of the Supervising Scientists report to the World Heritage Committee". Following the receipt of a written request from the Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO this report was provided to members of the Bureau as WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9F.

Finally, on 6 July, a complete copy of the Australian Senate Committee report was provided to the Centre by the observer from the Australian Democrats attending the Bureau session. The report of the Australian Senate Committee inquiry into the Jabiluka Uranium Mine Project contains separate majority and minority reports. Also on 6 July, Senator Hill wrote to the Director of the Centre drawing his particular attention to the conclusion of the minority report, issued by government members.

On 7 July, the Bureau heard presentations from the Australian Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Senator the Hon. Robert Hill, (included in its entirety as Annex VI.1), the representatives of IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM (included in their entirety in Annexes VI.2, VI.3 and VI.4) and the leader of the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) of ICSU (included in its entirety in Annex VI.5).

Following the above statements, the Delegate of Japan began by stating that the Bureau first needed to distinguish between two aspects of this very difficult issue, namely the scientific review aspect and the cultural aspect. Regarding the issue of scientific review, he expressed profound gratitude for the dedicated work of Professor Wilkinson and his colleagues who worked with limited time and without access to all necessary data and information. He also noted the very sincere work of the Australian Supervising Scientist. He recognized the fact that the ICSU experts' report did not affirm the existence of any

ascertained danger despite frequent reference to uncertainties or insufficiency of data and information. He also took note that the Australian Supervising Scientist accepted and agreed with a number of the recommendations contained in the ISP report, as reflected in his response to the ISP report (WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9F).

Turning to the cultural aspect, the Delegate of Japan commented that there existed a real problem at Kakadu. He stated that he believed that the shared concerns among the Bureau members are the difficulties to assess such cultural elements as the spiritual linkages between people and nature, the impact upon living cultures as well as the impact upon the cultural landscape. He commented that it seemed that the cultural assessment is, in a sense, much more difficult than scientific assessment and stressed that such cultural factors as living culture and cultural landscapes have gained more and more weight in the work of the Committee and Bureau through the history of the World Heritage regime. In this regard, the Delegate of Japan said that he shared the serious concern presented by ICOMOS about possible serious impacts of the Jabiluka mining project upon the living culture of Mirrar traditional owners.

The Delegate of Japan noted that he had listened with great care to the presentation made by Senator Hill from the Observer Delegation of Australia. He commented that his Delegation was very interested in several points in the statement from Australia. In particular, Japan considers it to be very important that ERA have suggested to defer commercial mining at Jabiluka. He commented that if his interpretation was correct, this indicated that there would be one mine instead of the original proposal for two mines in operation at the same time. He noted that ERA was ready to postpone commercial mining at Jabiluka until such time as mining at Ranger would be terminated. The Delegate of Japan said that the new proposal from the Australian Delegation deserved, in his view, the serious scrutiny of the Bureau as its implications had relevance to various aspects of the Kakadu issue.

Finally, the Delegate of Japan underlined the need to build trust between the Aboriginal Traditional Owners and the Commonwealth Government of Australia. He commented that everyone in the Committee is seriously concerned with the break of mutual trust between the two. In this regard he wished to support the statement of ICCROM that the work of the World Heritage Committee should be to produce a positive and constructive basis according to the aim of the Convention on a longer term perspective. He concluded by stating that he believed that the real work of the Committee and the Bureau is to create good basis for the building of trust between the Aboriginal traditional owners and the Government of Australia through dialogue.

The Delegate of Italy commented on the complexity of the issues before the Bureau. He referred to the difficulties that would be faced by the Bureau and Committee as this was a new case to which other precedents did not relate. He commented that courage and imagination would need to be used without jeopardising the Convention or the image of the State Party concerned. He said that there should be no interest in finding a cosmetic solution. What was required was a real, long-term solution soundly conceived and well balanced. He noted that two of the reports submitted to the Bureau confirmed and endorsed the alarm expressed in the mission report. He said that further verification was needed. He noted that there are facts that need to be reconciled, especially from the report of the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) established by ICSU. He referred to new concerns relating to the cultural heritage that would need to be addressed with attention to local sensitivity and international response to social and cultural change.

The Delegate of Italy said that the system for listing properties on both the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger required the consent of the State Party except in urgent cases. He commented that in Danger listing is not a sanction and that the Committee is not a ruling court but had standards that must be set and updated. He said that there was a need to act with respect to the Convention.

The Delegate of Cuba referred to the report of the Australian Supervising Scientist as an honest statement but noted that there are things that need to be taken into account and things to be implemented. She noted that with continuing scientific uncertainties and the need for further analysis of the scientific information the situation remained the same as it was at the last session of the Committee in Kyoto, 1998.

The Delegate of Morocco thanked the advisory bodies and the ISP panel established by ICSU for their work saying that new light had been provided on an issue of paramount importance. He stated that Morocco was of the opinion that the deliberations concerning Kakadu could be considered to be a major task for the Committee. He agreed with the Delegate of Japan that the major issue was one of confidence and trust. He asked the Bureau to instill a climate of confidence and noted Morocco's confidence in the work of the advisory bodies and the ISP panel established by ICSU. He referred to the international responsibility to find a solution that would be appropriate given that the decision will become legal case law. He concluded by commenting that the Bureau knows of other sites under more threat than that posed by the Jabiluka mine and therefore again restated the need to proceed with a real climate of trust and communication.

The Delegate of Korea referred to the heavy burden and pressure relating to the case of Kakadu National Park. He commented that this case will be precedent-setting for the future of the World Heritage Committee and will determine whether the Committee will be politically and scientifically viable in the future. He shared the view of Japan that the case referred to the relationship between people and nature and raised the question of which one comes first and noted that both are important. He noted that because of the gravity of the issue he did not want to make a hasty decision. He commented that there are still uncertainties and the need for future study. He also stated that this could be a good opportunity to build trust between experts and the State Party. The duty and responsibility of the Bureau is to urge all parties concerned to use creative ways to find a solution that would be scientifically and politically viable.

The Delegate of Benin remarked that the international community should thank Australia for having provided them with the opportunity to closely examine this new kind of situation. He indicated that, faced with this situation, Australia as a State Party, had conducted itself in a responsible manner. He said that in the future, the Committee should not have its hands tied, and it should take the necessary time before coming to a decision. He indicated that the complexity of the problems, both cultural and scientific, that were being faced, did not have a black and white attitude or solution. He recognized the spiritual importance of the land for the Aboriginal people and was of the opinion that it would be preferable to reach a consensual solution. He requested that a closer dialogue is established in Australia with the Aboriginal people and emphasized that this step could not be restricted to a timetable set by UNESCO. He also said that the Committee should determine the extent to which the dialogue between the Australian Government and the Aboriginal people be conducted, in order for a responsible opinion of the situation be obtained.

The Delegate of Hungary stated that, on the basis of present knowledge, written reports and discussions, the position of the Hungarian Government was that it cannot support the opening of

the mine at Jabiluka at present. He agreed with other Bureau members that this case is new and a precedent of the greatest importance to the Bureau and Committee. He noted that the scientific review pointed to some remaining uncertainties and commented that some additional scientific investigation would need to be done before a final decision concerning the site could be made. He agreed with the statement by other Bureau members that there needs to be caution and a consensus by the Bureau. He noted that the issue has become political, both in and outside Australia.

The Delegate of Hungary noted that the Jabiluka project is proceeding in two stages and that the first stage of the project is complete. The question is whether the mining process can now begin or not. He further questioned whether archaeological investigations had been properly performed.

The Delegate of Hungary noted the importance of the Bureau's deliberations to the Convention. He suggested that some rethinking might be required as to whether in Danger listing is the responsibility of the Bureau and Committee with or without the consent of the State Party. He gave great importance to the statement from the Australian Minister for the Environment and Heritage concerning the possible delay of mining at Jabiluka and the need to find a solution to solve the problem. He also sought a solution between the Mirrar Aboriginal people and the Australian Government.

The Minister for Environment and Heritage from Australia thanked the Bureau for their thoughtful comments. He stated that he too was looking for a constructive way to move forward. He stated that his Government is proud of World Heritage in Australia and does not shy away from its responsibilities. He noted that the case is historical and that new issues are being addressed.

The Minister questioned IUCN's comments concerning visual encroachment to the World Heritage property. He commented that the mineral leases were deliberately left out of the World Heritage property for this reason and questioned how issues relating to visual encroachment could have a higher value now than 18 years ago. He asked how it made sense for the open-cut mine at Ranger to have been acceptable over the last 18 years and now for an underground mine to not be acceptable. He asked how such a small underground mine could be said to be a visual encroachment to a World Heritage property of 20,000 square kilometres.

In noting the Bureau's comments concerning the now evolving concepts relating to living cultural traditions he suggested that a debate on the subject could take place but questioned where the limits of such new interpretations might lie. He questioned whether such re-interpretations can be applied retrospectively to Kakadu. He reported that the challenging issues relating to living cultures were being addressed through the assessment of potential sacred sites and the safeguarding of all identified sites at Jabiluka.

On the scientific issues, the Minister welcomed the dialogue between the Australian Supervising Scientist and the Independent Scientific Panel (ISP) established by ICSU. He said that he wanted, if possible, for all of the questions of the ISP to be answered.

In response to the comments from Japan, the Minister reported that ERA have made a commitment that mining at Ranger will be completed prior to full commercial mining at Jabiluka. This pause would give the opportunity for good faith to be established and for suspicion and distrust to be overcome. The Minister concluded by asking that a record of his statement be included in the report of the Bureau.

The Chairperson then decided to constitute an informal drafting group to be chaired by the Rapporteur, with one representative from each of the Bureau members, the Observer Delegation of Australia and a member of the Secretariat. The Chairperson asked the group to prepare draft recommendations to be discussed by the Bureau on Friday 9 July. The informal group after three sessions suspended its work. The Chairperson asked the Australian Government to provide its various oral communications to the group in a written form and make it available to all members of the Bureau meeting.

The Chairperson thanked the members of the Bureau, the Observer Delegation of Australia, the leader of the independent scientific panel (ISP) established by ICSU and the representatives of the advisory bodies for their careful consideration concerning Kakadu National Park.

On 9 July, the Australian Minister for Environment and Heritage provided the document, as requested by the Chairperson to the Bureau, with a series of additional measures that the Australian Government has developed to "enhance the existing environmental protection regime governing Jabiluka and Kakadu; address the social and economic conditions of the Aboriginal communities living in Kakadu; and provide additional assurance that the cultural values of the Park – including those of the Mirrar – are protected" (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9G).

The Chairperson asked the informal drafting group to resume its work with the participation of one representative of each Bureau member.

After having reached a consensus, the informal drafting group proposed findings and recommendations for consideration and adoption by the Bureau. The Chairperson first invited general observations on the proposal. The Minister for Environment and Heritage of Australia acknowledged and thanked the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for their work commenting that it was evident that the drafting group had made an attempt to look for consensus. He said that such an approach would strengthen the Convention and good will. He noted that the recommendation included reference to some of the initiatives in the package provided to the Bureau that morning (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9G). He commented that the recommendation provided a positive way forward but that he believed that some of the findings of the Bureau are not well founded. He referred to the recommendation as a reasonable document to be used as a basis for discussion at the third extraordinary session of the Committee and stated that he would like to take the opportunity at that meeting to debate the content of the recommendation in detail.

On point 1 summarizing the principal concerns and reservations of the Bureau, the Minister said that he had difficulty accepting some of the findings. On point 1(d) he was of the view that the Bureau's findings referring to the mine's impact on the living cultural and cultural landscape values could be questioned. On point 2 (c) of the recommendation, the Minister said that all of the recommendations of the ISP of ICSU would be accepted. He said the leader of the ISP and the Supervising Scientist had already started a dialogue in order to implement their recommendations. On point 4 of the recommendation the Minister commented that it was rather prescriptive and did not take into account that in the new information provided to the Bureau a reference group will propose and guide the process of developing the cultural heritage management plan (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9G).

Following this discussion, the Bureau considered and adopted the following:

1. The Bureau,
  - (a) Recognized, with appreciation, that the Australian Government, Australian Supervising Scientist, advisory bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM) and independent scientific panel (ISP) established by the International Council of Science (ICSU) had provided the reports requested by the twenty-second session of the Committee (Kyoto, 1998),
  - (b) Expressed its regret that the voluntary suspension of construction of the mine decline at Jabiluka until the twenty-third session of the Bureau (requested by the twenty-second session of the Committee) had not taken place,
  - (c) Continued to have reservations concerning the scientific uncertainties relating to mining and milling at Jabiluka,
  - (d) Was concerned about the serious impacts to the living cultural values and cultural landscape values of Kakadu National Park posed by the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka,
  - (e) Was concerned about the lack of progress with the preparation of a cultural heritage management plan for Jabiluka.
2. The Bureau wished to acknowledge the following developments in relation to the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park:
  - (a) The Australian Government has stated that there shall be no parallel commercial scale operation of the Ranger and Jabiluka uranium mines located in enclaves surrounded by, but not included, in Kakadu National Park (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9G). The Bureau regarded the announcement of the Australian Government as a positive change to addressing the issue concerning the conservation of Kakadu National Park, although the precise meaning of the output and scale of any parallel activities at the Ranger and Jabiluka uranium mines, in particular in terms of the relative difference from the present level of production at Ranger, should be clarified by the Australian Government.
  - (b) There are indications that a new dialogue between the Mirrar Aboriginal people and the Australian Government has begun in relation to issues concerning the Jabiluka uranium mine and mill. The Bureau considered this to be the first essential step in finding a constructive solution to the issues raised by the UNESCO mission to Kakadu National Park.
  - (c) A dialogue between the Australian Supervising Scientist (ASS) and the independent scientific panel (ISP) established by the International Council of Science (ICSU) has begun to show some progress in relation to resolving some of the outstanding questions relating to scientific issues concerning mining and milling at Jabiluka.
3. The Bureau was of the opinion that confidence and trust building through dialogue are crucial for there to be any resolution of issues relating to the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka. In particular, better dialogue needs to be established between the Australian Government and the traditional owners of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease, the Mirrar Aboriginal people.
4. The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Australian Government, with the necessary co-operation of the Mirrar and appropriate involvement of other stakeholders, to complete the cultural heritage management plan of Jabiluka and

proceed with exhaustive cultural mapping of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease and the Boyweg-Almudj site and its boundaries to ensure protection of these integral elements of the outstanding cultural landscape of Kakadu. The plan and cultural mapping work should be undertaken by senior archaeologists and anthropologists working with Aboriginal custodians within a stipulated timeframe. The archaeologists and anthropologists should report to a committee with representation from the Northern Territory's Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA), the Australian Heritage Commission, ICOMOS, ICCROM and the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation. Their work should be submitted to independent expert scrutiny via objective and impartial review.

5. The Bureau considered that it is the clear responsibility of the Australian Government to regulate the activities of a private company, such as Energy Resources of Australia, Inc, in relation to the proposed mining and milling activities at Jabiluka and notes the commitment of the Federal and Northern Territory Governments to strengthen the regulatory basis for mining.

6. The Bureau recommended that the Committee establish a mechanism for cooperation between the International Council of Science's (ICSU) Independent Scientific Panel (ISP), the Advisory Bodies and the Australian Government (in particular, the Supervising Scientist) in relation to resolving all of the remaining scientific issues raised by the ISP in its report (WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.9E).

7. The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Australian Government be asked, in response to the Kakadu Region Social Impact Study (KRSIS), to facilitate a comprehensive package of social and welfare benefits, together with the Northern Territory Government, for the benefit of the Aboriginal communities of Kakadu (including the Mirrar). The Bureau also recommended that the Committee request the Australian Government to provide an update on the implementation of the Kakadu Region Social Impact Study to its twenty-third session in Marrakesh, Morocco in December 1999.

8. The Bureau recommended that the third extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee on 12 July 1999 take full account of the information before it, including new information provided during the Bureau session and the considerations of the Bureau, in particular taking into consideration Paragraph 86 of the *Operational Guidelines*, in order to fulfill its mandate described in Kyoto (see Paragraph 5, page 18, WHC-98/CONF.203/18).

#### **IV.48 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau noted that the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA) signed by the Commonwealth and the Tasmanian Governments on 8 November 1997, has enabled: (i) the establishment of a significantly increased reserve system for Tasmania's Forest Estate; (ii) participation by the signatories in further World Heritage assessment of relevant Australia-wide themes; and (iii) initiation of discussions between the signatories on possibilities for further World Heritage nominations or additions to the present World Heritage site. The twenty-second session of the Bureau requested the State Party to keep the Centre informed of any potential boundary extensions that may be foreseen for the Tasmanian Wilderness and to provide a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement. At its twenty-second extraordinary session (November 1998), the Bureau learned that negotiations between the Tasmanian and the Commonwealth Governments for setting a timetable, potentially involving the extension of the boundaries of the World Heritage site, were underway and the Australian authorities had agreed to provide the timetable when the two parties reach an agreement.

The twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contact with the Australian authorities to obtain information on the timetable and requested the Centre to transmit a report from the Australian NGOs to the State Party concerning the Tasmanian Wilderness for review.

IUCN has informed the Centre that the Australian Committee for IUCN (ACIUCN) proposes to complete an assessment on the state of conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness, based on inputs from NGOs, Government agencies and other interested parties in 2000. In principle, IUCN supports the Regional Forest Assessment (RFA) process as it represents a significant step towards a comprehensive, adequate and representative reserve system. IUCN considers that elements of the dedicated RFA reserve system may be relevant to identifying suitable extensions to the World Heritage site and believes that the RFA cements relations between state and federal governments on matters affecting the World Heritage site such as policy, management and funding. However, IUCN remains concerned about the RFA possibly excluding from the reserve system important forest areas, already identified as of potential World Heritage value. Threats posed by logging, sanctioned by the RFA, to forest catchments that may be represented within the World Heritage site, are also a matter of concern to IUCN.

The Bureau wishes to request ACIUCN to complete its review process on the state of conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness, including specific concerns it has noted, and submit an up-to-date report to the twenty fourth-session on the Bureau in 2000.

To enable ACIUCN to undertake its assessment of the state of conservation of this site, the Bureau invites the State Party to inform the Centre by 15 September 1999 of the following: (i) any potential boundary extensions that may be foreseen together with a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA), (ii) its assessment of the implications of the RFA on other areas identified as having World Heritage value and (iii) the potential impacts on forest catchments in the World Heritage site of other areas which may be logged under the RFA.

#### **IV.49 Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)**

At its twenty-second ordinary (June 1998) and extraordinary (November 1998) sessions, the Bureau was informed of the events resulting from the eruptions of Mount Ruapehu in 1995 and 1996. The volcano's Crater Lake has been drained and a large build-up of ash has blocked the Lake's outlet. When Crater Lake refills, probably within the next few years, a rapid collapse of the ash dam could occur followed by a major lahar. The management authorities are faced with the dilemma of either letting nature take its course, putting both human life and some natural values at risk, or taking action to open up the outlet. The option to excavate a trench through the ash at the crater outlet should not significantly affect the natural values for which the site is inscribed. However, interference with the summit area has implications for the recognition and respect for the spiritual, traditional and cultural values to the Maori people which justified the site's inscription under cultural criterion (vi). The Ngati Rangi and the Ngati Tuwharetoa Maori Tribes are opposed to the idea of engineering works at the Crater Lake. The Minister for Conservation has called for a comprehensive environmental and cultural assessment identifying the risks associated with and possible impacts of the mitigation options.

In a letter dated 31 March 1999 from the New Zealand Department of Conservation, the Centre was provided with an update on the decisions concerning management of the ash build-up at the Crater Lake outlet on Mount Ruapehu. A Draft Assessment of the Environmental Effects report was released for

public comment in late October 1998 and consultations have taken place with Maori people, other agencies and the public. Furthermore, the Department of Conservation is investigating possible components of a suitable alarm system to warn members of the public about large lahars from Crater Lake and informal discussions have begun to establish an emergency management group to address such hazards. Continuous monitoring has shown that as of 22 March 1999, the Crater Lake was 22% full and 54 metres below the old overflow level. According to current projections, the Crater Lake will not fill until the year 2003.

IUCN confirmed to the Bureau that the New Zealand Government is proceeding with great caution not to offend Maori sensibilities over the option of excavating a trench through the 1995 and 1996 ash build-up blocking the outlet to the Crater Lake of Mount Ruapehu. IUCN also informed the Bureau that the report on public consultations on the Draft Assessment of the Environmental Effects report will be sent to the Minister of Conservation, who will make a decision as to what action to take, following receipt of an opinion on the legal implications of cutting a trench or letting nature take its course. ICOMOS commented on the relevance of the case of managing the ash-build up at Tongariro National Park to other cases where in the future there would be an equal need to negotiate a management solution between two cultures.

The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS to maintain contact with the State Party to monitor the ash build-up at the Crater Lake and submit a report to its twenty-fourth session in the year 2000.

#### **IV.50 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO had invited an expert mission to Peru to observe in situ the application of the Master Plan for Machu Picchu. It also informed that the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC) had provided information on the creation of a Management Unit for the Sanctuary that was foreseen in the Master Plan for Machu Picchu and in the National Plan for Protected Areas and that its first meeting was scheduled for 26 June 1999. This Management Unit will prepare short and middle-term operational plans for the implementation of the Master Plan. As to the cable car system, INRENA and INC had informed that the Environmental Impact Assessment had been reviewed critically and had not been accepted yet.

The Secretariat furthermore informed that it had received a great number of communications and appeals in which individuals, scientists and non-governmental organizations expressed concerns and opposition to the plans for the cable car system. These communications stated that its impact would seriously affect the natural and cultural values, and could increase the level of tourists to unacceptable levels.

Both IUCN and ICOMOS stated that the Master Plan provides a good strategic framework, but that operation plans will be required to implement it effectively. Particular attention should be given to the management of tourism and the research and preservation of the archaeological resources of the Park.

The Director of the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) emphasized the commitment of INRENA and INC to protect the integrity of the Park in a joint effort through the management structure that is foreseen in the Master Plan, i.e. the Management Unit. She noted concerns about the quality and quantity of tourism to the site and expected that a tourism management plan would be ready in a few months. As to the cable car, she stated that the Master Plan does not propose or

endorse the cable car and that the Environmental Impact Assessment so far has not provided sufficient information for a thorough evaluation. On other projects, she noted that an hotel extension had been firmly rejected and that information on any other project would be made available to the Secretariat. She concluded by saying that the Government would welcome an expert mission as proposed by the Secretariat.

Recalling (i) the decision of the Committee at its twenty-second session, (ii) the invitation from the Government of Peru that IUCN and ICOMOS undertake a second expert mission and (iii) the concerns expressed by the advisory bodies, the Bureau adopted the following:

“The Bureau takes note of the information provided by the Government of Peru through its letters dated 18 and 23 June 1999. It also notes the comments and observations made by IUCN and ICOMOS on the Master Plan for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, as well as on projects that are, or may be, under discussion and that would have serious impacts on the World Heritage site.

The Bureau considers that the Master Plan is in general a good strategic framework to enhance the protection of the site but that it lacks a comprehensive programme of implementation. It notes that the recently established Management Unit will prepare a short and medium-term plan for its implementation. The Bureau compliments the State Party for the creation of the Management Unit for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu and it urges the State Party to organise and promote the work of the Management Unit as a first step to implement the Master Plan. It also urges the State Party to consider the observations and recommendations made by IUCN and ICOMOS on the Master Plan and its implementation.

With reference to the cable car system and other possible works or projects, the Bureau regrets that no detailed information has been provided particularly on the plan for the cable car and the corresponding Environmental Impact Study. It reiterates the request made by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session that all relevant documentation and provisions with regard to the management structure and Master Plan for the Sanctuary, the cable car system (Environmental Impact Study, detailed plans, etc) as well as other works or projects that are or will be considered for implementation within the boundaries of the World Heritage site, or outside the site but likely to impact on it, be transmitted as soon as they become available to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN and ICOMOS and examination by the Bureau and/or the Committee.

The Bureau requests IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to undertake a second expert mission to Machu Picchu to assess:

1. the implementation and effectiveness of the Master Plan and management arrangements for the Sanctuary (with particular reference to tourism);
2. the status of the project of the cable car system and its possible impact on the World Heritage value of the Sanctuary, as well as the viability of alternatives to the cable car system;
3. the status of the eventual extension or modification of the hotel at Machu Picchu and other major works that may be planned inside or outside the site, as well as their possible impact on the World Heritage value of the Sanctuary;
4. options for extensions to the site, and to bring forward recommendations in this respect;
5. the overall state of cultural and natural conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu.

The report of the mission should be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session for examination and further action.

As suggested by the Rapporteur, the Secretariat, the advisory bodies and the Peruvian authorities will collaborate in drawing up detailed terms of reference for the mission.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### IV.51 Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis (Argentina and Brazil): The Jesuit Mission of Santa Ana (Argentina)

The Bureau took note of information provided by the National Commission for Museums, Monuments and Historical Sites: (1) an industrial plant was planned at 700 meters from the central square of the Mission and that both would be separated by a protective zone of 170 hectares and dense vegetation and that it would not affect the values of the Mission, and (2) plan for the industrial plant has led to developing a plan for a new and more appropriate access to the Mission.

The Bureau requested the authorities to submit by 15 September 1999, for further study and possible examination by the World Heritage Committee, a detailed plan and photographic documentation of the Mission of Santa Ana and its surroundings, including the location of the industrial plant and the actual and planned access.

The Observer of Argentina confirmed that the matter is being studied and that a report will be submitted as requested.

### IV.52 Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (The People's Republic of China)

Following receipt of a technical co-operation request and an alarming state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities, the World Heritage Centre recommended that an ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission be undertaken to identify the emergency conservation and site management needs. The Bureau was informed that, with the agreement of the State Party, ICCROM, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre were organizing this mission, which was expected to take place in September 1999.

The Delegate of the Republic of Korea brought the attention of the Bureau to the serious need to adequately conserve this important site and recommended that co-operation with relevant national geophysics research institutions be sought.

The Observer of China informed the Bureau that his Government welcomed the initiative of the World Heritage Centre to organize this ICOMOS-ICCROM mission, and that the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the national authorities entrusted to protect the site, had made preparations to welcome this mission.

The Bureau decided to examine further information to be made available at its twenty-third extraordinary session, after the proposed ICOMOS-ICCROM mission is undertaken. The Bureau asked the advisory bodies to co-operate with the national geophysics institutions in formulating recommendations for enhanced management of this site. Finally, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to ensure that the report of the geophysical research conducted in 1997 by Electricité de France (EDF) under the Assistance-Ethno/UNESCO/Chinese Academy of Sciences - *Project for Rehabilitation, Protection and Conservation of the Peking Man Site* be made available to the ICOMOS-ICCROM experts for integration into the report to be presented to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

### IV.53 The Potala Palace, Lhasa (The People's Republic of China)

In approving the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List at its eighteenth session in 1994, the Committee recommended the Chinese authorities to extend the boundary to include Jokhang Temple and its surrounding historic quarters.

The Bureau was informed by the World Heritage Centre that the nomination for the extension of the Potala Palace to include the Jokhang Temple and its surrounding Barkhor historic area had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre, by letter of 30 June 1999.

The Bureau expressed its appreciation to the Government of China for following up on the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee. It encouraged the State Party to continue safeguarding the Barkhor historic area encircling the Jokhang Temple, pending examination by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the submitted nomination for extension.

### IV.54 Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)

The Bureau took note of the report submitted by the authorities of the Dominican Republic on the damage caused by Hurricane Georges. It requested them to keep the Committee informed of further actions taken in response to the 1998 monitoring mission and towards the integrated rehabilitation of the Historical Centre of the City.

### IV.55 Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)

#### 1) Rehabilitation of Islamic Cairo

The Secretariat informed the Bureau of progress made in favour of the revitalization of this site, notably the posting of a technical co-ordinator to the Governor of Cairo as well as direct support from France, Italy, The Netherlands, UNDP and others, for the site. After having taken note of this information, the Bureau thanked the Egyptian authorities for their efforts for the restoration of Islamic Cairo and encouraged them to energetically pursue their work. The Bureau also thanked the States Parties and the institutions that had already established co-operation with UNESCO and Egypt for this site. It finally reminded the Secretariat to provide a detailed report on the activities undertaken to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### 2) Al Azhar Mosque

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau thanked ICOMOS for the quality of its report. It congratulated the State Party for the efforts made in response to the Committee's comments concerning the establishment of a databank. The Bureau finally requested Egypt to receive an ICOMOS mission to evaluate the project and collaborate in the setting up of a conservation and monitoring programme of the works at the Mosque to ensure its long-term conservation.

### IV.56 Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Arab Republic of Egypt)

After having examined the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau considered that a General Management Plan should be established with a complete mapping of the site. The Bureau recommended to the State party to study the recommendations of the mission report of March 1999 and to take actions for the establishment of an integrated interdisciplinary General Management Plan. The Bureau requested the State party to submit a progress report on the actions taken by 15 September

1999 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-third session.

#### **IV.57 Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the structure erected opposite the Abu Simbel Temple for a sound and light project had been removed. Consequently, after examination of the state of conservation of the site, the Bureau congratulated the Egyptian authorities on this rapid action and recommended the preparation of an integrated management plan for this important ensemble of monuments.

#### **IV.58 Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)**

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the French authorities that agreement had been reached to establish a precisely defined protection zone around the Cathedral (Zone de protection du patrimoine architectural, urbain et paysager ZPPAUP), the exact limits of which remained to be defined, and that a project for the surroundings of the Cathedral (le Parvis) will be the subject of a competition. The ICOMOS-designated expert will be involved in this process. The Bureau requested the French authorities to keep the Committee informed on further developments regarding the protection and planning for the surroundings of the Cathedral.

#### **IV.59 Roman Monuments, Cathedral and Liebfrauen Church in Trier (Germany)**

A report prepared by the Ministry of Culture, Youth, Family and Women's Affairs of Rheinland-Pfalz stated that the building permit for the new constructions north of the amphitheatre was issued on 23 December 1998 with the following characteristics:

- removal of one building in order to ensure sufficient distance from the theatre; - use of the western half of the site for green areas and access to the theatre;
- height limitation to the building closest to the theatre.

The report also states that the recently discovered archaeological remains are incorporated into the plans. Consultations are taking place between the Regional Office for the Preservation of Monuments and the city authorities with regard to the possible extension of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau expressed its thanks to the State Party for its report on the planning for and constructions in the surroundings of the Roman amphitheatre. However, in order that the new proposals may be more thoroughly evaluated, it requested the State Party to provide by 15 September 1999 detailed plans and drawings for consideration by the Centre and ICOMOS and examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.60 Groups of Monuments at Hampi (India)**

After receiving information concerning the construction of a highway and bridge over Tungabhadra River cutting across the World Heritage protected area of the site of Hampi, the World Heritage Centre expressed deep concern over the negative impact these public works may have on the integrity of this site. The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) confirmed that the bridge and the road leading from the bridge would affect the nationally protected monuments within Hampi, especially the Talauargattaa Temple and Gate through which the road already passes. ASI has contacted the Chief Secretary of the State Government of Karnataka, who is responsible for the construction of the bridge. The ASI officials have suggested that the Chief Secretary be requested to consider shifting the location of the bridge, and if not, at least divert the alignment of the road so that the World Heritage complex of Hampi is not affected by vehicular pollution

and vibration. The ASI authorities informed the World Heritage Centre that an international expert mission to this site would be welcome.

The Bureau, having been informed of the on-going public works within this World Heritage site, expressed deep concern over the declared threat to the integrity of the site. The Bureau recommended that the Secretariat: (a) urgently organize, a reactive monitoring mission to the site to assess the situation in close co-operation with the State Party, the advisory bodies and independent experts and, (b) submit a report by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau with a view to recommending the possible inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee at its twenty-third session.

#### **IV.61 Churches and Convents of Goa (India)**

The Bureau was informed that the World Heritage Centre undertook a mission to Goa in January 1999 to develop a project proposal based on co-operation between the local authorities of Old Goa (India), Guimaraes (Portugal) and Brighton & Hove (UK) for submission to the European Union Asia Urbs Programme. During this mission, it was noted that while there is an important effort being made to conserve the individual monuments, the overall site is not cohesive, both visually and spatially. Widening of the roads, neglect of archaeological ruins and new spatial organization and landscaping have enclosed the individual monuments in garden squares which have no relation to the historic urban form, thereby making the site into a collection of monuments undermining the integrity of the site as a former port town.

Urgent conservation needs for Se' Cathedral, Basilica of Bom Jesus and Church of St Francis of Assisi visited during the mission were noted, particularly the repair of moisture damaged wooden panels in order not to lose the art work (paintings and wood carving) on the panels.

An independent expert report subsequently received by the Centre noted grave concern over damage caused to some of the monuments due to the poor restoration work carried out with inappropriate material (concrete, synthetic paint, etc) in earlier years. While noting improvements in the more recent conservation work undertaken, the report stressed the need to enhance specialised training in material and architectural conservation. It is stressed the need to elaborate a comprehensive site management plan which would take into account a better presentation of the historic urban form of the site. Moreover, the report noted that the integrity and authenticity of the site would be seriously undermined if the planned project for the upgrading and extension of National Road No. 4 was implemented.

The Centre, upon consultations with the authorities of Old Goa, the State of Goa and locally-based experts of the Orient Foundation, among other institutions and non-governmental organizations, and in close collaboration with the local branch of the Archaeological Survey of India, prepared a project proposal for urban conservation and presentation. This proposal is now pending approval by the central government authorities prior to submission to donors. Subsequent discussions with the Portuguese Direction-General for National Monuments and Edifices (DGEMN) have resulted in a commitment of collaboration between the Centre and DGEMN to carry out an inventory of the site as the first step in elaborating a more coherent conservation management plan.

The Bureau, having been informed of the state of conservation of the property and efforts undertaken by the Secretariat in mobilizing financial and technical support, requested the State

Party in collaboration with UNESCO and international conservation experts to: (a) make a thorough evaluation of the conservation needs of each monument, including conservation training requirements, (b) review the existing site development plan with a view to enhancing the coherence in the relationship between the monuments and its historic urban context, and (c) develop an integrated and multi-sectoral approach in the safeguarding and development of the site to ensure that public works to improve the network of necessary roads and utilities do not undermine the integrity of this World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report on the actions taken by 15 April 2000 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth session.

#### **IV.62 Sun Temple of Konarak (India)**

The Committee, at its twenty-first session in 1997, requested the Government of India to report on the findings of the structural studies being undertaken with World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance. The Government of India was also requested to keep the Secretariat informed in the meantime, to enable UNESCO to mobilize additional international co-operation to undertake corrective measures, as required. The report on the structural studies has not been submitted and the World Heritage Centre has not received sufficient justification for the continuation of financial support for this study.

Since May 1998, the World Heritage Centre received information concerning the continued deterioration of the stone structures at the Sun Temple of Konarak. To cite but one example, a stone at the north-east side of the Jagamohan porch, weighing 2 tons, reportedly fell on the Pidha ledge of the Sun Temple on 19 September 1998.

The Bureau, having examined the new developments at the Sun Temple of Konarak, expressed serious concern over its state of conservation, and requested the Government of India to take urgent measures to halt the deterioration of the stone structures at this site. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to field a mission with the assistance of the advisory bodies to (a) prepare a report on the state of conservation of the site and the adequacy of conservation measures in place; (b) recommend, if necessary, additional measures that may be needed for the conservation of the site; and (c) assist the Government of India in submitting information concerning the structural study, implemented with financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance Reserve made available in 1998. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to submit a report of the mission for review by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session, and invited the Government of India to clarify whether or not it intends to nominate this site for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **IV.63 Historic Centre of Florence (Italy)**

The Bureau recalled that it had discussed at its twenty-second extraordinary session, a project of high tension towers in the landscape surrounding Florence. The Delegate of Italy informed that a detailed report would be submitted to the Secretariat shortly on the matter of the high tension towers in the landscape outside of Florence. He informed the Bureau that these towers are indeed located outside of the World Heritage site. He confirmed the concerns of his Government for the protection of the environment in this type of case, and announced that the Ministry for Cultural Properties and Activities would convene a conference on this matter in October 1999.

The Bureau noted with thanks the information provided by the Delegate of Italy.

#### **IV.64 The Sokkuram Grotto and Pulgulksa Temple (Republic of Korea)**

The Secretariat received a report indicating that an out-dated incinerator banned in many countries is being installed in a location 6.6 km from the Pulgulksa Temple. According to this report, the average emission rate of 0.92 ng per cubic metre of dioxin produced by this type of incinerator would have a negative impact on the community surrounding the Temple.

The Delegate of the Republic of Korea informed the Bureau that although the City of Kyongju was implementing the construction of the incinerator, due to strong opposition from the local communities, the project had been temporarily halted. However, in view of the existing possibility of the construction of the incinerator, which could have a negative impact, he expressed his support for the Secretariat's recommendation to the Bureau.

The Bureau, having been informed of a report of the potential negative environmental impact the installation of the incinerator may have on the surroundings of the Pulgulksa Temple, requested the State Party to provide a scientific report to the Secretariat by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.

#### **IV.65 Baalbek (Lebanon)**

After having examined the report of the Secretariat on the protection of the stones of the Temple of Bacchus and the results of the mission carried out to evaluate the restoration of the Great Mosque, the Bureau requested that the Secretariat continue co-operation for the conservation of the Temple of Bacchus. The Bureau also recommended to the Lebanese authorities that work should not recommence at the Great Mosque and no transformation should be envisaged. It also recommended the Lebanese authorities to provide a management plan of the site before the end of September for submission to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **IV.66 Byblos (Lebanon)**

Having been informed that the only remaining building of the 19<sup>th</sup> century still standing in the inscribed archaeological zone has been allocated to a cultural institution and aware of the risks that this use might have on the site, the Bureau requested the Lebanese authorities to take no further action which might have a negative impact on this important archaeological site and recommended that another building situated outside of the site be provided.

#### **IV.67 Tyr (Lebanon)**

The preparation of documents and the operational activities of this site, which is the object of an International Safeguarding Campaign, is the responsibility of the Division of Cultural Heritage. The Director of the World Heritage Centre reminded the members of the Bureau that, following the launching of the Campaign by the Director-General of UNESCO on 3 March 1998, the Bureau, at its twenty-second session in June 1998, had encouraged the Lebanese authorities to continue the Campaign in co-operation with UNESCO. It had strongly urged the Lebanese authorities to immediately halt all work likely to threaten the heritage of Tyr, and to improve the control mechanisms to prevent further destruction of the heritage of the region.

Taking account of the implementation of several activities such as the development of the highway and the port of Tyr, a letter was addressed to the Minister of Public Works in September 1998, jointly signed by the Director of the Centre and the Division of Cultural Heritage. This letter requested the



suspension of all work likely to modify the character of the site of Tyr and its surroundings, inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Division of Cultural Heritage consequently proposed four experts to the Lebanese authorities to comprise the International Scientific Committee, the names of whom were agreed upon by the Minister for Culture and Higher Education of Lebanon. This Committee, which met for the first time from 14 to 17 June 1999 in Lebanon, and Mr Azedine Beschouch, chargé de mission to the Assistant Director-General for Culture participated. After meetings with the new Director General of Antiquities, Dr Chaker Ghadban, the Director General of Urbanism, Mr Joseph Abdel Ahad, and the Municipality of Tyr, the Committee compiled a report and detailed recommendations concerning the continuation of activities at Tyr.

The Bureau recommended continued co-operation between UNESCO and the Lebanese authorities, notably in the framework of international campaigns and, in endorsing the recommendations of the International Scientific Committee, emphasized the need:

- a) to avoid further intensified urbanization of the old town of Tyr and to set and enforce limitations to the height of buildings;
- b) for a buffer zone, in conformity with the 1972 Convention for properties inscribed on the World Heritage List;
- c) to carry out explorations and soundings well in advance of all construction work, notably the along the length of the future highway;
- d) of the creation of a special "natural" protection zone, where all construction is forbidden, except for light structures without foundations for possible tourist exploitation.

#### **IV.68 Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that an earthquake occurred in Mexico on 15 June 1999 and that the World Heritage City of Puebla had been seriously affected. At the time of the Bureau, however, no further information was available to the Secretariat, ICOMOS or the Observer of Mexico. The Mexican Observer informed the Bureau that a request for emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund might be forthcoming.

The Bureau expressed its regret concerning the loss of human life and damage caused to the World Heritage site. It offered its support and assistance from the World Heritage Emergency Reserve Fund, if so requested by the State Party. It requested the Mexican authorities to assess the damage and to present a report by 15 September 1999 for examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

The Chairperson requested the Mexican authorities, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to collaborate in the preparation of a request for emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

#### **IV.69 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The Committee, at its seventeenth session, expressed deep concern over the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley site and considered the possibility of placing it on the List of World Heritage in Danger, following discussions on the findings of the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission.

At its twenty-first session, the Committee examined the state of conservation report of this site, and in view of the continued deterioration of the World Heritage values in the Bauddhanath and Kathmandu Monument Zones, affecting the site's integrity

and inherent characteristics, the Committee requested the Secretariat, in collaboration with ICOMOS and His Majesty's Government (HMG) of Nepal, to study the possibility of deleting selected areas within some Monument Zones, without jeopardizing the universal significance and value of the site as a whole. This review was to take into consideration the intention of HMG of Nepal to nominate Kokhana as an additional Monument Zone.

The Committee authorized a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal team to conduct a thorough study and to elaborate a programme for corrective measures in accordance with paragraphs 82-89 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Based upon the information of this study and recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee, at its twenty-first session, decided that it could consider whether or not to inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-second session. Following this decision, a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission was organized in March-April 1998.

The Committee examined the findings and results of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission, and the 55 recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal. The Committee commended HMG of Nepal for its efforts in strengthening the management of the Kathmandu Valley site with the creation of the *Heritage Conservation Unit*. The Committee took note of the special efforts made by the local authorities to raise awareness amongst the private home owners to prevent further illegal demolition and inappropriate new constructions.

The Committee decided to defer consideration of the inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its twenty-third session. However, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission, to respect the deadlines of the Time-Bound Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal and in addition, recommended that HMG of Nepal adopts the three additional ICOMOS recommendations annexed to the 55 recommendations. HMG of Nepal was requested to submit a progress report before 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June 1999.

The Committee at the time also requested HMG of Nepal to take measures to ensure that adequate protection and management are put into place at Kokhana, prior to its nomination as an additional Monument Zone to the Kathmandu Valley site.

The Bureau examined the reports of the Secretariat and HMG of Nepal in implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission, presented in WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.6 and WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.19. ICOMOS congratulated HMG of Nepal for its efforts to implement the Time-Bound Action Plan, and stated that the effectiveness of the Heritage Conservation Unit would be crucial for adequately safeguarding the seven Monument Zones composing the site. The Observer of Nepal reassured the Bureau that HMG of Nepal was doing its utmost to safeguard the Kathmandu Valley site, to respect the deadlines for the implementation of the Time-Bound Action Plan of Corrective Measures, and that this was a priority of the recently elected Prime Minister. He stated that the Ancient Monument Preservation Rules have been amended and would be approved shortly, and assured that the Heritage Conservation Unit would soon become fully active in regular monitoring and controlling development.

The Bureau requested HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission and urges HMG of Nepal to respect the deadlines for the implementation of the Time-Bound Action Plan of Corrective Measures, especially in

relation to the establishment of the essential Ancient Monuments Preservation Rules which should increase the capacity of the relevant authorities in implementing the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act and in establishing a Monuments Conservation Fund for safeguarding the Kathmandu Valley site.

The Bureau requested HMG of Nepal to report on the progress made in enforcing existing building regulations at Bauddhanath Monument Zone, and on the technical and financial plan for correcting the illegal buildings immediately surrounding the stupa, following the detailed recommendations of ICOMOS during the Joint Mission, before 15 September 1999.

Finally, the Bureau requested HMG of Nepal to submit a report on the further progress made in implementing the 55 recommendations before 15 September 1999 for examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

#### **IV.70 Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)**

The Bureau examined the report of the Secretariat concerning the proposal to organize an international technical meeting to ensure that the proposed project for the conservation, restoration and presentation of the Maya Devi Temple within the archaeological zone of the World Heritage site, which was prepared by the Japan Buddhist Federation and submitted by the Lumbini Development Trust conforms to international standards. In view of the religious and archaeological importance of the Maya Devi Temple, which is exposed to natural elements, pilgrims and visitors and is presently protected only with a corrugated roof, UNESCO and ICOMOS experts recommended that an international technical meeting be organized bringing together the national authorities responsible for this site and international experts, to discuss the project proposal.

The Observer of Nepal informed the Bureau that his Government considered that sufficient consultation with the national authorities had not taken place to discuss the proposed international technical meeting. ICOMOS stated that in view of the great impact the proposed restoration project would have on the Maya Devi Temple, it supported the Secretariat's suggestion for a small group of high level international experts to meet with the national authorities and experts for discussing the most appropriate conservation, restoration, and presentation plan for this monument.

The Bureau, having examined the report of the Secretariat and the comments of the Observer of HMG of Nepal and ICOMOS, noted the fragility of this important pilgrimage site. The Bureau asked the World Heritage Centre to immediately consult the authorities of Nepal to make the necessary arrangements to organize an international technical meeting to examine the proposal for the conservation, restoration and presentation of the Maya Devi Temple, and to report on the consultations to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

#### **IV.71 Taxila (Pakistan)**

During a mission undertaken in February 1999, a World Heritage Centre staff member witnessed the alarming construction of a football stadium on an unexcavated area on the Bhir Mound site, the earliest historical citadel site within Taxila World Heritage site. The stadium was being built directly on an archaeological area, which the Government of Pakistan had purchased in 1954. At the time of the mission, construction workers had already finished digging the dredges for the rectangular outer brick wall of the stadium, exposing the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD strata stone walls and pottery shards. A well had been dug and workers had exposed all four stratum of the Taxila Ancient City at Bhir

Mound, including the earliest dating to the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC Achaemenian period. The construction is on an archaeological area as yet unexcavated and no documentation of this area has been undertaken. The construction of the stadium would irreversibly damage the site, preventing archaeological and scientific research of one fifth of the most ancient part of the Taxila World Heritage site. A stadium will imply the installation of new drainage and water supply systems at the site to meet the needs of the stadium users, which could damage the archaeological remains. Furthermore, this stadium is bound to lead to an increase in visitors to a site that is not adequately prepared for mass tourism. In March 1999, the Director of the World Heritage Centre addressed a letter to the Minister of Culture of Pakistan requesting that urgent measures be taken to ensure the protection and preservation of Bhir Mound.

The mission also expressed deep concern over evidences of illegal excavations at two of the archaeological remains in the Taxila World Heritage site which were examined. The representatives of the Government of Pakistan confirmed that large-scale illegal excavation by looters in search of sculptures within Buddhist monastery sites had increased in the past two years.

Finally, the mission informed of the construction of a second heavy industry complex and military base within Taxila Valley, and expressed concern over the continuing expansion of the industrial estates. Despite their location outside the very limited buffer zone surrounding the registered archaeological sites, these industrial complexes nonetheless risk impacting upon the overall integrity of the Taxila World Heritage site in its ensemble.

ICOMOS, supporting the views of the Secretariat, expressed deep concern regarding the construction of a football stadium on the Bhir Mound and underlined the need for a full report from the Government of Pakistan.

The Observer of Pakistan thanked the Bureau and the World Heritage Centre for the mission undertaken in February 1999 by the World Heritage Centre, which was welcomed by the Government of Pakistan. She assured the Bureau of her Government's full commitment to protect the Taxila site. Being aware of the potential damages to the archaeological remains of Taxila, she informed the Bureau that the construction of the football stadium at Bhir Mound was of great concern. The Observer of Pakistan stated that the Government of Pakistan intended to correct the situation. She also informed the Bureau that her Government would address the recurring illegal looting and excavation of numerous archaeological remains at Taxila, with the continued support of UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau, having examined the reports of the Secretariat, ICOMOS and the Observer of Pakistan, requested the Government of Pakistan to take urgent measures to halt the construction of the stadium being built on Bhir Mound. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Government of Pakistan to undertake archaeological research at unexcavated sites at Taxila, and adequately protect the sites from illegal looters. In view of Pakistan's adherence to the UNESCO 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, the Bureau recommended that the authorities of Pakistan strengthen security at the archaeological remains of Taxila and the customs control at the borders of the North-Western Frontier Province. The Bureau also requested the Government of Pakistan to undertake an impact study of the heavy industries in the Taxila Valley areas. Finally, the Bureau requested the Government of Pakistan to submit a report by 15 September 1999 on the actions taken for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.

#### **IV.72 Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore (Pakistan)**

Following a request for Technical Co-operation aimed at restoring the Gardens to the original Mughal pattern, a mission by an ICOMOS expert was organized by the World Heritage Centre in October-November 1998 to assess repair needs, to report on the state of conservation of the gardens and landscape, and to make recommendations for future action following international conservation norms. An evaluation of the Master Plan for the Preservation and Restoration of Shalamar Gardens Lahore (April 1998) was also undertaken.

Despite the commendable efforts made by the responsible authorities within their limited financial resources, the ICOMOS expert reported on the general state of disrepair of the structural components and buildings of the Shalamar Gardens. The expert noted with concern that due to the recent development around the Gardens, inner and outer ground levels differ, resulting in damage to the peripheral walls caused by moisture and efflorescence. The deterioration of the water channels of the fountains is leading to water leakage, and the Gardens on the three terraces no longer have the historical layout or the greenery of the Mughal period. The mission made 17 recommendations, which were adopted by the authorities of Pakistan in February 1999, and a request for Preparatory Assistance for implementing the first five recommendations has been submitted.

In June 1999, information was received that the Road Construction Authorities of Lahore were demolishing the essential hydraulic works for the fountains of the Shalamar Gardens. Apparently, this work was being carried out to enlarge the road outside the Shalamar Gardens, to cope with heavy traffic.

During the session, ICOMOS underlined that consideration should be given to the establishment of an adequate management plan for the Shalamar Gardens.

During a mission by the World Heritage Centre, the state of conservation of the Fort of Lahore was also examined. The mission expressed concern about the lack of an overall Management Plan and the use of non-traditional building material for the restoration of the various monuments composing Lahore Fort. In view of the large number of visitors to the site, an urgent need for a Master Plan for enhanced management was identified.

The Pakistan authorities brought the attention of the mission to the alarming deterioration of the Shish Mahal Pavilion's Mirror Hall ceiling, where the convex mirror glass is cracking away from the carved stucco ceiling, and urgently requested international expert advice. An ICCROM reactive monitoring mission was organized by the World Heritage Centre in May 1999 to assist the authorities in addressing the problems of structural stability of Shish Mahal and for appropriate conservation methodology for the ceiling. ICCROM presented the findings and recommendations of this mission to the Bureau.

During the session, the Observer of Pakistan expressed her Government's appreciation for the missions to the Fort and Shalamar Gardens of Lahore, undertaken by ICOMOS, ICCROM and World Heritage Centre and organized by the World Heritage Centre. She informed the Bureau that the provincial and national authorities were changing the plan for extending the route beside the Shalamar Gardens to conserve the hydraulic works of the Shalamar Gardens. Regarding the Lahore Fort, the Observer of Pakistan informed the Bureau of the recent increase in public awareness for the need to protect the mirrored ceiling of the Shish Mahal Pavilion. She informed the Bureau that her Government welcomed the ICCROM expert mission and requested the World Heritage Committee, the advisory bodies

and the World Heritage Centre to continue assisting the national authorities in safeguarding the fragile ceiling.

The Bureau, upon examining the reports of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, requested the World Heritage Centre to assist the authorities of Pakistan in implementing the 17-point recommendations of the ICOMOS expert and in the establishment of a management plan for adequate protection of the Shalamar Gardens; and to address the concern over the deterioration of the peripheral walls of the first terrace of the Shalamar Gardens by examining the possibility of lowering the ground level immediately surrounding the peripheral walls of the Shalamar Gardens to its original level. The Bureau expressed deep concern over the planned demolition of the essential hydraulic works of the Shalamar Gardens, and also requested the State Party to provide further information on the plans for rehabilitating the hydraulic works.

The Bureau, upon examining the report of ICCROM concerning the state of conservation of the Shish Mahal Mirrored Pavilion, Lahore Fort, urged the authorities of Pakistan to immediately provide a temporary roof covering the Shish Mahal Pavilion to prevent further water leakage aggravating the condition of the Mirrored Ceiling. It requested the World Heritage Centre to assist the authorities of Pakistan in submitting a request for international assistance for (a) the repair and conservation of the Pavilion roof, the support system for the ceiling and the Mirrored Ceiling itself and (b) the formulation of a site management plan, within the framework of a Master Plan for enhanced management of Lahore Fort, integrating concern for the site's heritage values in management processes and operations.

#### **IV.73 City of Cusco (Peru)**

The Bureau noted that the UNESCO Representative in Peru was in Cusco at the time of its session to discuss the modalities of the implementation of the World Heritage assistance for the preparation of a Master Plan. The Observer of Peru informed that with the new municipal administration, a joint commission will be set up for the preparation of a Master Plan.

Considering this information, the Bureau decided to defer further examination to its twenty-third extraordinary session and requested the Peruvian authorities to submit a report in response to the request made by the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session, by 15 September 1999.

#### **IV.74 Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)**

At its twenty-second session, the Committee approved a technical co-operation request to purchase computer equipment and for partially funding the international experts' fees, for producing new maps for efficient and adequate management of this cultural landscape site, which is very vulnerable to a variety of adverse impacts. The UNESCO Regional Office in Bangkok is assisting the authorities of the Philippines in implementing this activity.

ICOMOS Germany expressed concern over the state of conservation and management of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras in December 1998, following an expert mission undertaken at the invitation of the Culture Committee of the Philippines of the National Commission for UNESCO. The Ifugao Terraces Commission responded in March 1999 informing the World Heritage Centre that it has taken into consideration for future action, the recommendations made by the expert concerning the creation of a buffer zone around the rice plantation areas, the restoration of the watersheds of Batad and the promotion of traditional houses in Batad.

The Bureau was informed that the Government of the Philippines had submitted for evaluation, a proposal, work plan and budget for the GIS mapping project to the Regional Advisor for Culture in the Asia Pacific Region of the UNESCO Bangkok Office, and was awaiting response to commence the implementation of the technical work.

ICOMOS stated that the state of conservation and the concerns raised should be taken seriously, as this fragile site, like many cultural landscape sites, was extremely vulnerable to the changes of the socio-ecological system. The closely interlinking characteristics of the site are essential in maintaining the integrity of its World Heritage values.

The Observer of the Philippines expressed her appreciation of the ICOMOS mission and its recommendations. She informed the Bureau that her Government had taken note of the concerns raised, and that the President of the Philippines had recently appointed a task force to address these concerns.

The Bureau, upon examining the report of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and the Observer of the Philippines, requested the authorities of the Philippines, with the assistance of the UNESCO Regional Office in Bangkok, to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Technical Co-operation project for GIS mapping, and also report on the actions taken in addressing the concerns raised by ICOMOS experts, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session. Furthermore, the Bureau reiterated that the newly appointed Government Task Force, established by the President of the Philippines, together with various national and local authorities responsible for this site, prepare a realistic plan of corrective measures upon technical evaluation of the conservation needs of this site.

#### **IV.75 Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

Following a mission by the Director of the World Heritage Centre to Poland, the Government of Poland submitted a substantive progress report on the actions taken for the management and preservation of this World Heritage site. This report addressed the following issues:

1. The Strategic Government Programme for Auschwitz, in operation since the beginning of 1997 will be extended until the year 2007. It provides for the creation of a communication infrastructure and the functional restructuring of the areas around the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. Funding has been provided under this programme for the restoration of the railway and facades and, for next year, the creation of an International Education Centre in the former Philip Morris tobacco factory. A new Plenipotentiary of the Government for the Strategic Government Programme has been appointed at the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Administration.
2. The international group of experts that met in June 1998 has now been formally established as an Advisory Body to the Plenipotentiary. This body met again in March 1999.
3. The Act for the Protection of the former Nazi Extermination Camps was signed by the President of the Republic on 10 May and became law on 25 May 1999. This act foresees strict control by the regional representative of the National Government of a zone of 100 meters around the Camps. In the case of Auschwitz/Birkenau, this is a zone within the wider protection zone around the World Heritage site. On the basis of this act, the crosses surrounding so-called 'Papal Cross' were removed to another location on 28 May 1999.

4. Planing documents for Oswiecim and Brzezinka (the towns and municipalities where the camps are located) will be developed in such a way that they respond to both the interests and aspirations of the local communities and to the need to maintain and increase the solemnity of the site.

Considering that major progress had been made in consensus building, planning and concrete actions for the preservation of the site, the Bureau commended the Government of Poland for the decisive actions it had taken to implement the Strategic Governmental Programme for Auschwitz, to implement the Act for the Protection of Former Nazi Extermination Camps and to initiate integrated planning for the surroundings of the Camps of Auschwitz/Birkenau. It requested the Government of Poland to submit a further progress report by 15 April 2000 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-fourth session. It requested that this report include detailed maps of the camps and their surroundings with a clear indication of the different protection zones and the management mechanisms that apply to them.

On behalf of his Government, the Observer of Poland thanked the members of the Committee, particularly the Delegation of the United States of America, for the interest in the preservation of this site. He also thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his mission to Poland and for his fruitful discussions and advice. He expressed his commitment, in his capacity as Chairperson of the international group of experts, to present by the time of the next reporting, a master plan for the site.

#### **IV.76 Angra do Heroismo (Portugal)**

At the request of the Portuguese authorities, a joint WHC-ICOMOS mission was undertaken to Angra do Heroismo from 28 to 31 January 1999. The mission examined the progress made in the preparation and adoption of the protective measures and planning mechanisms for the city and its surroundings and noted the need for these to be further integrated. The mission requested the authorities to submit by 1 May 1999 detailed reports on the measures taken for the protection of the World Heritage site and the insertion of the marina in the overall development and preservation of the city, as well as on the marina, including justification for its proposed location (alternative locations; historical, cultural, urbanistic and technical considerations; analysis of impact of the marina including traffic flow, infrastructure); proposals for the improvement of the plan for the marina (separation of the dam from the waterfront; revitalisation and restoration of the contact area between city and bay; location of services away from the old quay –preferably to the Pipas Harbour).

Since this mission, the ICOMOS expert participated in several meetings at the National Laboratory for Civil Engineering in Lisbon to study the models for the marina.

The Bureau took note of the dispatch to the World Heritage Centre by the Portuguese authorities of the report requested by the ICOMOS-WHC mission. This report will be presented to the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session.

#### **IV.77 Granada (Spain)**

The Bureau took note of the new information transmitted by the Secretariat. It thanked the authorities for the preparation of the revised protection plan. The Bureau recommended that the extension of the municipal cemetery respects the need to protect the site and that the revised protection plan be submitted to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.

**IV.78 Sacred City of Kandy (Sri Lanka)  
Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka)  
Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau examined the reports from ICOMOS, the Secretariat and the Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka, concerning the damage at the Temple of the Tooth, Kandy, following the terrorist bombing in January 1998. The authorities of Sri Lanka were requested to submit a report concerning the progress made in the restoration work undertaken, for presentation to the twenty-second session of the Committee. To date, this report has not been received by the Secretariat. However, ICOMOS experts found during a monitoring mission in December 1998, that conservation and restoration works are progressing steadily. On the other hand, the World Heritage Centre has not received sufficient justification for the 1998 financial support for technical co-operation and promotional assistance for the Sacred City of Kandy site.

ICOMOS monitoring missions to these three World Heritage sites were undertaken in December 1998:

**IV.79 Sacred City of Kandy (Sri Lanka)**

ICOMOS experts reported that conservation and restoration works are progressing steadily at the Temple of the Tooth. In particular, the high level of management of the site by both conservation and administration teams was noted. Given the strong public support for the conservation policy including development control of the whole city, ICOMOS experts noted that the systematic approach applied to urban conservation in Kandy could serve as a model for other relevant areas in Sri Lanka.

Seventeen recommendations were made by the ICOMOS experts for enhancing the conservation and management of the site. These recommendations address: (a) the need to consult stakeholders and experts before the finalization and implementation of the comprehensive Master Plan; (b) the need to improve traffic and parking systems immediately surrounding the World Heritage site; (c) the need for better information dissemination concerning development guidelines by the local authorities; and (d) the need to redefine the core zone to include the Kandy Lake and Udawattakele which form an integral part of the site, and the buffer zone to include the mountain range of Walker Estate to preserve the skyline of the site.

**IV.80 Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka)**

ICOMOS experts reported on the need for a clear demarcation of the World Heritage site and its buffer zone, and strongly recommended that the core zone should include the ancient harbour of Galle.

Eleven recommendations were made by the ICOMOS experts which address (a) the need to increase the standards of conservation of the monuments and historic buildings within the site; (b) the need to carry out scientific research of urban development of the historic town and the architectural details and; (c) the need to prepare and implement, with adequate technical staff, an overall Development Plan, for guiding development within the living historic town as well as for proper conservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings, following international conservation norms.

**IV.81 Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka)**

ICOMOS experts reported on the state of conservation of the site and its buffer zone, including information on the improved infrastructure around the site. However, ICOMOS experts expressed concern that no conservation work has been carried out

at the Golden Temple since the site's inscription on the World Heritage List, which has resulted in the general deterioration of the monument.

ICOMOS experts recommended that immediate intervention be arranged. ICOMOS experts made eight recommendations for improved conservation and management of the site, including the removal of the newly constructed temple that is alien to the World Heritage complex.

The Bureau, having examined the reports of ICOMOS, expressed concern over the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications, and the Golden Temple of Dambulla. The Bureau requested the Government of Sri Lanka to take urgent measures for enhanced conservation, presentation and management of these two sites, and to halt new construction, which could undermine the integrity of the sites. In particular, the Bureau requests the Authorities of Sri Lanka to submit a technical co-operation request, with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre, to formulate a Development Plan for the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications. The Bureau, while commending the relevant authorities on the high level of management at the Sacred City of Kandy, requested that they continue their efforts to enhance the management of the site. The Bureau recommended that the authorities of Sri Lanka consider extending the core zone of the Sacred City of Kandy site to include the Kandy Lake and Udawattakele, and the buffer zone to include the mountain range of Walker Estate. Extension of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications to include the ancient harbour was also recommended.

The Bureau encouraged the relevant authorities to consider the ICOMOS recommendations following its mission in December 1998. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report on the progress made in the restoration works at the Temple of the Tooth at Kandy by 15 September 1999, to enable reporting to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report on the progress made in improving the general management of all three sites, before 1 May 2000 for consideration by the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau in June/July 2000.

**IV.82 Rock Carvings in Tanum (Sweden)**

On 13 April 1999, the Ministry of Culture of Sweden informed the Secretariat that environmental impact studies for the different alternatives for the road upgrading had been completed as well as a specific study on the possible impact on the cultural values of the World Heritage site of Tanum. These studies will go through a consultative process before any decision is taken about the choice of the routing of the road. It is stated that the opinions expressed by the WHC-ICOMOS mission and the World Heritage Committee are valuable contributions to the process to determine the location for the new E6 road in the Tanum area.

ICOMOS advised that of the two alternative proposals identified in the studies for further consideration, only one (the so-called Red Route 4) would have a minimal impact on the World Heritage values of the site. The impact of the second alternative under consideration (the so-called Route 23) would still be undesirable on what is in effect a major cultural landscape.

The Observer of Sweden remarked that the consultation process had not been concluded and that the decision making stage had not yet been reached.

The Bureau thanked the State Party for its continued efforts to ensure that the upgrading of the E6 road, which is still under consideration by the Swedish authorities, should make the minimum impact on the World Heritage site. It expressed its

support for Red Route 4, favoured by the joint ICOMOS-UNESCO mission in September 1998, and requested the Government to keep the Committee and its Bureau informed on further developments in this matter.

#### **IV.83 The Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)**

The Bureau listened to the results of the mission dispatched by the World Heritage Centre to the study structural damage of the Tekiyeh as Suleymaniyeh. After examination of the state of conservation of the site and the recommendations of this mission, the Bureau requested the Syrian authorities to undertake the minor interventions described in this report so that the monument may be opened to the public.

#### **IV.84 Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

Having examined the state of conservation of the property, the Bureau considered that the primary action for the site is the establishment of the necessary regulations together with the creation of an on-site management office, to avoid further inappropriate interventions within the site. The Bureau recommended to the Syrian authorities to collaborate with the Secretariat in completing the draft management plan, including the proposal for the regulations. It also recommended that in continuing its collaboration, the Syrian authorities increase their financial contribution for the co-operation programme.

#### **IV.85 Historical Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)**

##### **1) The Monument of Hagia Sophia of the Archaeological Park**

The Bureau thanked the authorities for the efforts undertaken and recommended that the International Scientific Committee meets without delay and in accordance with the terms of reference decided upon so that a work programme may be established.

##### **2) Historic Areas of Istanbul**

The Bureau was informed of the international expert mission carried out in June 1999 to assist the Turkish authorities in the preparation of a periodic report on the state of conservation of the sites located in Fatih District— notably the site of Zeyrek and the Rampart area which are two of the four zones protected under the World Heritage Convention. In close collaboration with the local authorities of Fatih and ICOMOS National Committee of Turkey, the mission, built upon the report submitted by the Ministry of Culture of Turkey, as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session, the studies conducted by the Centre in 1997 under the project funded by the European Commission and the project profiles prepared by Istanbul Technical University under the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign for Istanbul.

The preliminary findings of the mission indicated that unauthorized demolition and illegal construction within the World Heritage protected areas were occurring due to the abolition in 1992 of the 1990 Urban Development Plan for Conservation of Istanbul. Moreover, despite the 1996 declaration by the Regional Council for Monuments and Sites placing the entire historic peninsula of Istanbul as a conservation area, a new Urban Development Plan for Conservation (at 1:5000 scale) and the Detailed Conservation Plan of Fatih and Eminonu Districts (at 1:1000 scale) have not been adopted, within one year, as provided under the law. This delay in the adoption of the Plan has resulted in the prolongation of the so-called “transitional phase” under which all building requests in the entire historic peninsula must be approved by the Regional Council. The limited

staff of the Regional Council causing delays in the building approval process has in turn, led to illegal construction activities.

The technical co-operation project co-funded by the World Heritage Fund, the Government of France and Fatih Municipality, has enabled the initiation of activities by the House of Fatih Inhabitants, now renamed “Istanbul Heritage House”. The office of this community advisory service has now been renovated, an information panel with a map of the World Heritage protected areas have been completed, and the Istanbul Technical University is preparing a detailed inventory of Zeyrek. International and national legal experts and urbanists have been identified to assist the authorities in the preparation and adoption of the Plan, as well as to define the terms and mechanisms of soft loans to the inhabitants for housing improvement in Fatih to be financed under the US\$ 7.7 million European Union project designed by the Centre. The Government of France will also provide the services of an Architect des Batiments du France to support this effort under the framework of the France-UNESCO Agreement for the Protection of Monumental and Urban Heritage.

The expert mission also noted with concern the demolition of the timber buildings in Zeyrek and the reconstruction in its place of concrete and timber clad buildings, undermining the authenticity of the area. The Centre, in collaboration with the ICOMOS Wood Committee experts of Turkey and the United Kingdom, and the Istanbul Architect Association is currently developing an action plan for the training in timber buildings rehabilitation and restoration.

Commenting on the Secretariat's report, ICOMOS praised the community-based approach being undertaken by the local conservation groups and commended the role played by the Secretariat. He noted however, that the serious degradation of the timber buildings and the poverty of the inhabitants of Zeyrek and certain other sectors of the protected area make this urban heritage conservation effort an almost utopian cause. He however stressed that the involvement of the local community is the only possible way to ensure the protection of these parts of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau commended the Turkish authorities and the Municipality of Fatih for the establishment of the “Istanbul Heritage House” and notably the continued efforts undertaken by the Municipality of Fatih to encourage the inhabitants to conserve the historic urban fabrics of the World Heritage areas.

The Bureau reiterated its concern with regard to the state of conservation of the Ottoman epoch timber buildings in Zeyrek, their demolition and reconstruction of concrete and timber-clad buildings in their place, undermining the authenticity of this area.

The Bureau furthermore, requested the State Party to encourage the early preparation of the Urban Development Plan for Conservation by Greater Istanbul Metropolitan Administration and the Detailed Plan for Conservation by the Municipalities of Fatih and Eminonu and for the official adoption of these Plans to ensure the protection of the World Heritage areas.

The Bureau requested the State Party to submit to the Secretariat by 15 September 1999, an update on the measures being taken to address the concerns expressed above, and for the Secretariat to continue mobilizing international co-operation to support the efforts of the national and local authorities.

#### **IV.86 Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)**

ICOMOS reported on the results of a mission it undertook to Kiev in response to a request made by the Bureau at its twenty-

second extraordinary session. The mission looked into the project to rebuild the Dormition Cathedral, particularly its hydrogeological implications. The mission concluded that, with the technology applied for the foundation, concerns for the stability of the soil are unjustified.

Furthermore, the mission reported that the Hotel Intercontinental project has now been modified and it will not be higher than the surrounding buildings and will not be intrusive. It also reported that the Laboratory House Office building has been lowered and will satisfy the initial objections.

Other issues discussed during the mission were: the possible extension of the World Heritage site, the need for UNESCO support in obtaining expert advice on open and green spaces, general concern about the state of conservation of the city and the need for an international conference on monument reconstruction in Central and Eastern countries.

The Bureau expressed its appreciation of the actions taken by the State Party to modify the design of new constructions in Kiev so as to mitigate their impact on the Historic Centre.

#### **IV.87 Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)**

A mission sent by the World Heritage Centre in November 1998 to Sana'a had reported that there were plans for the extension of the Great Mosque of Sana'a and for the construction of a large fly-over between the two parts of the city. The twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (November 1998) recommended that work on these two projects should be halted pending a global study on the development of Sana'a. This was communication to the authorities in January 1999. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the extension of the Grand Mosque has been abandoned. Furthermore, the Observer of Yemen provided additional information on the flyover, the length of which had been reduced. Consequently, the Bureau requested the Yemeni authorities to collaborate with the Secretariat in studying the holistic management of the site before works began. The Bureau also requested the authorities to receive at their earliest convenience a mission of specialists to study together alternative solutions for the development projects. This mission should report to the forthcoming session of the World Heritage Committee.

**IV.88** Before concluding the agenda item on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List, the Chairperson referred to the decision adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO at its 156<sup>th</sup> session concerning the situation in the Balkan region. Making particular reference to paragraph 6 of this decision, in which the Executive Board requested '*the Director-General to take, as of now, appropriate steps so that UNESCO can contribute to reconstruction in the fields of education, science, culture and communication as well as for the assistance of refugees*', he proposed that the Bureau listen to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for information on the cultural heritage in the region.

**IV.89** The Director of the Centre recalled that four World Heritage properties are located on the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Stari Ras and Sopocani; Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor; Durmitor National Park and Studenica Monastery).

**IV.90** He informed the Bureau that from mid-March onwards, UNESCO had received several official communications from the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia regarding the World Heritage. On 12 March 1999, the Ambassador- Charge d'Affairs a.i. wrote to the Director submitting an amendment to the tentative list in order to include three districts with a great

number of monuments in Kosovo and Metohija, Autonomous Province of Serbia to the tentative list. Furthermore, communications were received from the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 24 March, 2, 3 and 21 April 1999 requesting the inscription of World Heritage properties located on its territory, as well as properties included in and proposed for the tentative list, on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**IV.91** The Director informed that to date, the Secretariat had not received documented information on damage to the World Heritage sites or to properties proposed for inclusion on the tentative list. He also noted that it is only the Committee that has the authority to include properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**IV.92** Finally, the Director recalled that the Director-General of UNESCO had, on several occasions, called for the respect of cultural heritage in the Kosovo conflict and demanded that the different parties '*respect the museums, archives, libraries, religious and educational institutions, as well as monuments and sites that are evidence of the civilisation and history of the region*'. Referring to the resolution adopted by the Executive Board at its 156<sup>th</sup> session, the Director informed the Bureau that a staff member of the Cultural Heritage Division was on mission to Kosovo to assess the situation of the cultural heritage of this region.

## **V. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **Tentative Lists**

**V.1** The Chairperson informed the Bureau that all cultural and mixed sites under consideration are included on the Tentative Lists of the States Parties concerned.

### **Nominations**

**V.2** The Bureau examined 16 natural nominations, 1 extension to a natural site, 5 mixed properties, 48 cultural nominations and 4 cultural site extensions received for review by IUCN and ICOMOS. IUCN informed the Bureau that for climatic reasons access to five nominated sites was not possible prior to the Bureau session. The Bureau noted that these properties would be presented to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1999.

**V.3** At the request of the State Party, the Bureau did not examine one cultural nomination, El Palmeral de Elche y sus tradiciones (Misteri) (Spain). A revised nomination would be prepared in time for it to be considered at the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

## **NATURAL HERITAGE**

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

Property	<b>Península Valdés</b>
Id. N°	<b>937</b>
State Party	<b>Argentina</b>
Criteria	<b>N (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe Peninsula Valdés on the World Heritage List under *criterion (iv)*.

Peninsula Valdés contains very important and significant natural habitats for the in-situ conservation of several threatened species of outstanding universal value, and specifically its globally important concentration of breeding southern right whales, which is an endangered species. It is also important because of the breeding populations of southern elephant seals and southern sea lions. The area exhibits an exceptional example of adaptation of hunting techniques by the orca to the local coastal conditions.

The Bureau commended the government of the Province of Chubut for promoting the preparation of an Integrated Collaborative Management Plan for this site. The Bureau recommended that the State Party, along with responsible regional and local bodies should: (a) ensure that effective controls are in place over any possible pollution threat from the town of Puerto Madryn to the waters of Golfo Nuevo, (b) support the efforts of the relevant authorities to secure the equipment needed to respond quickly to any oil hazard from passing shipping so as to protect the marine conservation values of the area; (c) produce a tourism management plan as an integral element of the overall management plan; (d) encourage implementation of the Integrated Collaborative Management Plan, and in particular to ensure that farmers and other private owners of land can play a full part in the development of environmentally responsible tourism; and (e) work at the international level to ensure that the marine mammals concerned are protected throughout their range.

Property	<b>Area de Conservacion Guanacaste</b>
Id. N°	<b>828</b>
State Party	<b>Costa Rica</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Guanacaste Conservation Area on the World Heritage list under *criteria (ii) and (iv)*.

The site demonstrates significant, major biological and ecological processes in both its terrestrial and marine-coastal environments, as exemplified by: a) evolution, succession and restoration of Pacific Tropical Dry Forest; b) altitudinal migration and other interactive biogeographic and ecological processes along its dry forest - montane humid forest - cloud forest - lowland Caribbean rain forest transect; and, c) the major upwelling and development of coral colonies and reefs in regions long considered to not have either (marine area near the coast of the Murcielago sector of Santa Rosa National Park).

It contains important natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity (2.4% of global diversity), including both the best dry forest habitats and communities in Central America and key habitat for threatened animal species such as the Saltwater Crocodile, False Vampire Bat, Leatherback Sea Turtle, Jaguar, Jabiru Stork, Mangrove Hummingbird and threatened plant species such as Mahogany, Guyacan Real (*Lignum Vitae*), five species each of rare cacti and rare bromeliads.

Property	<b>Lorentz National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>955</b>
State Party	<b>Indonesia</b>
Criteria	<b>N (i) (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Lorentz National Park on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)*. The Bureau requested the Centre to inform the Indonesian authorities of a number of aspects suggested by IUCN dealing with the management of the site, and in particular: (a) the priority need to continue the process of management planning for the park with full involvement of the

local stakeholders; (b) encouragement for the proposed establishment of a Foundation which would assist in the management of the park; (c) possible twinning arrangement with the Wet Tropics World Heritage site in Australia; (d) appointment of a Park Director and support staff; (e) the concern over development projects that would affect the Park, for example the proposed Timika/Mapurajaya road and any expansion of mining activity towards the Park boundary so as not to conflict with Lorentz National Park's nomination as a World Heritage Site.

The site is the largest protected area in Southeast Asia (2.5 mil. ha.) and the only protected area in the world which incorporates a continuous, intact transect from snow cap to tropical marine environment, including extensive lowland wetlands. Located at the meeting point of two colliding continental plates, the area has a complex geology with on-going mountain formation as well as major sculpting by glaciation and shoreline accretion which has formed much of the lowland areas. These processes have led to a high level of endemism and the area supports the highest level of biodiversity in the region. The area also contains fossil sites which record the evolution of life on New Guinea.

The Bureau requested the Centre to commend the State Party for ensuring that the formerly existing mining and petroleum exploration leases in the Park were withdrawn. The Bureau also suggested that a monitoring mission be undertaken to gauge progress three years after inscription.

The Observer of Australia noted that his country, not having been informed about the suggestion of twinning arrangements between Wet Tropics of Queensland and Lorentz National Park, would however be pleased to establish such a collaboration.

Property	<b>The Laurisilva of Madeira</b>
Id. N°	<b>934</b>
State Party	<b>Portugal</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Laurel Forest of Madeira on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii) and (iv)*.

The site contains the largest surviving relict of the virtually extinct laurisilva forest type that was once widespread in Europe. This forest type is considered to be a centre of plant diversity containing numerous rare, relict and endemic species, especially of bryophytes, ferns and flowering plants. It also has a very rich invertebrate fauna. Endemic species include the Madeiran long-toed pigeon and some 66 species of vascular plants.

The Bureau noted IUCN's suggestions to: (a) commend the State Party on the protection afforded to the forest in a protected area less than 10 years old and on the commitment shown by the Autonomous Regional Government, (b) encourage the State Party to enhance interpretation of the area and envisage compatible forestry practices outside the site, (c) encourage discussions between the Portuguese and the Spanish authorities on the possibility of jointly proposing Garajonay National Park World Heritage site and the Laurel Forest of Madeira as a single World Heritage site representing laurel forest.

Property	<b>Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>914</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park on the World Heritage List under natural *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*.



The site is the largest estuarine system in Africa and includes the southernmost extension of coral reefs on the continent. The site contains a combination of on-going fluvial, marine and aeolian processes which have resulted in a variety of landforms and ecosystems. Features include wide submarine canyons, sandy beaches, forested dune cordon and a mosaic of wetlands, grasslands, forests, lakes and savanna. The variety of morphology as well as major flood and storm events contribute to ongoing evolutionary processes in the area. Natural phenomena include: shifts from low to hyper-saline states in the Park's lakes; large numbers of nesting turtles on the beaches; the migration of whales, dolphins and whale-sharks off-shore; and huge numbers of waterfowl including large breeding colonies of pelicans, storks, herons and terns. The Park's location between sub-tropical and tropical Africa as well as its coastal setting has resulted in exceptional biodiversity including some 521 bird species.

The Bureau commended the Government of South Africa on three issues: (a) for the decision to ban sand mining in the area and to subsequently nominate the area for World Heritage; (b) the long history of conservation in the area and the professional work of the Kwazulu-Natal Nature Conservation Service in maintaining the site; (c) the launch of the Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative which the neighbouring countries of Swaziland and Mozambique which provides the regional conservation and development framework for the Greater St. Lucia area and which will further strengthen community conservation work there.

The Bureau noted the possible extensions of the Greater St Lucia including a possible future transfrontier site with Mozambique. It urged the completion of the land claim negotiations and confirmed that World Heritage site designation should not prejudice this process.

The Chairperson informed the Bureau that this is the first nomination from South Africa and that the Bureau's recommendation to inscribe it is fully in line with the Global Strategy.

#### B. Properties which were referred back

Property	<b>Brazilian Discovery Coast</b>
Id. N°	<b>892</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	

Property	<b>"Paranapiacaba" – Upper Ribeira Group of Protected Natural Areas and Notable Landscapes</b>
Id. N°	<b>893</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	

Property	<b>Estuarine Lagoon Complex of Iguape - Cananéia – Paranaguá</b>
Id. N°	<b>894</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the evaluations of the three Brazilian sites have been undertaken based on the original nominations submitted by the State Party in 1998. Following the field evaluation the State Party sent revised nominations to the World Heritage Centre in April 1999, integrating the three sites into two nominations. Further review of these revised nominations will be undertaken by IUCN and a consolidated report presented to the 1999 November Bureau meeting.

The Observer of Brazil thanked IUCN and agreed with this procedure.

Property	<b>System of Marine Terraces of Cabo Cruz and Maisi</b>
Id. N°	<b>889</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the Desembarco del Granma National Park meets natural *criteria (i) and (iii)*. The Bureau however decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party seeking their concurrence to the adjusted boundaries, including the need for a marine extension, and inviting the State Party to update the relevant information and detailed maps focusing on the Desembarco del Granma National Park.

The Delegate of Cuba agreed to this suggestion and informed the Bureau that a revised proposal has already been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

Property	<b>St. Paul Subterranean River National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>652 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Philippines</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the site meets natural criterion (iii) and (iv). The Bureau however decided that the nomination be referred back to the State Party for amendment and legal definition of boundaries so that they include the area most important for the protection of the catchment of the underground river and for biodiversity conservation.

Property	<b>Western Caucasus</b>
Id. N°	<b>900</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	

Property	<b>The High Coast</b>
Id. N°	<b>898</b>
State Party	<b>Sweden</b>
Criteria	

Property	<b>Miguasha Provincial Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>686 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Canada</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the IUCN evaluation of these nominations was not available for the July Bureau meeting, the States Parties having requested that field missions be delayed for climatic reasons. Reports will be prepared for the November meeting of the Bureau.

#### Extension of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest - Extension</b>
Id. N°	<b>33-627 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus / Poland</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the IUCN evaluation of this extension was not available for this Bureau meeting, the relevant State Party having requested that a field mission be delayed for climatic reasons. A report will be prepared for the November meeting of the Bureau.

### C. Properties which the Bureau decided to defer

Property	<b>Alejandro de Humboldt National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>838 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that Alejandro de Humboldt National Park is considered to meet natural criteria (ii) and (iv) but decided to defer the nomination to allow approval of the law expanding the Park and approval of an expanded boundary which links the currently isolated core zones. Until this law and this boundary is in place, the integrity of the site cannot be guaranteed.

The Bureau commended the State Party for its efforts for the protection of this site.

Property	<b>Parco Nazionale Del Gran Paradiso</b>
Id. N°	<b>909</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	

IUCN informed the Bureau that the Parco Nazionale Del Gran Paradiso alone does not meet World Heritage natural criteria and that the site should be considered as one element of a broader World Heritage Alps nomination. IUCN noted that World Heritage nominations are currently under preparation for the Mont Blanc area and the Aletsch Glacier, and that an initiative is underway to convene a regional workshop to consider the potential of the Alps region in relation to the World Heritage Convention.

The Centre informed the Bureau that the Alpine Region is one of the biggest gaps for natural heritage in the European region and that a meeting on natural heritage in the Alps had been proposed in the Global Strategy document presented to the twenty-second session of the Committee. As no funding has been allocated, a State Party from this region may wish to consider hosting such a thematic meeting.

The Delegate of Italy underlined that a nomination from this region should not be rejected, but seen as stimulating a process in this regard and that it should not await a Global Strategy meeting. The Chairperson recalled Paragraph 62 of the Operational Guidelines and suggested deferring the decision on the site. The Bureau decided to defer the nomination to allow consultation between the State Party and IUCN on this matter.

Property	<b>Phong Nha Cave</b>
Id. N°	<b>951</b>
State Party	<b>Vietnam</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that that the nominated area has potential value as a World Heritage site under natural criteria (i) and (iv) on the condition that it was expanded to include the larger Phong Nha/Ke Bang National Park with an associated fully integrated management structure. The site is part of an extremely complex and ancient karst plateau with high geodiversity which also encompasses Ke Bang and Hin Namno karsts. The reserve is largely covered in tropical forest with a high level of biodiversity and endemic species. Lack of research means that the true significance of the biodiversity and geology of the area cannot be fully assessed. The area on its own is not considered to meet World Heritage criteria. However, if jointly nominated with the Hin Namno karst ecosystem in Lao PDR, the combined site would constitute the largest surviving area of karst forest in South-east Asia and may merit World Heritage status.

The Bureau decided to defer a decision on the site, pending review of the possibility of expanding the boundaries of the site

as proposed. It is also strongly recommended that there be discussions with the Lao PDR State Party with a view to further expanding the boundaries of the site, at a later stage, to include the Hin Namno Karst reserve of Lao PDR and any other relevant areas.

### MIXED PROPERTIES

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

Property	<b>Mount Wuyi</b>
Id. N°	<b>911</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>N (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe this site under natural *criteria (iii) and (iv)*. Mount Wuyi is heavily forested with steep slopes and deep gorges and contains the highest peak in south-east China. It is considered the most outstanding area for biodiversity conservation in south-east China and one of the most outstanding subtropical forests in the world. The area is the largest, most representative example of a largely-intact forest encompassing the diversity of the Chinese Subtropical Forest and the South Chinese Rainforest. The area is a refuge for a large number of ancient, relict species, many of them endemic to China. The faunal diversity of the area is higher than in other sites in the region, especially for reptile, amphibian and insect species. The site also contains spectacular riverine landscape, including 200-400m sheer-sided monoliths of red sandstone, with an exceptional juxtaposition of smooth rock cliffs with clear, deep water.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that this property, as defined in the nomination dossier, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria.

The Bureau recommended inscription of the property under natural criteria and referred the cultural part of the nomination back to the State Party for re-examination.

The Observer of China agreed to this procedure and informed the Bureau that additional material had already been provided to ICOMOS on 5 July 1999.

#### B. Properties which were referred back

Property	<b>Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands)</b>
Id. N°	<b>908</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the site has the potential to meet natural *criterion (i)*. The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to allow the State Party to provide additional information and to address the exclusion of human use areas and to propose more sharply defined boundaries for the Nature Reserves and buffer zones.

The volcanic landforms of the site represent classic features in the continuing study of volcanology worldwide. With scientific studies on the site from at least the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the islands have provided two of the types of eruptions (Vulcanian and Strombolian) to volcanology and geology textbooks and so have featured prominently in the education of all geoscientists for over 200 years. They continue to provide a rich field for volcanological studies of on-going geological processes in the development of landforms. The area also has a long history of land use, and subsequent abandonment, which has led to an on-going processes of maquis recovery.

The Bureau noted the ICOMOS recommendation that this property does not meet cultural criteria.

The Delegate of Italy informed the Bureau that the additional information had already been submitted.

Property	<b>Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture</b>
Id. N°	<b>417 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the site has the potential to meet natural criteria (ii) and (iv). The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to allow the State Party to provide clear evidence on the continuation of the Nature Reserve's legal status under autonomic law, as well as clarification of the pipeline plans and their impact on the site.

The marine component of this site is characterised by the presence of dense and very well preserved prairies of oceanic Posidonia (seagrass) and coral reefs. The prairie of Posidonia has been defined as the best preserved of the entire Mediterranean basin. The area also contains the most diverse community of *Cladocora caespitosa*, supporting 220 species, in the Mediterranean basin and habitat for three globally endangered species, including the Monk Seal. The area also contains an important community of *Ecteinascidia turbinata*, a marine species with recognised value to prevent and combat different types of cancer. Parts of the site are included in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention) for their importance for migratory birds.

Concerning cultural values, the Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party requesting a revised justification for inscription to treat the various elements in the nomination as components of an integrated whole. In the event that this is made available in an acceptable form, ICOMOS recommends inscription on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion(ii):** The intact 16th century fortifications of Ibiza bear unique witness to the military architecture and engineering and the aesthetics of the Renaissance. This Italian-Spanish model was very influential, especially in the construction and fortification of towns in the New World.

**Criterion (iii):** The Phoenician ruins of Sa Caleta and the Phoenician-Punic cemetery of Puig des Molins are exceptional evidence of urbanization and social life in the Phoenician colonies of the western Mediterranean. They constitute a unique resource, in terms of volume and importance, of material from the Phoenician and Carthaginian tombs.

**Criterion (iv):** The Upper Town of Ibiza is an excellent example of a fortified acropolis which preserves in an exceptional way in its walls and in its urban fabric successive imprints of the earliest Phoenician settlements and the Arab and Catalan periods through to the Renaissance bastions. The long process of building the defensive walls has not destroyed the earlier phases or the street pattern, but has incorporated them in the ultimate phase.

Property	<b>Uvs Nuur Basin</b>
Id. N°	<b>769 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Mongolia / Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau was informed that the evaluation of this nomination was not available, the State Parties having requested that the field

mission be delayed for climatic reasons. A report will be prepared for the November meeting of the Bureau.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the nomination provided little information on the cultural aspects of the site and that the State Parties may wish to provide additional material.

### C. Properties which the Bureau decided to defer

Property	<b>The Greater Blue Mountains Area</b>
Id. N°	<b>917</b>
State Party	<b>Australia</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the site is a deeply incised sandstone plateau with 300-metre cliffs, slot canyons and waterfalls. The area is thought to have acted as a refugia during recent geological history and thus enabled the survival of a broad spectrum of biota. The area is mostly forest covered and represents one of two "peaks" of eucalypt diversity in Australia, containing 90 eucalypt taxa or 13% of the global total. Though nationally important, it is not considered on its own to be a globally significant representation of eucalyptus-dominated vegetation.

The Bureau decided to defer the present nomination under natural criteria and to invite the Australian authorities to consider a serial nomination to cover the full range of values of eucalyptus ecosystems. The Bureau noted also a number of impacts, including 155 inholdings and the potential for an airport at Badgerys Creek, which might compromise the integrity of the area.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee should not inscribe this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criteria, as recommended by ICOMOS.

The Observer of Australia noted that the evaluations from IUCN and ICOMOS raised a number of issues which the Australian authorities wish to clarify, including new information on the EIA process with regard to the airport. He also noted that Australia had not proposed a serial nomination in order to immediately ensure a high standard of property management.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

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

Property	<b>Area Arqueológica y Natural Alto Río Pinturas - Santa Cruz</b>
Id. N°	<b>936</b>
State Party	<b>Argentina</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)</b>

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the Argentine authorities had responded positively to its recommendations and that it now could recommend inscription of the Cueva de los Manos, Río Pinturas on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage property will, therefore, be limited to the Cueva de los Manos with the surrounding protected area serving as a buffer zone.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criterion (iii)*:

**Criterion (iii):** The Cueva de los Manos contains an outstanding collection of prehistoric rock art which bears

witness to the culture of the earliest human societies in South America.

The State Party agreed to the recommendation that the site be named “The Cueva de los Manos, Río Pinturas”.

Property	<b>City of Graz – Historic Centre</b>
Id. N°	<b>931</b>
State Party	<b>Austria</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The Historic Centre of the City of Graz reflects artistic and architectural movements originating from the Germanic region, the Balkans, and the Mediterranean, for which it served as a crossroads for centuries. The greatest architects and artists of these different regions expressed themselves forcefully here and thus created brilliant syntheses.

**Criterion (iv):** The urban complex forming the Historic Centre of the City of Graz is an exceptional example of a harmonious integration of architectural styles from successive periods. Each age is represented by typical buildings, which are often masterpieces. The urban physiognomy faithfully tells the story of its historic development.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of the Town of Diamantina</b>
Id. N°	<b>890</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** Diamantina shows how explorers of the Brazilian territory, diamond prospectors, and representatives of the Crown were able to adapt European models to an American context in the 18th century, thus creating a culture that was faithful to its roots yet completely original.

**Criterion (iv):** The urban and architectural group of Diamantina, perfectly integrated into a wild landscape, is a fine example of an adventurous spirit combined with a quest for refinement so typical of human nature.

Property	<b>Dazu Rock Carvings – the cliffside carvings at Beishan, Baodingshan, Nanshan, Shizhuanshan, and Shimensan</b>
Id. N°	<b>912</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii) and (iii)*:

**Criterion (i):** The Dazu Carvings represent the pinnacle of Chinese rock art for their high aesthetic quality and their diversity of style and subject matter.

**Criterion (ii):** Tantric Buddhism from India and the Chinese Taoist and Confucian beliefs came together at Dazu to create a highly original and influential manifestation of spiritual harmony.

**Criterion (iii):** The eclectic nature of religious belief in later Imperial China is given material expression in the exceptional artistic heritage of the Dazu rock art.

The State Party agreed to the recommendation that the site be named “The Dazu Rock Carvings”.

Property	<b>Litomyšl Castle</b>
Id. N°	<b>901</b>
State Party	<b>Czech Republic</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** Litomyšl Castle is an outstanding and immaculately preserved example of the arcade castle, a type of building first developed in Italy and modified in the Czech lands to create an evolved form of special architectural quality.

**Criterion (iv):** Litomyšl Castle illustrates in an exceptional way the aristocratic residences of central Europe in the Renaissance and their subsequent development under the influence of new artistic movements.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Santa Ana of the Cuenca Rivers</b>
Id. N°	<b>863</b>
State Party	<b>Ecuador</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under cultural *criteria (ii), (iv) and (v)*.

**Criterion (ii):** Cuenca illustrates the successful implantation of the principles of Renaissance urban planning in the Americas.

**Criterion (iv):** The successful fusion of different societies and cultures in Latin America is vividly symbolized by the layout and townscape of Cuenca.

**Criterion (v):** Cuenca is an outstanding example of a planned inland Spanish colonial city.

It requested ICOMOS to undertake the evaluation of this nomination based on additional information submitted by the State Party and to submit a written evaluation to the Committee at its twenty-third session.

The Bureau decided, with the agreement of the State Party, to recommend the inscription of the property under the following name: Historic Centre of Santa Ana de los Rios de Cuenca.

Property	<b>The Bronze Age Burial Site of Sammallahtenmäki</b>
Id. N°	<b>579 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Finland</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Bronze Age Burial Site of Sammallahtenmäki on the World Heritage List under *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (iii):** The Sammallahtenmäki cairn cemetery bears exceptional witness to the society of the Bronze Age of Scandinavia.

**Criterion (iv):** The Sammallahtenmäki cemetery is an outstanding example of Bronze Age funerary practices in Scandinavia.

The Observer of Finland informed that the management plan is under preparation and will be transmitted to ICOMOS in September 1999.

Property	<b>The Ancient Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion</b>
Id. N°	<b>932</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau accepted the proposal of ICOMOS and the Observer of France that the title of site be shortened to « The Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion », and recommended that the Committee inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (iv):

**Criterion (iii):** The Ancient Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion is an outstanding example of an historic vineyard landscape that has survived intact and in activity to the present day;

**Criterion (iv):** The intensive cultivation of grapes for wine production in a precisely defined region and the resulting landscape is illustrated in an exceptional way by the historic Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion.

Property	<b>Museumsinsel (Museum Island)</b>
Id.N°	<b>896</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** The Berlin Museumsinsel is a unique ensemble of museum buildings which illustrated the evolution of modern museum design over more than a century.

**Criterion (iv):** The art museum is a social phenomenon that owes its origins to the Age of Enlightenment and its extension to all people to the French Revolution. The Museumsinsel is the most outstanding example of this concept given material form and a symbolic central urban setting.

Property	<b>Wartburg Castle</b>
Id. N°	<b>897</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe Wartburg Castle on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (vi):

**Criterion (iii):** The Castle of Wartburg is an outstanding monument of the feudal period in central Europe.

**Criterion (vi):** The Castle of Wartburg is rich in cultural associations, most notably its role as the place of exile of Martin Luther, who composed his German translation of the New Testament there. It is also a powerful symbol of German integration and unity.

Property	<b>The Archaeological Sites of Mycenae and Tiryns</b>
Id. N°	<b>941</b>
State Party	<b>Greece</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribed these sites as one single property on the World Heritage List, under criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi):

**Criterion (i):** The architecture and design of Mycenae and Tiryns, such as the Lion Gate and the Treasury of Atreus and the walls of Tiryns, are outstanding examples of human creative genius.

**Criterion (ii):** The Mycenaean civilisation, as exemplified by Mycenae and Tiryns, had a profound effect on the development of classical Greek architecture and urban design, and consequently also on contemporary cultural forms.

**Criterion (iii) and (iv):** Mycenae and Tiryns represent the apogee of the Mycenaean civilization, which laid the foundations for the evolution of later European cultures.

**Criterion (vi):** Mycenae and Tiryns are indissolubly linked with the Homeric epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the influence of which upon European literature and the arts for more than three millennia.

Property	<b>The Historic Centre (Chorá) with the Monastery of Saint-John the Theologian and the Cave of the Apocalypse on the Island of Pátmos</b>
Id. N°	<b>942</b>
State Party	<b>Greece</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under criteria (iv) and (vi):

**Criterion (iv):** The Monastery of Hagios Ioannis Theologos (Saint John the Theologian) and the Cave of the Apocalypse on the island of Pátmos, together with the associated ancient settlement of Chorá, constitute an exceptional example of a traditional Greek Orthodox pilgrimage centre of outstanding architectural interest.

**Criterion (vi):** The Monastery of Hagios Ioannis Theologos and the Cave of the Apocalypse commemorate the site where St John the Theologian (Divine), the "Beloved Disciple", composed two of the most sacred Christian works, his Gospel and the Apocalypse.

Property	<b>Hortobágy National Park</b>
Id.N°	<b>474 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Hungary</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under criteria (iv) and (v):

**Criterion (iv):** The Hungarian *Puszta* is an exceptional surviving example of a cultural landscape constituted by a pastoral society.

**Criterion (v):** The landscape of the Hortobágy National Park maintains intact and visible traces of its traditional land-use forms over several thousand years, and illustrates the harmonious interaction between people and nature.

The Hungarian Delegation stated, in agreement with the suggestion of ICOMOS, that his country could contact IUCN in order to envisage the preparation of a proposal for nomination for inscription on the World Heritage List under natural criteria.

Property	<b>Darjeeling Himalayan Railway</b>
Id. N°	<b>944</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the site on the World Heritage List under *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The Darjeeling Himalayan Railway is an outstanding example of the influence of an innovative transportation system on the social and economic development of a multi-cultural region, which was to serve as a model for similar developments in many parts of the world.

**Criterion (iv):** The development of railways in the 19<sup>th</sup> century has a profound influence on social and economic developments in many parts of the world. This process is illustrated in an exceptional and seminal fashion by the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway.

The Bureau drew the attention of the State Party to the recommendations of ICOMOS concerning a) the creation of a heritage conservation unit, b) the establishment of a buffer zone along the length of the railway line and the station, c) the establishment of an adapted management plan. All these issues could be examined by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session in 2001.

Property	<b>Villa Adriana</b>
Id. N°	<b>907</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii) and (iii)*:

**Criteria (i) and (iii):** The Villa Adriana is a masterpiece that uniquely brings together the highest expressions of the material cultures of the ancient Mediterranean world.

**Criterion (ii):** Study of the monuments that make up the Villa Adriana played a crucial role in the rediscovery of the elements of classical architecture by the architects of the Renaissance and the Baroque period. It also profoundly influenced many 19th and 20th century architects and designers.

Property	<b>Shrines and Temples of Nikko</b>
Id. N°	<b>913</b>
State Party	<b>Japan</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (iv) and (vi)*:

**Criterion (i):** The Nikko shrines and temples are a reflection of architectural and artistic genius; this aspect is reinforced by the harmonious integration of the buildings in a forest and a natural site laid out by people.

**Criterion (iv):** Nikko is a perfect illustration of the architectural style of the Edo period as applied to Shinto shrines and Buddhist temples. The Gongen-zukuri style of the two mausoleums, the Tōshōgū and the Taiyū-in Reibyō, reached the peak of its expression in Nikko, and was later to exert a decisive influence. The ingenuity and creativity of its architects and decorators are revealed in an outstanding and distinguished manner.

**Criterion (vi):** The Nikko shrines and temples, together with their environment, are an outstanding example of a traditional Japanese religious centre, associated with the Shinto perception of the relationship of man with nature, in which mountains and forests have a sacred meaning and are objects of veneration, in a religious practice that is still very much alive today.

The Bureau took note of the comment of ICOMOS that the development pressure near the south-west border of the site would require the State Party to be vigilant in monitoring potential threats in the future.

Property	<b>Zone of Historic Monuments of the town of Campeche and its System of Fortifications</b>
Id. N°	<b>895</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this cultural property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The harbour town of Campeche is an urbanization model of a Baroque colonial town, with its checkerboard street plan; the defensive walls surrounding its historic centre reflect the influence of the military architecture in the Caribbean.

**Criterion (iv):** The fortifications system of Campeche, an eminent example of the military architecture of the 17th and 18th centuries, is part of an overall defensive system set up by the Spanish to protect the ports on the Caribbean Sea from pirate attacks.

Property	<b>The Archaeological Monuments Zone of Xochicalco</b>
Id. N°	<b>939</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (iii):** Xochicalco is an exceptionally well preserved and complete example of a fortified settlement from the Epiclassic Period of Mesoamerica.

**Criterion (iv):** The architecture and art of Xochicalco represent the fusion of cultural elements from different parts of Mesoamerica, at a period when the breakdown of earlier political structures resulted in intensive cultural regrouping.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party take note of the recommendation to upgrade visitor facilities, security and management planning.

Property	<b>Droogmakerij de Beemster (Beemster Polder)</b>
Id. N°	<b>899</b>
State Party	<b>Netherlands</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iv)*:

**Criterion (i):** The Beemster Polder is a masterpiece of creative planning, in which the ideals of antiquity and the Renaissance were applied to the design of a reclaimed landscape.

**Criterion (ii):** The innovative and intellectually imaginative landscape of the Beemster Polder had a profound and lasting impact on reclamation projects in Europe and beyond.

**Criterion (iv):** The creation of the Beemster Polder marks a major step forward in the interrelationship between humankind and water at a crucial period of social and economic expansion.

Property	<b>Sukur Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>938</b>
State Party	<b>Nigeria</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (v) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii), (v) and (vi)*:

**Criterion (iii):** Sukur is an exceptional landscape which graphically illustrates a form of land-use that marks a critical stage in human settlement and its relationship with its environment.

**Criterion (v):** The cultural landscape of Sukur has survived unchanged for many centuries, and continues to do so at a period when this form of traditional human settlement is under threat in many parts of the world.

**Criterion (vi):** The cultural landscape of Sukur is eloquent testimony to a strong and continuing spiritual and cultural tradition that has endured for many centuries.

The Bureau discussed the importance of spirituality in the African context and decided to apply **criteria (vi)**. The Bureau also noted the protection of the site through customary law.

The Bureau requested the Centre to forward to the State Party for immediate action, the two ICOMOS proposals.

- the organization of a round table on the future of Sukur, in association with governmental agencies, the local community, tourism organisms and other potential partners;
- the adoption of a cultural and tourism management plan which foresees the creation of a body responsible for its implementation, the production of authentic material for tourism purposes, the integration of a visitor centre and lodging infrastructure for tourism and the development of means of transport integrated into the landscape and environment. Part of the income deriving from these activities will be reinvested in the management of the natural and cultural resources of Sukur.

The Observer of Nigeria thanked the World Heritage Centre and its initiative of the Global Strategy, ICOMOS and the Bureau for their assistance.

The Bureau congratulated the State Party for having submitted its first nomination for inscription to the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>The Dacian Fortresses of the Orastie Mountains</b>
Id. N°	<b>906</b>
State Party	<b>Romania</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this group of properties on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii), and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The Dacian fortresses represent the fusion of techniques and concepts of military architecture from inside and outside the classical world to create a unique style.

**Criterion (iii):** The Geto-Dacian kingdoms of the late 1st millennium BC attained an exceptionally high cultural and socio-economic level, and this is symbolized by this group of fortresses.

**Criterion (iv):** The hill-fort and its evolved successor, the *oppidum*, were characteristic of the Late Iron Age in Europe, and the Dacian fortresses are outstanding examples of this type of defended site.

Property	<b>The Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartrans, Kromdraai, and Environs</b>
Id. N°	<b>915</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (vi)*:

**Criteria (iii) and (vi):** The Sterkfontein area contains an exceptionally large and scientifically significant group of sites which throw light on the earliest ancestors of humankind. They constitute a vast reserve of scientific information, the potential of which is enormous.

Property	<b>Robben Island</b>
Id. N°	<b>916</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (vi)*:

**Criterion (iii):** The buildings of Robben Island bear eloquent witness to its sombre history.

**Criterion (vi):** Robben Island and its prison buildings symbolize the triumph of the human spirit, of freedom, and of democracy over oppression.

The Observer of South Africa thanked the World Heritage Centre and its Global Strategy Initiative, the Nordic World Heritage Office, the ICOMOS mission and the Bureau for their assistance. The Observer noted that the recommendation would be the Committee's greatest millenium present to their country and an eloquent testimony to honour the work of Mr Nelson Mandela.

The Bureau congratulated the State Party for having submitted its first nominations for inscription to the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>San Cristóbal de la Laguna</b>
Id. N°	<b>929</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criteria (ii) and (iv):** San Cristóbal de la Laguna was the first non-fortified Spanish colonial town, and its layout provided the model for many colonial towns in the Americas.

Property	<b>The Heart of Neolithic Orkney</b>
Id. N°	<b>514 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i),(ii),(iii), and (iv)*:

The monuments of Orkney, dating back to 3000-2000 BC, are outstanding testimony to the cultural achievements of the Neolithic peoples of northern Europe.

Property	<b>Hoi An Ancient Town</b>
Id. N°	<b>948</b>
State Party	<b>Vietnam</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (v)*:

**Criterion (ii):** Hoi An is an outstanding material manifestation of the fusion of cultures over time in an international commercial port.

**Criterion (v):** Hoi An is an exceptionally well-preserved example of a traditional Asian trading port.

#### Extension of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin – Extension</b>
Id. N°	<b>532 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

The Bureau recommended that this extension to the World Heritage site of the Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin should be *approved*, subject to the provision of maps showing revised boundaries, as agreed with the ICOMOS expert mission. These maps should be submitted by 1 October 1999 for verification by ICOMOS.

Property	<b>The Residences of the Dukes of Este in the Po Delta (extension of Ferrara: City of the Renaissance)</b>
Id. N°	<b>733 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)</b>

The Bureau recommended the Committee to extend the inscribed property of the City of Ferrara and to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (v)*, in addition to the already existing criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi):

**Criterion (iii):** The Este ducal residences in the Po Delta illustrate the influence of Renaissance culture on the natural landscape in an exceptional manner.

**Criterion (v):** The Po Delta is an outstanding planned cultural landscape that retains its original form to a remarkable extent.

Furthermore the Bureau recommended that the name of the inscribed property be changed to “Ferrara: City of the Renaissance and its Po Delta” as requested by the State Party.

#### B. Properties for which the nominations were referred back to the State Party

Property	<b>The Mir Castle (The Radzivils Castle)</b>
Id. N°	<b>625</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting the provision of an up-to-date report on the property, covering current legal status, ownership, management, and conservation history, with appropriate plans, photographs, and slides. If this information is available by 1 October 1999 for evaluation and recommendation by ICOMOS, the Bureau could examine this nomination at its twenty-third extraordinary session in November 1999.

Property	<b>Flemish Belfries</b>
Id. N°	<b>943</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party requesting the State Party to expand the nomination to include properties of the same typology in the Walloon Region. If this information would be provided before 1 October 1999, a revised evaluation and recommendation could be presented by ICOMOS to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

The Bureau suggested that other States Parties could make complementary proposals of the same type of property at a later stage.

Property	<b>The Old Mostar: a Bridge of the Worlds</b>
Id. N°	<b>946</b>
State Party	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv) (vi)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting further information about the management plan for the Old Town. In the event of this information being supplied and found to conform with the requirements of the Committee, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iv) and (vi)*:

**Criterion (iv):** The Old Town of Mostar is an outstanding example of a multicultural European urban settlement.

**Criterion (vi):** Mostar is an exceptional symbol of the human potential for successfully integrating groups with differing ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds into a homogeneous civilized community.

Furthermore the Bureau recommended that the name of the nominated property to be changed to “The Old City of Mostar” .



Property	<b>Viñales Valley</b>
Id. N°	<b>840 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau recalled that the site was nominated originally under natural criteria. The Bureau at its twenty-first session did not recommend inscription of this site on the List under natural criteria and "noted that the Cuban authorities may wish to consider nominating the area as a cultural landscape."

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party to enable it to provide additional information for review by ICOMOS. If this information would be provided before 1 October 1999, a revised evaluation and recommendation could be presented by ICOMOS to the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>The Loire Valley between Maine and Sully-sur-Loire</b>
Id. N°	<b>933</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party requesting adjustment of the boundaries of the nominated property, as recommended by ICOMOS, and assurances that action will be taken without delay to prepare an overall management plan for the proposed World Heritage site. In the event that the requested information is provided by 1 October 1999 and found to be satisfactory, the Bureau recommended the inscription of the site to the World Heritage List under *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The Loire Valley is an outstanding cultural landscape along a major river which bears witness to an interchange of human values and to a harmonious development of interactions between human beings and their environment over two millennia.

**Criterion (iv):** The landscape of the Loire Valley, and more particularly its many cultural monuments, illustrate to an exceptional degree the ideals of the Renaissance and the Age of the Enlightenment on western European thought and design.

The Observer of the United Kingdom requested that for its next session a map of the whole site be provided to the Bureau.

The Observer of France stated that all the information requested by the Bureau would be provided for its next session. He also indicated that detailed maps of the site existed in the nomination dossier submitted by France.

Property	<b>The Historic Town of Vigan</b>
Id. N°	<b>502 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Philippines</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau decided to refer back this nomination requesting modifications to the boundaries of the nominated area and its buffer zone, as suggested by ICOMOS. In the event of this information being supplied and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria(ii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (ii):** Vigan represents a unique fusion of Asian building design and construction with European colonial architecture and planning.

**Criterion (iv):** Vigan is an exceptionally intact and well preserved example of a European trading town in East and South-East Asia.

Property	<b>Kalwaria Zebrzydowska: the Mannerist Architectural and Park Landscape Complex and Pilgrimage Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>905</b>
State Party	<b>Poland</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting that a draft management plan for the property be prepared for evaluation before the December 1999 meeting of the World Heritage Committee. In the event that this is supplied by 1 October 1999 and favourably evaluated, the Bureau recommended that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*.

**Criterion (ii):** Kalwaria Zebrzydowska is an exceptional cultural monument in which the natural landscape was used as the setting for a symbolic representation in the form of chapels and avenues of the events of the Passion of Christ. The result is a cultural landscape of great beauty and spiritual quality in which natural and man-made elements combine in a harmonious manner.

**Criterion (iv):** The Counter Reformation in the late 16th century led to a flowering in the creation of Calvaries in Europe. Kalwaria Zebrzydowska is an outstanding example of this type of large-scale landscape design, which incorporates natural beauty with spiritual objectives and the principles of Baroque park design.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Sighisoara</b>
Id. N°	<b>902</b>
State Party	<b>Romania</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (v)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party to provide supplementary information as requested by ICOMOS. In the event of this information being provided by 1 October 1999 and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (v)*:

**Criterion (iii):** Sighisoara is an outstanding testimony to the culture of the Transylvanian Saxons, a culture that is coming to a close after 850 years and will continue to exist only through its architectural and urban monuments.

**Criterion (v):** Sighisoara is an outstanding example of a small fortified city in the border region between the Latin-oriented culture of central Europe and the Byzantine-Orthodox culture of south-eastern Europe. The apparently unstoppable process of emigration by the Saxons, the social stratum that had formed and upheld the cultural traditions of the region, threatens the survival of their architectural heritage as well.

Property	<b>The Wooden Churches of Maramures</b>
Id. N°	<b>904</b>
State Party	<b>Romania</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party requesting the preparation of management plans for the nominated properties. In the event of this information being supplied by 1 October 1999 and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criterion (iv)*:

**Criterion (iv):** The Maramures wooden churches are outstanding examples of vernacular religious wooden architecture resulting from the interchange of Orthodox religious traditions with Gothic influences in a specific vernacular interpretation of timber construction traditions, showing a high level of artistic maturity and craft skills.

Property	<b>Brimstone Hill Fortress National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>910</b>
State Party	<b>Saint Christopher &amp; Nevis</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting information on the progress of the draft National Development and Planning Act. In the event that assurances are received by 1 October 1999 that it will be enacted and implemented by the end of 1999, the Bureau recommended that this property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

**Criterion (iii):** Brimstone Hill is an outstanding British fortress, built by slave labour to exact standards during a peak period of European colonial expansion in the Caribbean.

**Criterion (iv):** Because of its strategic layout and construction, Brimstone Hill Fortress is an exceptional and well preserved example of 17th and 18th century British military architecture.

Property	<b>Three Castles, defensive wall and ramparts of the Market-Town of Bellinzona</b>
Id. N°	<b>884</b>
State Party	<b>Switzerland</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party requesting further details of the nature of the restoration work affecting the monument (independent of any development work) and of the limits to the property proposed for inscription. ICOMOS noted that additional information had been provided very recently and that this material would need further analysis in order to come to a conclusion for the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	<b>State Historical and Cultural Park "Ancient Merv"</b>
Id. N°	<b>886</b>
State Party	<b>Turkmenistan</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting the following additional information: **a)** a map showing precise boundary of the site and **b)** assurances that the Five-Year Management Plan should be fully implemented. In

the event of such a map and assurances being provided by 1 October 1999, the Bureau recommended that this property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*

**Criterion (ii):** The cities of the Merv oasis have exerted considerable influence over the cultures of Central Asia and Iran for four millennia. The Seljuk City in particular influenced architecture and architectural decoration and scientific and cultural development.

**Criterion (iii):** The sequence of the cities of the Merv oasis, their fortifications, and their urban lay-outs bear exceptional testimony to the civilizations of Central Asia over several millennia.

Property	<b>My Son Sanctuary</b>
Id. N°	<b>949</b>
State Party	<b>Vietnam</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party. The State Party is requested to supply information on the implementation of the management plan for the property and assurances that the necessary funding in this regard will be forthcoming. The Bureau also requested the State Party to reflect on the natural and historical links between Hoi An and this nomination expressed in the river connecting them, including its source at the Ngoc Vinh Natural Reserve. If this information is available before the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau, Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

**Criterion (ii):** The My Son Sanctuary is an exceptional example of cultural interchange, with the introduction of the Hindu architecture of the Indian sub-continent into South-East Asia.

**Criterion (iii):** The Champa Kingdom was an important phenomenon in the political and cultural history of South-East Asia, vividly illustrated by the ruins of My Son.

#### Extension of a Property on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>The Villages with fortified churches in Transylvania (extension of Biertan and its fortified church)</b>
Id. N°	<b>596 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Romania</b>

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party requesting the State Party that management plans are prepared for each of the nominated properties. In the event of this information being supplied and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be extended.

#### C. Properties which the Bureau decided to defer

Property	<b>Victoria Terminus (Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus)</b>
Id. N°	<b>945</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to *defer* further consideration of this nomination. The Bureau informed the State Party that it may wish to undertake a properly formulated conservation programme, to be implemented under the direction of qualified professionals in this specialized field. A relevant comparative study of historic railway termini on a worldwide basis should also be carried out.

Property	<b>The Harbour Fortifications of Malta</b>
Id. N°	<b>891</b>
State Party	<b>Malta</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to defer further consideration of this nomination, to enable the State Party to put forward a master plan for the fortifications as recommended by ICOMOS. The Bureau recommended that the State Party submit this nomination as an extension of the already inscribed site "City of Valletta", and that consideration be made for the site to be extended with the additional cultural *criteria (ii)* and *(iii)*.

Property	<b>The Pachacamac Archeological Sanctuary</b>
Id. N°	<b>952</b>
State Party	<b>Peru</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to *defer* further consideration of the nomination and to await the preparation and implementation of a new management plan and the improvement of existing services (visitor handling, security, etc) as proposed by ICOMOS.

Property	<b>The Monastery of Neamt – the Church of the Ascension of Jesus</b>
Id. N°	<b>903</b>
State Party	<b>Romania</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *deferred*, pending the completion of a comparative study of similar church complexes in the region.

Property	<b>The Historic Inner City of Paramaribo</b>
Id. N°	<b>940</b>
State Party	<b>Suriname</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided to *defer* this nomination to allow the State Party to initiate the recommendations made by ICOMOS.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Shakhrisabz</b>
Id. N°	<b>885</b>
State Party	<b>Uzbekistan</b>
Criteria	

The Bureau decided that the nomination be *deferred*. The State Party is requested to furnish precise details of the area proposed for inscription, the limits of the buffer zone and the regulations governing its use, and further material relating to the merits of Shakhrisabz in comparison with other central Asian cities (Samarkand, Bukhara, Herat, etc.).

#### D. Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Sarajevo - Unique symbol of universal multiculturalism - continual open city</b>
Id. N°	<b>851 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>Cathedral of St-Maurice and St-Catherine, Magdebourg</b>
Id. N°	<b>536 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>The Kysuce-Orava Switchback Railroad</b>
Id. N°	<b>756</b>
State Party	<b>Slovakia</b>

The Bureau recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

#### E. Extension of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List approved by the Bureau

Property	<b>The Routes of Santiago de Compostela in France</b>
Id. N°	<b>868</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

The Bureau decided to extend the inscribed property of the Routes of Santiago de Compostela in France to include the Cathedral Church of Oloron, the Abbey of Le Buisson-de-Cadouin, and the Church of Saint-Avit-Sénieur.

**V.4** During the examination of the nominations, some delegates remarked that in the evaluation, examination and decision-making process, due consideration should be given to the Global Strategy and the decision of the Committee to improve the representivity of the World Heritage List.

**V.5** In the case of some nominations, States Parties had submitted to the Secretariat, prior to the session of the Bureau, complementary information and documentation in response to the expert missions and the written evaluations of the advisory bodies. This documentation had, in some cases, not been transmitted to the advisory bodies in a timely fashion and could, therefore, not be fully taken into account in the presentation to the Bureau, particularly by ICOMOS. The Director of the Centre regretted this but pointed out that the extremely heavy workload in the weeks preceding the June/July sessions of the Bureau, which is also the period of the year in which dozens of new nominations are delivered, makes it impossible to process this supplementary information properly. The Chairperson expressed his understanding for this situation and his sympathy for the Secretariat, which is called upon to handle more and more documentation and information within a very short period of time. He stated that this situation therefore requires further review.

#### VI. FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORK OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**VI.1** The Chairperson introduced Item 6 of the Agenda: Follow-up of the Work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee. He recalled that Document WHC-99/CONF.204/8 included two annexes: The first presenting a report on the follow-up to the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the evaluation of the

administrative management of the World Heritage Convention ” which had already been distributed at the twenty-second session of the Committee in Kyoto; the second which is the “ Report of the Director-General on the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre, as requested by the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee ”.

**VI.2** Several members of the Bureau and observers commented on the idea of creating a strategic task force. The representatives of Japan, Italy, Hungary and Morocco as well as the observers of the United Kingdom, Thailand, Finland and the United States stated their reservations on the establishment of such a task force at the present time. They considered that it would be more useful to begin consolidating the results achieved by the Consultative Body and that further profound deliberation upon key substantive issues should be pursued within the Committee, and that time was needed to further study the terms of reference of such a group. The latter could be done best between the members of the Bureau and of the Committee on the one hand and the Centre of the other with a contribution from the advisory bodies.

**VI.3** The Observer of Thailand commented on the possibility of establishing a 2-year planning and budgeting cycle, reminding that the mode of operating and the periodicity of the meetings of the statutory organs of the Convention differed from those of UNESCO. While the General Conference of UNESCO meets every two years and approves the programme and budget of the Organization, it is the World Heritage Committee which, at its annual meeting, approves the Fund’s budget and the workplan of the World Heritage Centre.

**VI.4** The Rapporteur (Hungary) shared with the Bureau his appreciation of the quality of the preparation of the information management system carried out by the World Heritage Centre with the help of some States Parties, namely Finland, the United-Kingdom and the United States of America, with technical inputs of the European Space Agency. However, he emphasized that further input is needed, in particular to include an appropriate geographical information system (GIS) interface.

**VI.5** To conclude on Annex I, the Chairperson submitted the following text which was approved:

The Bureau,

1. Requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare a document on the creation of a strategic task force including its terms of reference and taking into consideration the various interventions which took place during this debate,
2. Took note of the importance of the installation of an integrated information management system, with an appropriate geographical information component,
3. Took note of the other points presented in Annex I of document WHC-99/CONF.204/8.

**VI.6** Coming to Annex II of the Document, the Chairperson asked the Director of the Centre to present this Annex which is the “ Report of the Director-General on the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as requested by the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee ”.

**VI.7** In his presentation, the Director of the Centre informed the Bureau of his wish to present to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee, the organizational chart of the Centre that would reflect a geographical distribution of dossiers among the professionals, a documentation and information unit and an administrative unit which is being reinforced. He also informed the Bureau of his desire to follow the efforts started by his predecessor in order to regularize the personnel of the Centre still outside of the regular budget of the Organization.

**VI.8** Bureau members and observers recalled that the Organization was not to increase its number of posts during the next biennium. They however considered that, in view of the specific nature of the work of the Convention (continuous increase in the nominations and in the requests for co-operation), the Centre could be given priority despite the limitations imposed on the Organization as a whole. The Observer of the United Kingdom suggested that the Bureau presents a recommendation to the General Assembly to ensure that the Centre receives the human resources necessary for its functioning. The Delegate of Japan supported this proposal.

**VI.9** At the proposal of the Chairperson, the Bureau approved the following text:

The Bureau,

1. Appreciated the work undertaken by the World Heritage Centre,
2. Insisted on the necessity to allocate within UNESCO’s resources, the human and financial support to the Centre in view of increased services required by the States Parties to the Convention.
3. Requested the Director-General to take into consideration the request of the Bureau to pursue its policy of integration of all the personnel of the Centre during the approval of the Programme and Budget of the Organization for 2000-2001. Furthermore, it requested the Director-General to give priority to the development of the human resources of the Centre including its training.
4. Asked the Secretariat to prepare a draft resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly.

**VI.10** The Secretariat has prepared a draft resolution. This draft resolution was discussed by the members of the Bureau and the observers. It was in particular, mentioned that the Bureau should refer to the Director-General and request the States Parties to support the reinforcing of the Centre to the Executive Board and the General Conference of UNESCO. The text of the resolution as approved by the Bureau is as follows:

**“The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee**

**Noting** that the true nature of the functioning of the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage implies a regular growth in the annual activities relating to its implementation.

**Pointing out** that the staff of the World Heritage Centre who ensure the Secretariat of this Convention are funded by UNESCO, as well as its operating costs,

**Considering** that the resources of the World Heritage Centre, notably its staff, have to respond on a regular basis to the workload resulting from its functions relating to the Convention,

**Reaffirming** the interest of all States Parties to the Convention for its efficient implementation, in conformity with the undertakings of the General Conference of UNESCO and its Director-General,

**Taking note** of all the efforts already undertaken by the Director-General of UNESCO to secure the necessary resources,

## 1. Requests the Director-General of UNESCO

- a) to request the General Conference of UNESCO, during its approval of the Programme and Budget for 2000-2001 of the Organization, to take into consideration the needs and resources of the World Heritage Centre so that it may ensure the implementation of the Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage,
- b) to take the above into consideration during the implementation of the approved Budget and Programme »

2. Expresses the wish that the States Parties support the need to reinforce the working capacity of the World Heritage Centre to the Executive Board and the General Conference of UNESCO.

## VII. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

**VII.1** The Chairperson informed the Bureau that there were three subjects to be discussed under this Agenda Item; (a) general issues concerning the allocation of limited funds for International Assistance and recommendations for the revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* related to the priority in granting international assistance (paragraphs 113-116); (b) specific requests for international assistance; and (c) examination of the proposal formulated by the UNESCO Central Evaluation Unit for the evaluation of international assistance (US\$ 40,000 in the 1999 budget).

**VII.2** The Chairperson drew the attention of the Bureau to the new challenges facing the Committee in promoting the Global Strategy and in the technical implementation of the World Heritage Convention. He recalled the report of the Director of the Centre regarding the dramatic rise in the number of requests for international assistance and the amounts requested, reflecting the growing number of sites and increasing threats. By May 1999, Preparatory and Promotional Assistance had been completely allocated, and only limited funds were available for Emergency Assistance, Technical Co-operation and Training Assistance for natural heritage. Referring to the information on international assistance in previous years (WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.15) prepared by the Centre, the Chairperson stressed the need to address several issues aimed to prioritize the allocation of limited international assistance funds.

**VII.3** The Chairperson underlined his serious concern that many States Parties to the World Heritage Convention could not implement the Global Strategy for increasing the representivity of the World Heritage List, due to limited Preparatory Assistance available. By May 1999, the allocation of US\$ 300,000 for Preparatory Assistance, decided upon by the Committee at its twenty-second session, had been completely committed to finance 22 approved requests from 19 States Parties, seven being Least Developed Countries (LDCs) or Low-Income Countries (LICs). He noted that, as of 8 July 1999, there were 14 additional requests for Preparatory Assistance submitted by 14 States Parties, of which six had been submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Fiji, Guyana, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Sudan, which are States Parties with no site inscribed on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, two other requests submitted by Nepal and Pakistan specifically followed actions recommended by the Committee. These 14 new requests together amounted to US\$ 241,811. The Chairperson underscored this critical situation and called upon the Bureau for taking positive actions to address this crisis.

**VII.4** The Chairperson, recalling the decision by the Committee at its 19th session regarding the allocation of funds between natural and cultural heritage, stated that all categories of assistance for cultural heritage (technical co-operation and training assistance) and promotional assistance were fully allocated. Moreover, very limited funds remain for natural heritage and emergency assistance. In reviewing the requests and amounts approved, he noted that priority had not necessarily been given to LDCs or LICs, as requests are approved on a "first-come-first-serve" basis. The Chairperson therefore stated that existing guidelines provided under paragraphs 113-116 of the *Operational Guidelines* are insufficient in prioritizing approvals, in particular for LDCs and LICs in an effective and efficient way.

**VII.5** The Chairperson also remarked on the Director's report concerning the allocation of funds to finance requests approved in previous years, which have been debited against the 1999 budget. Approximately 10 percent of the approval of funds for technical implementation of the Convention and Emergency Assistance is funding requests approved in previous years. To seek a solution to this problem, the Bureau was informed that discussions were held between the Chairperson, the UNESCO Legal Advisor, the Bureau of the Comptroller, and the World Heritage Centre. However, due to stringent administrative regulations of UNESCO, it was reaffirmed that it was not possible to replenish the budget allocation nor use funds unobligated that had been returned to the Reserve without the authorization of the Committee. Therefore, the Chairperson underlined the need for a mechanism to be adopted by the Committee to ensure that requests which had been approved in previous years, but could not be implemented, can be honoured without jeopardizing the approval of new requests under the current budget.

**VII.6** The Director of the Centre was invited to provide information on the current status of funds. The Director confirmed that in addition to all Preparatory Assistance and Assistance for Educational, Information and Promotional Activities, US\$ 1,077,137 of the US\$ 1,245,000 for Technical Co-operation, US\$ 882,100 of the US\$ 981,000 for Training Assistance, and US\$ 491,529 of the US\$ 600,000 for Emergency Assistance had been allocated, including approximately US\$ 330,000 (10 percent) to finance requests approved in previous years, as indicated in WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.15. He clarified that these requests approved in previous years were not implemented or completed due to factors, such as the security situation in the concerned State Party, difficulties faced by UNESCO Field Offices where funds were decentralized, force majeure, and finally, approval of requests late in the year (particularly after October), which prevented full obligation of funds approved.

**VII.7** The Director agreed that a mechanism to ensure that adequate international assistance is made available to LDCs and LICs to address the need to establish a balanced and representative World Heritage List. He informed the Bureau of the difficulties faced by States Parties in formulating requests for international assistance, especially new States Parties to the Convention, which often delay the submission of requests, thus leading to the difficulties faced by the Committee today where funds are no longer available. On the other hand, some States Parties have received repeated assistance.

**VII.8** Some members of the Bureau expressed surprise in being informed of this serious situation, brought to their attention for the first time. The Bureau stressed the need to increase the annual allocation of Preparatory Assistance to meet the needs of the States Parties who have been encouraged by the Committee to implement the Global Strategy and in enhancing the representivity of the World Heritage List. Noting that requests will continue to increase in number and in amounts requested,

along with the growing enthusiasm for greater balance of the List, the Bureau reaffirmed that the World Heritage Fund is currently not sufficient to meet these needs. However, as this matter must be discussed within a broader, strategic context, including management of the Fund and implementation of the Convention, the Bureau agreed on the need for the Committee to address this matter. The Bureau, recalling the information provided by the Centre that only 44% of the dues to the World Heritage Fund had been received as of 31 May 1999, called upon those States Parties with outstanding dues to make their payments. Moreover, States Parties should be encouraged and assisted to seek voluntary contributions from donor countries and development co-operation agencies to finance activities to implement the Convention.

**VII.9** Concerning the rigid regulations in managing the World Heritage Fund, the Delegate of Japan stated that the Committee, at its twenty-third session, should discuss ways forward to avoid the situation such as the 10 percent use of the 1999 budget for financing prior year approvals. The Delegate of Benin requested the Secretariat to ensure that information concerning approved requests that were not implemented during the year to be made available to the Committee at its twenty-third session.

**VII.10** The Delegate of Japan shared the concern over the grave situation of insufficient funds. To overcome the current impasse, the Government of Japan announced a special "one-time-only" contribution of up to US\$ 300,000 from the UNESCO Japan Funds-In-Trust, subject to the agreement of the Secretariat, for financing Preparatory Assistance requests. However, the Delegate of Japan stressed that this was an exceptional contribution that should not be considered as a solution. In order to ensure prioritization of international assistance, he emphasized that possible amendments for the *Operational Guidelines* could be deliberated by the Committee at its twenty-third session to find a solution with a long-term perspective.

**VII.11** These views were reiterated by the Delegate of Hungary, who also underlined the need for the strategic and catalytic use of international assistance under the Fund, and to ensure quality control, along with prioritization. In this regard, ICCROM was invited to prepare a long-term strategy for quality control of requests for training assistance. The Director of the Centre welcomed this proposal in view of the importance of training activities for the sustainable management of World Heritage sites. Furthermore, the Delegate of Hungary proposed the establishment of a special Heritage Programme, based on its proposal made during the twenty-second session of the Committee (see Annex XI.3 of the Report of the Committee), that would create a continuously growing alumni of trainees, who have benefited from the World Heritage Fund, to address the issues described in the Global Strategy, and enable the mobilization of quality human resources.

**VII.12** The Delegate of Italy confirmed his Government's interest in promoting the Global Strategy and in the protection of World Heritage sites, and expressed their intention to make additional contribution to support the World Heritage Centre and States Parties.

**VII.13** The Observer of Australia, in reaffirming his Government's commitment to the World Heritage Convention, reiterated his Government's proposal to act as a regional focal point to promote enhanced site management, and its wish to enter into dialogue with the Asia-Pacific States Parties for a more balanced World Heritage List.

**VII.14** The Representative of IUCN recalled that Preparatory Assistance is designed, not only for the preparation of Tentative Lists and nomination forms, but also for preparing project

proposals for funding by sources other than the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, the Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that the Government of New Zealand had made a financial contribution of New Zealand \$ 75,000 to the World Heritage Centre to finance a post in the UNESCO Apia Office in Samoa for World Heritage matters. He welcomed the Australian offer to establish a focal point in the Asia-Pacific, and reinforced the importance of dialogue to ensure that efforts complement each other.

**VII.15** The Bureau, observers and the Secretariat thanked the Government of Japan for its generous contribution in addressing the pending requests for Preparatory Assistance, especially those from LDCs and LICs to enhance the representivity of the World Heritage List. Appreciation to the Governments of France, Italy and Japan for the continued contributions for operational projects to safeguard World Heritage sites provided through the Division of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO through Funds-In-Trust arrangements, was also expressed by the Director. He thanked the Government of Australia for its offer, particularly as this was in line with UNESCO's "Focus on the Pacific" strategy. The Director stated that concrete proposals would be made to the Government of Australia and he added his appreciation for the support provided by the New Zealand Government for the Pacific. He informed the Bureau that the Government of France has also agreed to finance series of actions under the France-UNESCO Agreement to support under-represented States Parties in preparing World Heritage nomination dossiers. Furthermore, the Director of the Centre informed the Bureau that discussions were underway with the Permanent Delegate of Belgium for their support to States Parties in the preparatory phase of implementing the Convention. Moreover, he mentioned that assistance to Portuguese-speaking African States Parties from the Government of Portugal might be forthcoming in the future.

**VII.16** The Bureau confirmed the strategic importance of international assistance for implementing the Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List, and stressed its grave concern over the lack of necessary funds, in particular for Preparatory Assistance. The Bureau requested the Committee to take into account the views in its decisions on the budget allocation at its twenty-third session.

**VII.17** The Bureau decided that the matters on international assistance, including concern over insufficient funds, and the need to revise the *Operational Guidelines* to enable priority consideration to States Parties under-represented on the World Heritage List, particularly LDCs and LICs, would be put forward to the Committee for discussions at its twenty-third session.

**VII.18** The Bureau therefore requested the Centre to propose specific revisions to paragraphs 113-116 of the *Operational Guidelines* related to international assistance on the basis of the concerns expressed during the discussion by the Bureau at its twenty-third session, for decision by the Committee at its twenty-third session.

**VII.19** The Bureau also invited the advisory bodies to prepare a strategic plan on the optimal use of international assistance funds to promote the sustainable management of World Heritage sites.

After this discussion, the Bureau examined specific requests for international assistance and took the following decisions.

<b>NATURAL HERITAGE</b>
-------------------------

<b>Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan</b>	<b>"Training for Nomination of Natural and Mixed Properties as World Heritage in Central Asia" (Training Assistance)</b>	<b>US\$ 29,440</b>
--	--	--------------------

The Bureau approved an amount of US\$ 29,440 from the natural heritage training funds for this project, subject to the WWF Russia Programme (WWF-PRO) confirming, before 31 October 1999, that it has been successful in raising the balance of US\$ 29,900 needed for the implementation of the project. The Bureau also recommended that WWF-PRO submit to the World Heritage Centre, a list of organisations providing cash and in-kind contributions to meet the balance of US\$ 29,900 needed for the project and a full list of the central Asian participants to be involved in the implementation of the project.

<b>Regional</b>	<b>"Asia Pacific Training Workshop on Integrated Conservation and Development Planning: the role of Multilateral Agreements Related to Biological Diversity" (Training Assistance)</b>	<b>US\$ 30,000</b>
-----------------	--	--------------------

The Bureau approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 for this project and requested the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to negotiate with developed States Parties in Europe and North America to support the participation of their site managers and use the savings thus obtained to support as many site managers as possible from developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Bureau also recommended that preference be given to choosing managers of sites that have the twin designations of World Heritage and Biosphere Reserves, to the extent possible.

<b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	<b>"Support to Resident Staff in the World Heritage sites in Danger – Garamba, Kahuzi Biega and Virunga National Parks and the Okapi Faunal Reserve" (Emergency Assistance)</b>	<b>US\$ 105,000</b>
-------------------------------------	---	---------------------

The Bureau approved the sum of US\$ 105,000 for paying staff salaries allowances, purchase of equipment and undertaking training, construction of guard posts and monitoring activities benefiting the four sites. The Bureau decided that US\$ 105,000 shall comprise of the following budget components:

- US\$ 75,000 as emergency assistance using the US\$ 50,471 of non-earmarked funds available under the 1999 allocation and transferring US\$ 24,529 from the unspent amount of US\$ 167,863 available under technical co-operation for natural heritage;
- US\$ 30,000 as technical co-operation from the remaining balance of US\$ 143,334 remaining unspent under technical co-operation for natural heritage, after a sum of US\$ 24,529 has been transferred to emergency assistance as indicated above.

In addition the Bureau:

- Commended the dedication of the staff resident in all four sites;
- commended the commitment of the Task Force comprising Institut Congolaise pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN), GTZ (Germany) and several international non-governmental organisations supporting the conservation of the four sites, and endorsed their efforts to develop proposals to raise support from the international community for the sites over the medium term (3-4 years); and
- requested the Centre and IUCN to report to the twenty-third session of the Committee, in Marrakesh, Morocco (29 November–4 December 1999) an assessment of the effectiveness of the delivery of these funds to site staff with the assistance of the Task Force and recommendations concerning possible additional assistance to the four sites that may be considered by the Committee for the year 2000.

<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	<b>"Strengthening Protection Infrastructure of Tanzanian World Heritage sites – Serengeti and Kilimanjaro National Parks" (Technical Co-operation)</b>	
------------------------------------	--	--

The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the equipment purchase unit of UNESCO, in order to transfer the two vehicles, purchased in 1998 for two sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) but are currently stored in Mombassa, Kenya, to the Serengeti and Kilimanjaro National Parks of Tanzania. The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the UN Resident Co-ordinator's Office as well as the UNESCO Office in Nairobi, and the Kenyan Government to request the Kenyan Government to waive vehicle-storage charges payable to the Ports authorities in Kenya and the cost of the transport of the vehicles to the United Republic of Tanzania. In the event that such costs cannot be waived, the Bureau authorised the Chairperson to approve the amount needed to pay storage and transport charges, upon the submission of detailed invoices by the Centre, under the technical co-operation funds available for natural heritage projects in 1999.

<b>CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>
--------------------------

<b>Cuba</b>	<b>"Training course in preventive conservation" (Training Assistance)</b>	<b>US\$ 30,000</b>
-------------	---	--------------------

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twenty-second session had set aside US\$ 30,000 for a training activity proposed by Cuba. The Bureau examined a revised proposal for a training course in preventive conservation that had been prepared by Cuba in collaboration with an ICCROM expert. ICCROM informed the Bureau that it viewed the reformulated request very favourably and fully supported the emphasis on training of trainers. As to the relevance of the course to World Heritage preservation, ICCROM stated that it had discussed this matter with the Cuban Delegation and that assurances had been given that participants will be selected in function of their responsibilities for World Heritage preservation.

The Delegate of Cuba confirmed that the course will take place in the World Heritage site of Havana and that participants will come from the three World Heritage properties in Cuba and from the region with direct responsibility for World Heritage.

Subsequently, the Bureau approved the implementation of this assistance for an amount of US\$ 30,000 as proposed by Cuba.

<b>Lithuania</b>	<b>"Vilnius Old Town Revitalization Programme" (Technical Co-operation)</b>	<b>US\$ 30,000</b>
------------------	---	--------------------

The Secretariat introduced the request and noted that no funds remained available for technical co-operation for cultural heritage under the 1999 budget and that, therefore, the Bureau could only recommend approval by the Bureau at its twenty-third extraordinary session to approve the request under the budget for the year 2000.

The representative of ICCROM, speaking also on behalf of ICOMOS, recalled that considerable assistance had been provided to this site over the past years and that a donors conference in 1997 had led to the creation of the OTRA Old Town Revitalization Agency. The proposed activities being part of a larger project, he questioned if a deferral of the assistance was logical or desirable, as needs certainly would change over time. He furthermore noted that the request put forward by the Permanent Delegation of Lithuania did not seem to entirely correspond to the activities agreed upon by OTRA and the UNESCO consultant. In particular, he noted the absence of a proposed co-ordination meeting to improve coherence among the many national and international agencies involved in this project. ICCROM therefore recommended that the State Party following consultations with all appropriate bodies, including OTRA, re-submit a request for funding support at the earliest opportunity in order to permit completion of the complete assistance package designed for the development of the capacity of OTRA. It recommended further that the request include funds for a co-ordination meeting of all concerned international and national partners.

Asked about the urgency of the request, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that the request was part of an international assistance package for 1999 that included funding from other sources such as UNDP and that these funds might be at stake if the request under the World Heritage Fund was not approved. Several of the Bureau members strongly supported the request and gave it the highest priority for funding.

Considering that no funds remained available for 1999 and the high priority attached to the Vilnius revitalization programme, the Delegate of Italy offered to study the possibility of assistance by his government. The Bureau thanked the Delegate of Italy for this generous offer and requested the Secretariat to pursue this matter urgently in close collaboration with the Permanent Delegations of Italy and Lithuania.

<b>Syrian Arab Republic</b>	<b>«Establishing an overall management plan of Palmyre – 2<sup>nd</sup> phase » (Technical Co-operation)</b>	<b>US\$ 20,000</b>
-----------------------------	--	--------------------

After having heard the presentation by the Secretariat concerning this request which is the follow up to a first assistance request to establish detailed terms of reference for the management plan of the site of Palmyre, the Bureau recommended that the Committee approve an amount of US\$ 20,000 from the 2000 budget of the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau also recommended that, during the next mission, contacts be made with the funding sources to obtain the necessary resources for the implementation of this management plan.

**VII.20** The Bureau was informed of the proposal elaborated by the Secretariat and the Central Evaluation Unit (CEU) of UNESCO for the evaluation of international assistance (Document WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.20). This proposal was the

follow up to a recommendation made by the External Audit on the management of the World Heritage Centre and the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session to allocate an amount of US\$ 40,000 from the World Heritage Fund in 1999 for this purpose. This approval was granted under the condition that a proposal be submitted by the Secretariat to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau approved the proposal that was submitted with the following revisions:

- In its methodology, the evaluation should be based on the external auditor's reports (management and financial), take note also of the relation between the use of the funds and the Global Strategy and also analyse the pertinence of emergency assistance,
- The team proposed by the Secretariat to be established to carry out the evaluation task will be open to any interested members of the Committee who may wish to observe its activities without any decision-making power,
- The authority of the statutory bodies will be exercised by the permanent members of the Bureau participating in the work of the team full time.

**VII.21** The Observer of Canada expressed her concern in the allocation of Emergency Assistance, and requested the Secretariat to study the regularity aspects and prioritization of grants, in relation to the conservation strategies for specific sites or regions.

## **VIII. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

### **Revisions to Section I of the Operational Guidelines**

**VIII.1** The Chairperson recalled that the proposed changes to the Operational Guidelines derive from the Global Strategy expert meeting held in Amsterdam (The Netherlands) in March 1998 - one in a series of Global Strategy expert meetings - as well as the work on technical issues undertaken by the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee in 1998. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the draft revisions to Section I of the Operational Guidelines attempt to amalgamate the six cultural and four natural criteria into a single set of criteria and to develop conditions of integrity incorporating the concept of authenticity for both cultural and natural properties. The Committee at its twenty-second session did not have time to fully consider this proposal and requested that the Centre review the work together with the advisory bodies. This matter was discussed at the meeting of the Secretariat and the advisory bodies (February 1999). Subsequently, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM provided further reflections which were presented in Annexes I and II of Working Document WHC-99/CONF.204/10.

**VIII.2** At the session, IUCN highlighted the following points (1) IUCN supported the integration of the natural and cultural criteria into a single set as a means to reflect the nature/culture continuum, favoured minimal change to the text of the criteria and believed that reference to "human interaction with the environment" should be located in one of the cultural criteria, as this would be consistent with Article I of the Convention; (2) A timely decision would be welcomed to achieve clarity and certainty; (3) Once a decision is made, user-friendly Operational Guidelines should be prepared without frequent change; (4) IUCN strongly supported the Global Strategy which focuses on improving the balance and representativity of the World Heritage



List. However, IUCN stressed that the Global Strategy was only one element of what should be an overall strategy for World Heritage. Such a strategy would have to focus on effective management of sites already on the list and how these sites can be better used as models to demonstrate how people, nature and culture can more effectively co-exist in the next century; (5) IUCN noted that the current aim of the Global Strategy is not being achieved and that each year the imbalance, between regions and natural and cultural sites is growing. Concrete actions have to be taken to accomplish a balanced World Heritage List.

**VIII.3** ICCROM, speaking also on behalf of ICOMOS, noted that the proposed changes need careful consideration and require an analysis in the regional cultural context as was noted in the Nara Document on Authenticity. Both ICOMOS and ICCROM took part in the discussions in Amsterdam and noted that the merging of the criteria was only of the beginning of a process. While agreeing that the momentum should not be lost, they however suggested to defer any changes until after the General Assembly of ICOMOS to allow full reflection on the matter of authenticity (the Nara Document).

**VIII.4** Whereas some Delegates agreed with the position of ICCROM and ICOMOS, others urged that the matter of the integration of the criteria be considered as soon as possible.

**VIII.5** The Observer of the United Kingdom, speaking as a frequent user of the Operational Guidelines, highlighted the need for an integrated approach and a thorough revision and reorganization of the Operational Guidelines. The United Kingdom would be happy to consider hosting an expert meeting on this matter. This offer was gratefully accepted by the Bureau. The Delegate of Benin reiterated that in this meeting, a balanced representation of cultures, regions and disciplines should be ensured. The Chairperson emphasized that within the World Heritage Fund budget, no allocation was foreseen for such a meeting.

**VIII.6** The Director of the Centre observed that it would be difficult to organise this meeting before the end of this year. It was also suggested that such a meeting should take place after the African Expert Meeting on Authenticity and Integrity scheduled for March 2000, that was recommended by the African Cultural Landscape Meeting (see WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.4). Regional reviews of the matter of authenticity could also be envisaged prior to the meeting in the United Kingdom.

**VIII.7** Subsequently, the Bureau decided:

- (1) To request the Centre to present a proposal for the unified set of criteria to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.
- (2) To welcome the invitation by the Observer from the United Kingdom to host an international expert meeting to consolidate the proposals to revise the Operational Guidelines. The Bureau requested the Centre to assist the authorities of the United Kingdom with the organization of such an event in early 2000, following the planned African meeting and to ensure a balanced representation from all cultures of the world,
- (3) The Bureau encouraged ICOMOS to present the *Nara Document on Authenticity*, and a summary of subsequent discussions concerning authenticity, to the ICOMOS General Assembly in October 1999 and invited ICOMOS to report to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee on discussions concerning authenticity that took place at the ICOMOS General Assembly.
- (4) The Bureau recommended to the twenty-third session of the Committee that it invite ICOMOS and ICCROM to co-operate in efforts to ensure further discussion and dissemination of

information on the subject of authenticity (particularly as it relates to the conservation of World Heritage properties) to cultural heritage management professionals.

#### Revision to paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines

**VIII.8** The Delegates discussed at length a revision to paragraph 65 that was originally proposed by Italy to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session. A number of Delegates supported the proposal that evaluations of nominations be sent to the States Parties concerned prior to the Bureau session, as this would give equal chances to all States Parties to review these in a timely fashion. Some Delegates, however feared that this could create confusion with additional information from States Parties to be evaluated just before the session, and underlined that the decision about the nominations lies with the Bureau and the Committee. To avoid this, the Observer of Belgium suggested to add an additional sentence to the text proposed. A small working group led by the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Professor Francioni, was convened and proposed to revise paragraph 65 as follows:

«During April/May

The Secretariat receives the evaluations of the advisory bodies and ensures that States members of the Committee, as well as the States Parties concerned, receive them six weeks in advance of the Bureau session with available documentation. All additional information or documentation shall be sent to the Secretariat as soon as possible, and depending on its nature and complexity, may be examined at the extraordinary session of the Bureau preceding the Committee session in order to give the advisory bodies sufficient time to carefully examine this information. »

**VIII.9** The Bureau decided to recommend the above revision to the World Heritage Committee for adoption.

#### Revision to paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines

**VIII.10** The Observer of Australia suggested that the Bureau recommends a similar amendment concerning reactive monitoring. He proposed to insert in paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines the following text (new text in **bold**):

« 68. Reactive monitoring ..... under threat. **The relevant section of the working document on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties shall be sent to the State Party concerned at the same time as this document is distributed to the members of the Bureau and the Committee.** To this end ..... »

**VIII.11** The Bureau decided to transmit this proposal to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session for consideration.

### IX. APPROVAL OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON ITS ACTIVITIES FOR 1998-99 TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE 30<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

**IX.1** The Bureau approved the report of the World Heritage Committee on its activities for 1998-99 to be submitted to the 30<sup>th</sup> session of the General Conference of UNESCO including remarks made by the Bureau.

**IX.2** The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau that the number of States Parties had increased to 157 with Chad as a new State Party to the World Heritage Convention.

## X. PREPARATION OF THE TWELFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES

**X.1** The Chairperson, after having recalled that he had requested the Rapporteur to chair a working group to work on a draft resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly, referred to Working Document **WHC-99/CONF.204/12Rev.** and its four annexes:

<b>WHC-99/CONF.206/1</b>	Provisional Agenda (Annex I)
<b>WHC-99/CONF.206/INF.1</b>	Provisional List of Document (Annex II)
<b>WHC-99/CONF.206/5</b>	Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List (see the draft resolution which will be examined by the General Assembly of States Parties) (Annex III)
<b>WHC-99/CONF.206/6</b>	Elections to the World Heritage Committee (Annex IV)

**X.2** Following approval of Annexes I and II, the Chairperson referred to the Working Document (Annex III) which will be submitted to the General Assembly and in particular to the draft resolution elaborated by the informal working group chaired by the Rapporteur. The Rapporteur recalled that the Chairperson had transmitted to the members of the Bureau and observers, as well as the advisory bodies, a note prepared by Belgium. In this note, the Belgian Delegation considered it appropriate that the draft resolution prepared by the Secretariat be endorsed by the States Parties, and suggested the setting up of a working group to prepare a consensual and pragmatic text which would involve all the States Parties. The working group met five times; the following twelve States Parties participated in these meetings: Benin, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Republic of Korea (members of the Bureau), Canada, Finland, France, Zimbabwe (members of the Committee), Belgium and United Kingdom (observers) and the Secretary General of ICOMOS. The Rapporteur congratulated the Observer of Belgium for her valuable input to the deliberations of the informal working group as well as that of the Secretariat. He emphasized that should there be any criticism, he took full responsibility for the text. He believed that the draft resolution might have devoted a paragraph to non States Parties.

**X.3** At the request of the Chairperson, the Observer of Belgium briefly presented the draft resolution and underlined that it reflected on the one hand the results of the work and deliberations carried out by the Committee over many years, and on the other, invited the States to contribute actively in the implementation of the Global Strategy, whilst leaving them free choice.

**X.4** The Chairperson then drew the attention of the Bureau to paragraph B that **“invites the States Parties which already have a substantial number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List”** to the dispositions of paragraph 6 (vii) in the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, by proposing four options:

- i) *Apply paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention:*
  - a) *by spacing voluntarily their nominations according to conditions that they will define, and/or*
  - b) *by proposing only properties falling into categories still under-represented, and/or*

c) *by linking each of their nominations with a nomination presented by a State Party whose heritage is under-represented, or*

d) *by deciding, on a voluntary basis, a moratorium of a pre-determined duration, and to inform the Committee of the measures taken.*

He also referred to paragraph C which **“invites the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List”**.

- i) *Give priority to the preparation of tentative lists and nominations,*
- ii) *Initiate and consolidate at regional level, partnerships based on the exchange of technical expertise,*
- iii) *Encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation so as to increase their expertise and the technical capacities of institutions in charge of the protection, safeguard and management of their heritage,*
- iv) *Participate, as much as possible, in the meetings of the World Heritage Committee.*

**X.5** Paragraph B i) d) was the subject of debate. Italy, Greece, Thailand and Romania, whilst supporting the general philosophy of the text, expressed reservations and felt that the measure proposed was too restrictive and not conducive to improving the representativity of the List. The Italian Delegation thought that the word moratorium had a negative impact and that the real issue was to provide more assistance to States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List. Italy also recalled that it was already working in this direction and was providing support to co-operation projects for the benefit of these States Parties. The Delegation of Greece expressed its reservations on the whole text of the draft resolution, due to the fact that it needed more elaboration before examination by the General Assembly of States Parties.

**X.6** The Delegations of Greece, Italy, Romania and Thailand also raised a procedural point and queried whether a text that had not been examined and adopted by the Committee could be transmitted to the General Assembly. It was proposed at this stage that it would be more judicial to present a text comprising general rather than specific considerations. It was suggested that the Committee rather examine the text that was prepared by the Secretariat.

**X.7** The Delegate of Benin recalled that this item of the agenda of the Bureau was inscribed following the decision adopted by the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1998. The Chairperson confirmed that the Bureau had been mandated to examine the working document relating to agenda item 8 of the General Assembly on “Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List”, and judged that it should include a draft resolution. He did however emphasise that the text that will be submitted to the General Assembly should be the subject of a consensus and reflect the wish expressed in Kyoto to “move forward from recommendations to action”. He requested the members of the Bureau and the observers to submit proposals reflecting the spirit of co-operation that marked the debates of the Global Strategy at the twenty-second session of the Committee.

**X.8** During the debate, the Delegates of Australia, Benin, Japan, Morocco, the United States of America and Zimbabwe who are all members of the Committee, and the United Kingdom (observer) underlined the voluntary character of the dispositions

that figure in Article B i) of the draft resolution prepared by the informal working group chaired by the Rapporteur. The Delegate of the United States of America also emphasized that it was possible for States Parties to comply with the provision of this Article B i) without ever instituting a moratorium since the first two items a) and b) are separated by "and/or", whereas items c) and d) are separated by the word "or" only. The Delegate of Benin referred to the conservation projects for the Royal Palaces of Abomey funded for many years by Italy, and after having thanked the Italian Delegation, he requested him "to accept the proposed text that could but reinforce their image, without constraint". The Delegate of Finland, (Committee member), recalled that she had proposed at the twenty-second session of the Committee, the idea of a "moratorium" to allow the Secretariat to provide necessary support to the process leading to new nominations coming from States Parties whose heritage was still under-represented on the List.

**X.9** In his concern to satisfy the States having expressed reserves reflecting preoccupations which could be raised by the General Assembly of States Parties, the Delegate of Morocco proposed that the wording of item d) being the subject of the debate, be modified. He suggested that the word "moratorium" be deleted and replaced by the word "suspension". The draft resolution prepared by the informal working group was adopted with the following modification to item d) that was accepted by the Italian Delegation "By deciding on a voluntary basis **to suspend the presentation of new nominations**, for a predetermined duration". The final text of the draft resolution adopted by the Bureau is Annex VII of the report adopted by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

**X.10** The Delegate of Canada (Committee member) recalled that the debate to improve the representativity of the List was ongoing since 1992, and that a very clear message should be given to States Parties. She requested that the draft resolution be transmitted to all States. She recalled that Canada had, on a voluntary basis, spread out the preparation of its proposals for inscription and had only submitted one at a time over the last five years. She also drew the Bureau's attention to point c) of paragraph B that could be implemented in the framework of bilateral co-operation and should not be submitted to bureaucratic constraints.

**X.11** The Chairperson requested the Secretariat to distribute as soon as possible to all the States Parties the working document which was adopted, and to receive any observations which might be made on the Draft Resolution.

**X.12** The Bureau then approved paragraph 6 of Annex IV "Elections to the World Heritage Committee", to harmonise together with Article 13.4, the Articles 13.6 and 13.7 of the Rules of Procedures of the General Assembly, to facilitate the counting of votes during elections.

**X.13** The Chairperson thanked the Bureau members, observers and the Italian Delegation for their contributions to the debate.

## **XI. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-THIRD EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU (Marrakesh, Morocco 26-27 November 1999)**

**XI.1** The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-99/CONF.204/13, the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau to be held in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 26 to 27 November 1999. Following a suggestion by ICOMOS, the Bureau decided to reverse the order of item 3 "State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World

Heritage List" and item 4 "Nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List". The Provisional Agenda was adopted with this amendment and is attached as Annex VIII.

## **XII. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Marrakesh, Morocco 29 November - 4 December 1999)**

**XII.1** The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-99/CONF.204/14, the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the Committee to be held in Marrakesh, Morocco, from 29 November - 4 December 1999. Following a suggestion by ICOMOS, the Bureau decided to reverse the order of item 9 "State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List" and item 10 "Nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List". The Bureau also decided to take up the item on the "Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee".

**XII.2** The Delegate of Morocco suggested that incomplete nomination files should be returned to the States Parties concerned and not be presented, which would provide additional time for the Committee. The Observer of France, however, noted that the Bureau and the Committee are the competent bodies to deal with this matter. The Bureau noted that a more precise time schedule should be developed for the presentation of nominations.

**XII.3** The Provisional Agenda was adopted with the amendments and is attached as Annex IX.

## **XIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XIII.1** The Delegate of Hungary stated that a text recommending ICCROM to prepare a strategic plan to enhance the effective use of international assistance, particularly for training activities under the World Heritage Fund, had been transmitted to the Secretariat. The Director confirmed receipt and stated that it will be included in the Bureau Report under Agenda Item 7, International Assistance.

**XIII.2** No other business was raised.



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

**Twenty-third session / Vingt-troisième session**

**UNESCO Headquarters /Siège de l'UNESCO**

**5 – 10 July 1999 / 5 – 10 juillet 1999**

---

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

---

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

**BENIN**

M. Joseph YAI O.  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Alioune Sylla ALADJI BONI  
Directeur des Forêts et des Ressources naturelles  
B.P. 393, Cotonou

M. Eric TOTAH  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel  
B.P. 120, Cotonou

M. Isidore MONSI  
Premier Conseiller à la Délégation permanente du  
Bénin  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Edith LISSAN  
Deuxième Conseiller à la Délégation permanente du  
Bénin  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**CUBA**

Ms Marta ARJONA PEREZ  
Presidenta, Consejo Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural  
Ministerio de Cultura  
Calle 4 esquina a 13, Vedado  
La Habana

Mr Antonio PERERA PUGA  
Director, Centro de Areas Protegidas  
Ministerio de Ciencia Tecuatogía y Medio Ambiente  
Calle 18A No 4114 e/ 41 y 47  
11300 Miramar, Playa, C. Habana,

**HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

M. Zsolt VISY  
Secrétaire d'Etat adjoint  
Ministère du Patrimoine Culturel National de  
Hongrie  
Président du Comité National Hongrois du  
Patrimoine  
H-1055 Budapest, Sialay u. 10-14

M. János TARDY  
Secrétaire d'Etat adjoint  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
Office de Protection de la Nature  
H-1121, Budapest, Költö u. 21

M. Ferenc NÉMETH  
Directeur général  
Ministère du Patrimoine Culturel National  
Secrétaire du Comité national Hongrois du  
patrimoine  
H-1052 Budapest, Szalay u. 10-14

M. János JELEN  
Ambassadeur  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Rapporteur du Comité du patrimoine mondial  
c/o Mission de Hongrie auprès de l'UNESCO

M. Béla KOVÁCSI  
Conseiller administratif  
Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement rural  
H-1055 Budapest, Kossuth Ter 11

M. Peter KARIKAS  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente de Hongrie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Gábor SZILAGYI  
Deputy Director  
Hortobágy National Park  
H-4024 Sumen u. 2 Debrecen

#### **ITALY / ITALIE**

S. Exc. M. Gabriele SARDO  
Délégué permanent de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. le Conseiller Pietro SEBASTINI  
Délégué permanent adjoint  
Délégation permanente d'Italie pour l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Marina MISITANO  
Délégation permanente d'Italie pour l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Prof. Umberto LEANZA  
Chef du Service du Contentieux Diplomatique  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1, 00194, Rome

Mme Maria Clelia CICIRIELLO  
Service du Contentieux Diplomatique  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1, 00194, Rome

M. Francesco FRANCONI  
Prof. de Droit International  
Université de Sienne  
53100 Sienne

M. Stefano CACCIAGUERRA  
Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1, 00194, Rome

Mme Silvia LIMONCINI  
Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1, 00194, Rome

Mme Gabriella IAVICOLI  
Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1, 00194, Rome

M. Pasquale Bruno MALARA  
Surintendant pour les Biens Culturels du Piémont  
Ministère pour les Biens et les Activités Culturelles  
Palais Royal, Turin

M. Stefano DE CARO  
Surintendant archéologue des villes de Naples et  
Caserta  
Ministère pour les Biens et les Activités Culturelles  
Piazza Museo 19, Naples

M. Luciano MARCHETTI  
Surintendance pour les Biens Culturels de Florence  
Ministère pour les Biens et les Activités Culturelles  
Piazza Pitti, Florence

Mme Alessandra MELUCCO VACCARO  
Bureau Central pour les Biens paysagers  
Ministère pour les Biens et les Activités Culturelles  
Piazza del Popolo 18 – 00186 Rome

Mme Roberta ALBEROTANZA  
Cabinet du Ministre  
Ministère pour les Biens et les Activités Culturelles  
Via del Collegio Romano 27, 00186 Roma

Mme Licia BORRELLI VLAD  
Commission nationale italienne pour l'UNESCO  
Piazza Firenze 27, 00186 Rome

#### **JAPAN / JAPON**

H. E. Mr Koichiro MATSUURA  
Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee  
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of  
Japan to France  
7 avenue Hoche, 75008 Paris

Mr Yasukuni ENOKI  
Director-General of Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku 100-8919, Tokyo

M. Kensuke TSUZUKI  
Minister, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Japan to  
UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Akira YOSHIKAWA  
Minister-Councillor  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Yuichi ISHII  
 Director  
 Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division  
 Cultural Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign  
 Affairs  
 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919

Mr Takahiro OKAMOTO  
 Official, Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division  
 Cultural Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign  
 Affairs  
 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8919

Mr Tomoyuki ONO  
 Troisième Secrétaire  
 Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Akihiro TAKAZAWA  
 Troisième Secrétaire  
 Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Kanenori MIURA  
 World Natural Heritage Ecosystem Conservation  
 Officer  
 Nature Conservation Bureau, Environment Agency  
 2-1-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8975

Mr Hiroshi SOWAKI  
 Director, Monuments and Sites Division  
 Cultural Properties Protection Department  
 Agency for Cultural Affairs  
 3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0013

Dr Makoto MOTONAKA  
 Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural properties  
 Monuments and Sites Division  
 Cultural Properties Protection Department  
 Agency for Cultural Affairs  
 3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0013

Dr Nobuko INABA  
 Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
 Architecture Division  
 Cultural Properties Protection Department  
 Agency for Cultural Affairs  
 3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0013

Ms Kumiko YONEDA  
 Senior Research Scientist  
 Japan Wildlife Research Centre  
 2-29-3 Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0034

#### **MOROCCO / MAROC**

M. Abdelaziz TOURI  
 Directeur du Patrimoine Culturel  
 Ministère des Affaires Culturelles  
 17 rue Michlifén, Agdal, Rabat

M. Salah Salomé ELHONSALI  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente du Maroc auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Ahmed SKOUNTI  
 Chargé de recherche  
 Ministère des Affaires Culturelles  
 Direction du Patrimoine Culturel  
 17 rue Michlifén, Agdal, Rabat 10000

#### **REPUBLIC OF KOREA / REPUBLIQUE DE COREE**

Mr June-Hyuck CHO  
 Director, Cultural Cooperation Division  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
 Government Building, Kwanghwamun, Seoul

Mr Jae-Sun SHIM  
 Director, Cultural Properties Planning Division  
 Cultural Properties Administration  
 Government Complex-Taejon 920, Taejon-City

Mr Il CHUNG  
 First Secretary, Korean Representative  
 Embassy of Republic of Korea  
 125 rue de Grenelle, 75007 Paris

Mr Sung-Soo PARK  
 Assistant Director, Cultural Cooperation Division  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
 137-13 Dolim/domy, Youngdungpogu, Seoul

Mr Mancheol SUH  
 Professor, Department of Geoenvironmental  
 Sciences  
 Kongju National Univ., Kongju Chungnam, 314-901

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

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

Ms Joan DOMICELJ  
Director  
Domicelj Consultants Pty Ltd.  
49 Olympian Parade  
LEURA, N.S.W. 2780, Australia

Mr Herb STOVEL  
World Heritage Convention Coordinator  
Via di San Michele, 13  
00153 Rome, Italy

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

M. Jean-Louis LUXEN  
Secrétaire général  
49-51 rue de la Fédération  
75015 Paris

Mlle Regina DURIGHELLO  
Assistante du Coordinateur  
49-51 rue de la Fédération, 75015 Paris

Mme Carmen AÑON  
Member, Executive Committee  
Puerto Santa Maria 49, Spain

Mlle Gwenaëlle BOURDIN  
ICOMOS  
49-51 rue de la Fédération - 75015 Paris

Mr Michel JANTZEN  
Consultant

M. Joseph PHARES  
Vice-Président ICOMOS  
B.P. 50222 Beyrouth, Liban

Dr Henry CLEERE  
Coordinateur du patrimoine mondial  
49-51 rue de la Fédération, 75015 Paris

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

Mr Patrick DUGAN  
Global Programme Director  
IUCN  
CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland

Mr P.H.C. (Bing) LUCAS  
Vice-Chair World Heritage  
World Commission for Protected Areas (WCPA)  
1/268 Main Road, Tawa  
Wellington 6006, New Zealand

Mr David SHEPPARD  
Head, Programme on Protected Areas  
IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland

Mr Rolf HOGAN  
Administrative Assistant for World Heritage  
Programme on Protected Areas  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland

Dr Jim THORSELL  
Senior Advisor World Heritage, Programme on  
Protected Areas  
c/o IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland



<b>WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE</b>
---

Mr Jeremy Harrison  
World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge CB3 0DL, United Kingdom

### III. OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

#### (i) STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION /ETATS PARTIES A LA CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

<b>ARGENTINA / ARGENTINE</b>
------------------------------

H. Exc. Mr Carlos A. FLORIA  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Dra. Beatriz GUTIERREZ WALKER  
Secretaria de Cultura de la Nación  
Alvear 1690, Buenos Aires

Lic. Francisco MAYORGA  
Ministro de Turismo, Ministerio de Turismo  
Suipacha 1111, Piso 20 (1368)  
Buenos Aires

Mr Antonio TORREJON  
Secretario de Turismo de la Provincia de Chubut  
Patagonia, Bv Brown 1772, Puerto Madryn

Ms Cristina SAN MARTIN  
Assistant to the Minister  
Ministerio de Turismo  
Suipacha 1111, Piso 20, 1368 Buenos Aires

Ministro Maria Susana PATARO  
Permanent Delegation of Argentina to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Sr Pedro NEIFF  
Directeur des Relations Internationales  
Secretaría de Turismo de la Nación  
Suipacha 1111, Piso 21, 1368 Buenos Aires

Dra. Diana ROLANDI  
Directora, Instituto Nacional De Antropología y  
Pensamiento Latina Americano  
Secretaría de Cultura  
3 de Febrero 1378 – 1426 Buenos Aires

Lic. Maria ONETTO  
Researcher, Instituto Nacional de Antropología  
Secretaría de Cultura de la Nación  
3 de Febrero 1378 – 1426 Buenos Aires

Ing. Francisco ERIZE  
Assesseur, Secrétariat des Ressources Naturelles  
Rodriguez Peña 1882, 1023 Buenos Aires

<b>AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIE</b>
------------------------------

Senator the Honourable Robert HILL  
Minister for the Environment and Heritage  
Parliament House, Canberra, ACT 2600

Mr Roger BEALE  
Secretary, Department of the Environment and  
Heritage  
John Gorton House, Parkes ACT 2600

Mr Matthew PEEK  
Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Howard BAMSEY  
Deputy Secretary, Department of the Environment  
and Heritage  
P.O. Box 787 Canberra, ACT 2603

Ms Gillian BIRD  
First Assistant Secretary, International Organisations  
Branch  
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
Canberra, ACT 2601

Dr Arthur JOHNSTON  
Supervising Scientist  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
PMB 2 Jabiru, NT 0886

Mr Peter VAUGHAN  
First Assistant Secretary  
Office of Indigenous Affairs  
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet  
3-5 National Circuit  
Barton ACT 2600

Mr Robin BRYANT  
 General Management  
 Department of Industry, Science and Ressources  
 Assistant Secretary, Australian Government  
 c/o Australian Embassy, Paris

Mr Kevin KEEFFE  
 Assistant Secretary  
 Department of the Environment and Heritage  
 GPO Box 787  
 Canberra, ACT 2601

Mr Jon DAY  
 Director, Conservation, Biodiversity and World  
 Heritage  
 Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority  
 P.O. Box 1379 Townsville QLD 4812

Mr David Charles WALKER  
 Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to  
 UNESCO  
 4 rue Jean Rey, 75724 Paris Cedex 15

Ms Anne SIWICKI  
 Attaché  
 Australian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO  
 4 rue Jean Rey, 75724 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Michael REED  
 Deputy Chief Minister, Northern Territory Govt.  
 P.O. Box 3146, Darwin N.T.

#### **AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE**

M. Hans HORCICKA  
 Director  
 Federal Ministry for Education and Cultural Affairs ,  
 Minoritenplatz 5, A-1014 Vienna

Mr Ernst BACHER  
 Conservator-General  
 Bundesdenkmalamt  
 Hofburg-Säulenstiege, A-1010 Vienna

#### **BELGIUM / BELGIQUE**

Mme Bénédicte SELFSLAGH  
 Relations avec les Organisations Internationales  
 Division du Patrimoine  
 Ministère de la Région Wallonne de Belgique  
 14 rue d'Aumale, 75009 Paris

Mme Gislaine DEVILLERS  
 Première attachée  
 Région Wallonne – Division du Patrimoine  
 Rue Brigade d'Irlande – 51000 Jambes

Mr Edgard GOEDLEVEN  
 Head Division Monuments and Sites  
 Ministry Flemish Community  
 Em. Jacquainlaon 156 b7, 1000 Brussels

Ms Suzanne VAN AERSCHOT  
 Assistant to the Director  
 Architectural Heritage Inventories  
 Ministry Flemish Community, Monuments and  
 Sites Board  
 Waaistraat 1, B-3000 Leuven

#### **BRAZIL / BRESIL**

M. José Pedro de OLIVEIRA COSTA  
 Secrétaire National pour la Biodiversité et Forêts  
 Ministère de l'Environnement  
 Brasilia, Esplanada dos Ministerios Bloco B – 70000

M. Carmelito DE MELO  
 Conseiller, Délégation permanente du Brésil auprès  
 de l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **CANADA**

Dr. Christina CAMERON  
 Director General  
 National Historic Sites, Parks Canada  
 25 Eddy Street, 5th Floor  
 Hull, Quebec, K1A 0M5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN  
 Chef, Affaires internationales  
 Parcs Canada  
 25 Eddy Street, 5<sup>e</sup> étage  
 Hull, Québec, K1A 0M5

Mr John PINKERTON  
 Analyst, National Parks Directorate  
 Parcs Canada  
 25 Eddy Street, 4th Floor  
 Hull, Quebec, K1A 0M5

#### **CHINA / CHINE**

Mr Zhan GUO  
 Director  
 Department of Preservation of Cultural Heritage  
 National Administration of Cultural Heritage of  
 China, 29 Wusi Street, Beijing 10009

Mr Zhe LI  
 Deputy Director, Comprehensive Division  
 Department of Foreign Affairs  
 Ministry of Construction of China  
 Sanlihe Road 9, Beijing 100835

Ms Xiaoping ZUO  
 Deputy Director, National Parks Division  
 Department of Urban Planning  
 Ministry of Construction of China  
 Sanlihe Road 9, Beijing 100835

Mr Enhua XU  
Director, Wuyi Mountains Protection and  
Management Committee  
Yingbin Road, Wuyishan, Fujian

Mr Xiangying GUO  
Director of Dazu Arts Museum  
7 Beishenlo, Longgang Zheng, Dazu, Chengqing

Ms Xiaoping YU  
Program Officer  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
37 Damucanghutong, Xidan, Beijing

Mr Jin XU  
Vice-Director  
Office of Application by Dujiangyan for inclusion in  
the World Heritage List  
52 Ruilianjie, Dujiangyan 611830

Mr Jianhua Gerald YANG  
Officer, Overseas Liaison Department  
Wuyi Mountains Protection and Management  
Committee  
Yingbin Road, Wuyishan- Puzian

#### **COLOMBIA / COLOMBIE**

S. Exc. M. Augusto GALÁN  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent de la Colombie  
auprès de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Ms Marcela ORDONEZ  
2<sup>e</sup> Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente de la Colombie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **COSTA RICA**

Mme LEIVA-BILLAULT  
Ambassadeur, Déléguée adjointe  
Délégation permanente du Costa Rica auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

Dr Josef STULC  
Director of the State Institute for Historic Sites  
Valdstešnske 3, Praha 1, 11800

M. Michal BENES  
Secrétaire pour les Affaires Culturelles de l'UNESCO  
Ministère de la Culture  
160 00 Praha 6, Milady, Horakove 139

#### **DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO / REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO**

M. Mbo MALEMBE  
Président – Directeur général de l'ICCN  
Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature  
B.P. 868 Kinshasa

M. Georges DORKEN  
Conseiller technique principal  
21 rue Ituvi, Kinshasa

M. Norbert MUSHENZI-LUSENGE  
Directeur provincial ICCN/Kivu  
B.P. 868 Kinshasa

M. Karl RUF (Expert)  
Director, Gilman International Conservation  
3823 Owens Road, Yulee 32097, USA

Mme Kes FRAZER (Expert)  
Coordinator Monitoring and Research  
Garamba National Park Project  
P.O. Box 15024, Nairobi, Kenya

Mme Annette LANJOW (Expert)  
AWF/WWF/FFI  
P.O. Box 48177, Nairobi, Kenya

Dr. Thérèse HART  
Directrice CEFRECOF  
Wildlife Conservation Society  
185<sup>th</sup> Street and Southern Blvd, Bronx, NY. 10460,  
USA

#### **DOMINICAN REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE**

Ms Laura FAXAS  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Dominican  
Republic to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Jimmy SIERRA  
Délégation permanente de République Dominicaine  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **ECUADOR / EQUATEUR**

Mr Mauricio MONTALVO  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Ecuador to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Edmundo BATALLAS  
Director of International Relations  
Universidad Tecnológica Equinoccial  
P.O. Box 5001 CCI, Quito

Ms Ximena BATALLAS  
Assistant of Director of CODEU  
P.O. box 5001, CCI, Quito

Mr Teodoro PENTA  
Ministro de Desarrollo Urbano y Vivienda  
Calle Cordero y du 10 Agosto  
Quito

Mr Fernando CORDERO  
Alcalde  
Municipalidad de Cuenca 01-05-1940

#### **EL SALVADOR**

S. Exc. M. José Ramiro ZEPEDA ROLDAN  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent d'El Salvador en  
France  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Nanette VIAUD DESROCHES  
Conseiller  
Délégation permanente d'El Salvador auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **FINLAND / FINLANDE**

Ms Taina KIEKKO  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Finland to  
UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Henrik LILIUS  
State Archaeologist  
Director-General of the National Board of  
Antiquities  
Nervandersnk 13, 00100 Helsinki

Mr Jukka-Pekka FLANDER  
Chief Inspector  
Ministry of the Environment, Land Use Department  
Kasarminkatu 25, P.B. 380,  
00131 Helsinki

Ms Anne LAMMILA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Finland to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **FRANCE**

M. Alain MEGRET  
Directeur adjoint de la nature et des paysages  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de  
l'Environnement  
20 Avenue de Ségur, 75302 Paris 07 SP

Ms Catherine CARO  
Administrateur civil, Adjoint au sous-Directeur des  
sites et paysages  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
20 Avenue de Ségur, 75302 Paris 07 SP

Mme VINCENT  
Chargée de Mission Formation en patrimoine  
Centre des Hautes Etudes de Chaillot  
1 Place du Trocadéro, 75116 Paris

Mlle Eva CAILLART  
Chargée de Mission  
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication  
DAPA, 8 rue Vivienne, 75002 Paris

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la France auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Olivier POISSON  
Inspecteur général des Monuments Historiques  
Ministère de la Culture  
2 Bis rue Manuel, 66000 Perpignan

Mme Catherine DUMESNIL  
Conseillère technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
57 Bd des Invalides, 75700 Paris SP

M. Gérard CHIODO  
Directeur  
Ecole d'Architecture de Paris-Ile-de-France  
41 Allée le Corbusier, 92023 Nanterre

M. Antoine THELAMON  
Stagiaire, Délégation permanente de la France auprès  
de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

#### **GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Mr Hans CASPARY  
Conservateur  
Monuments Historiques Rhenanie-Palatinat  
Schillerstra. 44, D-55156 Mainz

Mr Michael WORBS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**GREECE / GRECE**

Mme Hélène METHODIOU  
 Conseiller pour la Culture  
 Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr Nicolas KALOGERAS  
 Professor  
 School of Architecture National University  
 42 Patission Str., Athens 10682

**HONDURAS**

S. Exc. Mme Sonia MENDIETA DE BADAROUX  
 Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent de Honduras  
 auprès de l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mr J.C. BENDANA-PINEL  
 Délégué permanent adjoint de Honduras auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**IRAN**

Mr Jarad SAFAEI  
 Conseiller  
 Permanent Delegation of Iran to UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**IRAQ / IRAK**

M. Iyad AFLAK  
 Conseiller  
 Délégation permanente de l'Irak auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**JORDAN**

Ms Janette BERMAMET  
 Deputy Permanent Delegate of Jordan to UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**KAZAKHSTAN**

Mr Rustam MUZAFAROV  
 First Secretary  
 Permanent Delegation of Kazakhstan to UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**LEBANON / LIBAN**

M. Samia MOUKARZEL  
 Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Carla JAZZAR  
 Délégué permanent adjoint  
 Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de  
 l'UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Assaad SEIF  
 Archéologue  
 Direction Générale des Antiquités du Liban  
 Musée National, rue de Damas, Beyrouth

**MEXICO / MEXIQUE**

Lic. Dámaso LUNA CORONA  
 Director General de Recursos Naturales y Medio  
 Ambiente  
 Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores  
 Av. Veracruz 101

M. Francisco Javier LOPEZ MORALES  
 Deputy Director  
 INAH  
 Correo Mayor 11, Centro Historico Mexico D.F.

Ministro José SANCHEZ GUTIERREZ  
 Representante Permanente Alterno de México ante la  
 UNESCO  
 Permanent Delegation of Mexico to UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Oscar RAMIREZ  
 Director General de Investigación de los Procesos de  
 Desarrollo Sustentable  
 Instituto Nacional de Pesca  
 Ministry of Environment (SEMARNAP)  
 Pitagoras # 1320  
 Col. Sta Cruz Atoyac, Mexico 03310 D.F.

Biólogo David GUTIERREZ CARBONEL  
 Director General Adjunto de Manejo y Conservación  
 de las Areas Naturales Protegidas  
 Instituto Nacional de Ecología  
 Revolucion # 1425, 14000, Mexico D.F.

Mr Alejandro MONTEAGUDO  
 Deputy Director for Environmental Affairs  
 Secretariat of Commerce and Industrial Development  
 Alfonso Reyes N° 30, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Mexico D.F.,  
 C.P. 06140

**NEPAL**

Mr Indra Bahadur SINGH  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Nepal to  
UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Dr. Robert de JONG  
Co-ordinator Netherlands Department for  
Conservation World Heritage UNESCO  
President ICOMOS-IFLA Committee  
P.O. Box 1001, 3700 BA Zeist

Mr Fred SCHOORL  
Head Immovable Heritage Division  
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science  
Post Box 2500, 2700 LZ, Zoekimeer

**NIGER**

M. Amadou TCHEKO  
Délégué permanent adjoint du Niger auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Alioune Sylla ALADJI-BONI  
Directeur des Forêts et des Ressources Naturelles  
B.P. 393 Cotonou

M. Seyni SEYDOU  
Directeur, Parc national du W du Niger  
Direction de la Faune, Pêche et Pisciculture  
Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement  
B.P. 721 Niamey

**NIGERIA**

M. Yémi LIJADU  
Permanent Delegation of Nigeria to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Dr Yaro GELLA  
National Commission for Museums and Monuments  
Abuja, 2018 Cotonou Crescent, Wuse Zone 6

Dr Joseph EBOREIME  
Co-ordinator Nigerian World Heritage Committee  
National Commission for Museums and Monuments  
PO Box 1115, Benin City

**NORWAY / NORVEGE**

Ms Ingunn KVISTEROY  
Nordic World Heritage Office  
Postbox 8196 Dep., N-0034 Oslo

**PANAMA**

Ms Maria Elena DE AGUILAR  
Déléguée permanente adjointe du Panama auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**PERU / PEROU**

S. Exc. Mme Maria Luisa FEDERICI  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent du Pérou auprès  
de l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Dra. Josefina TAKAHASI  
Jefa del Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales  
(INRENA)  
Calle Diecisiete 355, San Isidra, Lima

Sr. Miguel PAZOS RIVERA  
Asesor de la Alta Dirección del Instituto Nacional de  
Cultura (INC)  
Av. Javier Prado Este, 2465, Lima  
Ministro Alberto CARRION TEJADA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Peru to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Carlos VASQUEZ  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**PHILIPPINES**

Ms Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO  
First Secretary/Senior Foreign Affairs Adviser for  
UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Philippines to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Prof. Andrzej TOMASZEWSKI  
Ministère de la Culture  
Varsovie, Krakowskie Przedmiescie, 26

**ROMANIA / ROUMANIE**

M. Aurelian TRISCU  
Architecte, Vice-président de la Commission  
nationale des Monuments Historiques  
Ministère de la Culture, Piafa Presei Libere, Bucarest

Mr Ion MACOVEI  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la Roumanie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**SAUDI ARABIA / ARABIE SAOUDITE**

Mr Abdulaziz BIN SALAMAH  
Permanent Delegate of Saudi Arabia to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**SLOVAKIA /SLOVAQUIE**

Mr Jozef HLAVAC  
Director  
Slovak Show Cave Organisation  
Hodaova 11, Liptovske Mikulas

Mr Jozef KLINDA  
Director General  
Ministry of the Environment  
Namestie L. Stura 1, 812 35 Bratislava

Ms Katarina NOVAKOVA  
Director ing.  
Centre for the Protection of Cultural Landscape and  
Natural Heritage  
Kammerhofska 26, Banska Stiavnica

**SOUTH AFRICA / AFRIQUE DU SUD**

Ms Juanita PASTOR-MAKHURANE  
Heritage Resources Manager  
Robben Island Museum, Robben Island, 7400

Mr Karl NAUDE  
Assistant Director, Biodiversity Management  
Dept. of Environmental Affairs and Tourism  
P/Bag 441 Pretoria

Mr Devandhran MOODLEY  
Permanent Delegation of South Africa to UNESCO  
Embassy of South Africa  
59 Quai d'Orsay, 75007 Paris

Mr MAKGOLO  
Acting Deputy Director, Cultural Resources  
Management  
Dept. of Environmental Affairs and Tourism  
P.O. Box 447, Pretoria 0001

Dr Stephen TIBA  
Chief Director  
Biodiversity and Heritage  
Dept. of Environmental Affairs and Tourism  
Private Bag 447, Pretoria

**SPAIN / ESPAGNE**

H.E. D. Jesús EZQUERRA  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Spain to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

D. Antonio NUÑEZ GARCIA-SAUCO  
Director General de Relaciones Culturales  
Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores

D. Luis LAFUENTE BATANERO  
Subdirector General Protección Patrimonio Histórico  
Dirección General Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales

D. Alberto RUIZ DEL PORTAL  
Director de Parques Nacionales  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente

D. Pablo BENAVIDES  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Spain to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

D. Jesús CASAS  
Dirección de Parques Nacionales  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente

Da Mónica FERNANDEZ MUÑOZ  
Jefa Servicio Inventario  
Subdirección General Protección Patrimonio  
Histórico

Dra. Clara BARREIDO  
Consejera de Educación y Cultura, Delegación  
Permanente de España

Mr Juan Carlos RODRIGUEZ ACOSTA  
Vicerrector de Cultura  
Universidad de las Palmas de Graw Canaris  
Juan de Quesada 30, 35001 Las Palmas de Graw  
Canaris

**SWEDEN / SUEDE**

Ms Birgitta HOBERG  
Senior International Officer  
National Heritage Board  
P.O. Box 5405, 11484 Stockholm

Mr Lars WILSON  
Head, Division for Cultural Heritage  
Ministry of Culture  
SE-103 33 Stockholm

Mr Rolf LÖFGREN  
Swedish Environmental Protection Agency

Mr Jan LUNDQVIST  
Expert, Country Administration of the Province of  
Västernorrland

Mr Jan TURTINEN  
Expert, University of Stockholm  
Score SE-10691 Stockholm

**SWITZERLAND / SUISSE**

S. Exc. Mme Sylvie MATTEUCCI  
Ambassadeur  
Délégation permanente de la Suisse auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Nicole WYRSCH  
Conseiller (Education, Science et Culture)  
Délégation permanente de la Suisse auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

**THAILAND / THAÏLANDE**

Prof. Dr. Adul WICHICHAROEN  
Chairman, National Committee for Protection of  
World Cultural and Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Pibunwattana, Rama 6 Road, Bangkok 10400

Mr Manit SIRIWAN  
Secretary, National Commission on the Protection of  
the World Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Pibunwattana, Rama 6 Road, Bangkok 10400

Mrs Siriporn NANTA  
Assistant Secretary, National Committee for  
Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Pibunwattana, Rama 6 Road, Bangkok 10400

**TUNISIA / TUNISIE**

Ms Dhouha BOUKHRIS  
Délégué permanent adjoint de la Tunisie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

M. Jamel THLIBI  
Directeur  
Agence nationale de Protection Environnement  
B.P. 52 Tunis-Belvédère

**TURKEY / TURQUIE**

M. Muzaffer ADALI  
Chercheur  
12 rue du Bac, 75007 Paris

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA /  
REPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE**

Mr Mohammed S. SHEYA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of the United Republic  
of Tanzania to UNESCO  
13 Avenue Raymond Poincaré, 75116 Paris

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Mr Nigel PITTMAN  
Dept. for Culture, Media and Sport  
2-4 Cocurpur St. London SW1Y 5DH, U.K.

Mr Christopher YOUNG  
Director for Hadrian's Wall  
English Heritage, Abbey Gate House, Market St.  
Hewham, Northumberland, England NEU6 3LJ

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA /  
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE**

Ms Karen KOVACS  
Counselor to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and  
Wildlife Parks  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C. Str., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20240, U.S.A.

Mr John J. REYNOLDS  
Regional Director  
Pacific West Region  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
San Francisco

Mr William W. McILHENNY  
United States Observer to UNESCO  
United States Embassy  
2 Avenue Gabriel, Paris

Mr James H. CHARLETON  
International Cooperation Specialist  
Office of the International Affairs  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C. Str., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20240

**VENEZUELA**

Mr Hiram GAVIRIA  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Ms Clarelena AGOSTINI  
Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15



Ms Cristiane ENGELBRECHT  
 Second Secretary  
 Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO  
 1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris Cedex 15

Ing. Jorge ROMERO  
 Director General  
 Sectorial de Parques Nacionales

Lic. Jaqueline MENDOZA  
 Directora de la Oficina de Desarrollo Profesional y  
 Relaciones Internacionales

## ZIMBABWE

Mr Dawson MUNJERI  
 Executive Director  
 National Museums and Monuments  
 Box CY 1485 Causeway, Harare

## (ii) UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS

### UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Mr Andrew PARSONS  
 United Nations Environment Programme  
 Tour Mirabeau -- 39-43 quai André Citroén  
 75739 Paris Cedex 15

## (iii) NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES

### FRIENDS OF THE EARTH (FOE)

Mr Ben OQUIST  
 Friends of the Earth  
 P.O. Box A474 Sydney South 1235  
 53 rue Ramus, 75020 Paris

Mr Lincoln SILIAKUS  
 Friends of the Earth  
 121 rue de Rennes, 75006 Paris

### WORLD ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONGRESS

Prof. Rob LAYTON  
 The World Archaeological Congress  
 Anthropology Dept., University of Dunham  
 43 Old Elvet, Dunham DH1 3HN, U.K.

### AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

Mr Dave SWEENEY  
 Australian Conservation Foundation  
 340 Gore Street, Fitzroy,  
 Victoria 3065 Australia

### GREENPEACE

Mr Rob GUETERBOCK  
 Campaigner, Greenpeace UK  
 Canonbury Villas, London N1 2PN  
 United Kingdom

Mr Simon REDDY  
 Greenpeace International  
 Keizergradht 176, 1016 DW, Amsterdam,  
 Netherlands

### GUNDJEHMI ABORIGINAL CORPORATION

Ms Jacqueline KATENA  
 Executive Officer  
 Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation  
 PO Box 245 Jabiru NT 0886 Australia

Mr Mathew FAGAN  
 Legal Policy Officer  
 Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation  
 PO Box 245 Jabiru NT 0886 Australia

### THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr Alec MARR  
 National Campaign Director  
 The Wilderness Society  
 130 Davey St. Hobart Tasmania, Australia 7000

Ms Christine MILNE  
The Wilderness Society  
130 Davey St. Hobart Tasmania, Australia 7000

**SIERRA CLUB**

Mr Stephen MILLS  
Director, International Program  
Sierra Club  
408 C Street, NE Washington, D.C. 20002 USA

**SURVIVAL INTERNATIONAL**

M. Jean-Patrick RAZON  
Directeur  
Survival International (France)  
45 rue du Faubourg du Temple, 75010 Paris, France

Melle Sara FEUERSTEIN  
Chargée de la Communication  
Survival International (France)  
45 rue du Faubourg du Temple, 75010 Paris, France

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL WELFARE**

Mr Hemmo Jan MINTINSH  
Senior Policy Consultant  
Habitat for Animals Program, International Fund for  
Animal Welfare  
13 rue Boduogrant, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

**(iv) NON PROFIT-MAKING INSTITUTION**

**NAMGYAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

Ms Amita BAIG  
Heritage Manager Consultant  
Namgyal Research Institute  
8 A Hauz Khas, New Delhi, India

**AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT**

Mr Justin O'BRIEN  
Representative of the Australian Democrats  
Level 1, Wellington Parade, East Melbourne 3002  
Australia

**UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION**

Mr Nicholas LAPHAM  
Program officer for Environment , United Nations  
Foundation  
1301 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036 USA

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE /  
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL POUR LA  
SCIENCE**

Prof. Brian WILKINSON  
Leader of Independent Scientific Panel (Kakadu)  
International Council for Science  
Conseil International des Unions  
51 Bd de Montmorency  
75016 Paris

Ms Anne LARIGAUDERIE  
International Council for Science  
Conseil International des Unions  
51 Bd de Montmorency  
75016 Paris

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Mr John RISHEL  
Congressional Staff  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1413 A Longworth Hob, Washington, D.C. 20515  
U.S.A.

Mr Kurt CHRISTENSEN  
Professional Staff  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Lhob, Washington D.C., 20515, U.S.A.

(v) **NGO OR NON PROFIT MAKING INSTITUTIONS WHICH WERE NOT AUTHORIZED TO PARTICIPATE AS OBSERVERS**

**WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL MEDIA GROUP  
Inc.**

Ms Joan VEON  
Executive Director  
The Women's International Media Group Inc.  
P.O. Box 77, Middletown MD 21769, U.S.A.

**IV. UNESCO SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO**

Mr M. IACCARINO  
Assistant Director-General , Science Sector

**World Heritage Centre / Centre du patrimoine mondial**

Mr Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Director

Mr Georges ZOUAIN  
Deputy Director

Ms Minja YANG  
Director, Asia/Pacific Region

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO

Mr Peter STRASSER

Ms Marianne RAABE

Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN

Ms Vesna VUJICIC-LUGASSY

Mr David MARTEL

Mr Herman van HOOFF

Mr Feng JING

Ms Claire SERVOZ

Ms Elizabeth WANGARI

Mr Stéphane DUCLOT

Ms Marie-Christine BOTTE

Ms Mechtild ROSSLER

Ms Joanna SULLIVAN

Ms Réjane HERVE

Ms Sarah TITCHEN

Mr Peter STOTT

Ms Laeticia MAUCOURANT

Ms Josette ERFAN

Ms Jane DEGEORGES

Ms Vittoria FRESCO

Ms Junko TANIGUCHI

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU

**Bureau for Coordination of Environmental Programme / Bureau de Coordination du Programme d'Environnement**

Mr Thomas SCHAAF

**Division of Ecological Sciences / Division des Sciences Ecologiques**

M BRIDGEWATER, Director a.i.

Ms J. ROBERTSON

Ms M. JARDIN

M. Sami MANKOTO

**Division of Cultural Heritage / Division du Patrimoine culturel**

M L. LEVI-STRAUSS

**UNESCO Office / Bureau de l'UNESCO**

M. Celso Salatino SCHENKEL  
Bureau de l'UNESCO  
SAS Q5 L6 11<sup>e</sup> étage, CEP 70775-100  
Brasilia - Brésil



## Speech of the Assistant Director-General of Natural Sciences for UNESCO

Ambassador Matsuura, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Your Excellencies, Members of the Bureau and Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

It is a great honour and a pleasure for me to open the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee on behalf of the Director-General.

The growing international interest and support for the World Heritage Convention is witnessed year after year by the increasing number of participants who come from all regions of the world as part of the Member and Observer Delegations to the annual Committee sessions, as well as to the Bureau sessions held twice a year.

Requests to observe these sessions also abound from elected Members of the Parliament, of local authorities, and representatives of non-governmental organizations and community-based organizations.

This can only be an indication that concerns over our environment, both natural and built, have now spread beyond the confines of governmental institutions and out into the streets. Citizens around the world are now, more than ever, aware that a threat to the environment in one corner of the earth is a threat to us all.

The globalisation of the world economy through the interdependence of its components have made it all the more necessary that those who struggle to conserve the environment also unite to ensure that the efforts at the local and national levels are strengthened by the support of other nations and their citizens. In this regard, the World Heritage Convention provides a formidable mechanism of international solidarity.

Today, with 156 States Parties to the Convention, and close to 600 World Heritage sites, I believe that the authority and power of our Convention has grown far beyond the limits imagined by the founders of the Convention. But *helas*, it remains woefully inadequate.

Members of the Bureau, you have before you a heavy agenda. With some 80 state of conservation reports to examine and over 70 new nominations to evaluate for the decision of the Committee later this year, the responsibilities in your hands are greater than ever before. Behind the words summarizing each case, assiduously prepared by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, that make up the voluminous documents that have reached you through the internet and mail,

are years, if not decades of work of individuals and institutions committed to the cause of conservation.

You are here, gathered today, at the pinnacle of this effort. But far from being an end, it is an important part of the World Heritage conservation process to protect the heritage of outstanding universal value. The examples that are set by your work will also serve to protect many other sites of national and local value, equally important to humankind.

On behalf of the Director-General, allow me to reiterate his personal commitment and that of UNESCO, to further strengthen our efforts to serve the Committee and through it, the States Parties and their citizens in the vital work to ensure the protection of the world's cultural and natural diversity. The Director-General has asked me to convey his deep gratitude to you, the Members of the Bureau, for having worked closely with the Secretariat in preparing the work of the Committee and the General Assembly. In this regard, he hopes that the on-going effort by the Committee to guide the Secretariat in optimizing its effectiveness and those of the statutory organs of the Convention will continue.

These months leading to this Bureau session have been particularly difficult for the Secretariat in dealing with the multitude of tasks entrusted to us by the Committee, and in meeting the growing demands from conservation groups and the general public. The transition phase after the retirement of Mr Bernd von Droste and the arrival of Mr Mounir Bouchenaki as Director of the World Heritage Centre, I am sure you will agree, has been smooth. And this has been in large part thanks to the excellent leadership provided over the past months by His Excellency Ambassador Matsuura, as Chairperson to the Committee.

Finally, permit me to conclude by transmitting the Director-General's best wishes to you in the deliberation of the tasks before you.

Thank you.



### Statement by Australia on the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area

- The Great Barrier Reef is a massive and complex property. It is bigger than the Italian peninsula and only slightly smaller than Japan.
- It has a full range of IUCN categories – it is a multiple use area, not just IUCN categories I and II.
- The IUCN report identifies a number of issues which have the potential to impact in the long-term in parts of the GBR World Heritage Area. It also highlights concerns about the possible long term impact of climate change. It does not suggest that any of these issues mean the GBRWHA is currently ‘in danger’.
- Australia is already addressing all of the points raised by IUCN:
- *To meet the emerging challenges in the GBRWHA, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority was restructured by the Government in 1998 to more specifically address the four most critical issues in the Marine Park: namely, fisheries; tourism and recreation; water quality and coastal development; and the maintenance of conservation, biodiversity and World Heritage values.*
- a Representative Areas Program was commenced in 1996 to review the identification and distribution of broad-scale habitats occurring in the GBRWHA (refer to the ‘Overview’ document). This program aims to ensure that representative areas of all broad scale habitats/communities are identified for highly protected categories (IUCN I or II) by the end of 2000. I would point out the extent of IUCN category I & II areas alone in the GBRWHA cover 15,000 sq km (this alone is bigger than most other Marine Protected Areas anywhere in the world!).
- The report makes 29 recommendations – most of which can be supported by the Australian Government in full or in substantial part.
- There must be a real question for the Committee whether a report of this complexity and with a long list of detailed recommendations puts it more in the position of a manager than a high level policy body.
- We therefore agree with IUCN there are advantages in further consultation between IUCN and Australia to see if these recommendations can be simplified and consolidated.

It is important that monitoring reports produced for the World Heritage Bureau and Committee are carefully coordinated with GBRMPA’s five-yearly State of the Reef Report as well as its other monitoring programs. As much as it is possible we should only be asking the Authority to collect and publish information once to meet its reporting obligations, domestic and international on the state of the Reef.





## STATEMENT OF MEXICO REGARDING THE SANCTUARY OF EL VIZCAINO

The Government of Mexico is grateful to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee for the opportunity to update information on the Vizcaino Sanctuary.

First of all, the Government of Mexico wishes to reaffirm its political will to comply fully with its obligations as Party to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

Second, I wish to report that, pursuant to the decisions adopted at the Meeting of the Bureau in Kyoto, on December 1998, the Government of Mexico has invited the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to send a Mission to assess the state of conservation of the "Ojo de Liebre" and "San Ignacio" lagoons, located in the Vizcaino Biosphere Reserve.

In this regard, the Government of Mexico reiterates its willingness to receive the UNESCO Mission as soon as possible and, consequently, takes this opportunity to present:

- A third proposal of dates for conducting the mission.
- Mexico's consent with the proposal of experts designated by the World Heritage Centre.
- The Mexican experts who will join the Mission.
- The Mission's programme, in accordance already agreed terms of reference.

On behalf of my Government, I also wish to clarify two specific points regarding the Mission:

- Its mandate should be the one agreed at the Kyoto Meeting.
- The Mission's recommendations should be based on the best available scientific evidence.

In the other hand, while the Government of Mexico recognize the importance of transparency and full participation of all stakeholders, we are also convinced that the treatment of this cases should be govern by the principles and criteria of the Convention. Therefore the case of El Vizcaino should not be judged through political or emotional arguments nor through a media debate.

The Government of Mexico considers that the Mission's efforts should be aimed at determining whether the fundamental values of the Site have changed, as a result of current problems, and, as appropriate, to demonstrate on scientific basis any potential threats.

Since the Bureau Meeting held in Kyoto, the Government of Mexico has provided the World Heritage Centre with reports on the Site's state of conservation in view of the comments made by the Centre's scientific advisory body. This additional information has not been reflected in the report to the Bureau as part of the new developments related to the case.

Mexico's reports broadly reflect the extensive scientific investigations that various national and international research institutions have been conducting for several

decades. As specified in the agreed terms of reference for the Mission, these researches could be reviewed.

While the Mission is in Mexico, we hope to have the opportunity to review the scientific evidence that substantiates the reports that several organizations and individuals have sent to the Centre and to IUCN.

Meanwhile, it should once again be noted that this year the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission has recognized that the Northwest Pacific gray whale population continues to grow, based on evidences provided by institutions and researchers of Mexico and other countries.

Finally, the comments formulated by the Government of Mexico at the Kyoto Meeting remain valid. In this regard, we wish to reiterate the following remarks:

- The Government of Mexico has neither authorized, nor evaluating at this time any project to establish salt production facility at Laguna San Ignacio. Consequently, the indications of actual problems at the site are groundless.
- Compliance with Mexican legislation, as well as with the environmental and socio-economic criteria established by the International Committee of Experts of member countries of the International Whaling Commission is a prerequisite that must be fulfilled by any project that is to be carried out at the Site, or to be submitted in the future to the pertinent national competent authority.
- Salt production in areas adjacent to the Site included on the World Heritage List is subject to national regulations that are being fully enforced. The company has been audited in 1996, and as result of such process 150 corrective measures have been applied. Meanwhile, my Government considers that it is inappropriate that the scientific advisory body evaluates compliance of the Mexican regulations, as it exceeds its authority.
- The Government of Mexico is conducting a thorough investigation of the sea turtle deaths recorded in 1997 and, until that investigation has been concluded, it is premature to attribute them to causes not based on science.
- There has not been new human settlements in El Vizcaino .



**VENEZUELAN POSITION REGARDING THE UNESCO- IUCN EXPERT  
MISSION TO EVALUATE THE CANAIMA NATIONAL PARK SITUATION  
AS A SITE ON THE WORLD NATURAL HERITAGE LIST**

**Paris, France, 5 July 1999**

On behalf of the Minister of Environment and Natural Resources and of the President of the National Institute of Parks of Venezuela, we would like to thank UNESCO's World Heritage Centre for the opportunity to express our opinion concerning Canaima National Park, without doubt one of the most important sites of World Natural Heritage due to its exceptional universal values.

**Our participation in this meeting is an authentic demonstration of the Venezuelan Government's interest in maintaining the entire National Park as a World Natural Heritage site. We are aware of the necessity of reinforcing our environmental monitoring and actions with the help of the Pemon community, native inhabitants of these valuable lands which every day face the threat of various types of economical interests.**

**For this reason** the new administration of the Ministry of Environment has outlined as a fundamental objective, the reclaiming of control over Venezuela's environment, in order to guarantee the preservation of the said environment and of natural resources for present and future generations. This governmental action will be enforced in all our protected natural areas, especially in those where native communities are settled.

**The UNESCO - IUCN mission that visited our country last May noted in its report our position - which we share with the representatives of the Gran Sabana native community, with non governmental environmental organizations, with the Venezuelan Congress and with the members of the IUCN national committee - to maintain Canaima National Park as a World Heritage site, exactly as it was initially included on the World Heritage List in 1994.**

**The mission stated that Canaima is and continues to be a site worthy of being declared a Natural World Heritage site. Therefore,** we do not believe it to be necessary to redefine its border or to take any other measure that could diminish its status or position on the World Heritage List. We do agree with the UNESCO mission to immediately create an action plan to solve the problems observed in Canaima.

It is important to point out the actions that have already been implemented in Venezuela to restrain and monitor mining and forestry activities close to the Park in the Imataca Forest Reserve. **We will establish a buffer zone in the Lema Sierra,** which will

constitute an extension of the entire protected zone of the Northern border of the Canaima National Park.

On the other hand, measures of surveillance **will be reinforced on the Southern border of the protected zone. We will study at the same time the possibility of including the "tepuyes" in the Eastern region on the Natural World Heritage List, as well as to put the "humedales" on the Ramsar site list, located on the left borderline of "troncal" 10, outside of the Eastern border of the Park.**

Concerning the electrical line, we agree with the mission's conclusion that it is not compatible with the image of a National Park. Ideally it should not have been built anywhere within the Park. However, it is necessary to recognize that it was built with the minimum possible impact on nature. It is important to mention that the competent bodies of the Ministry of Environment are consulting at present with the native communities and with the parties involved with the electrical line problem in order to correct technical details and to define measures to curb the resulting social and environmental impacts.

We welcome the mission's recommendations but wish to stress that the problems observed in Canaima can be found in any other National Park in the world. These problems do not justify in any way its inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. With the firm intention of preserving this site for present and future generations, **we request technical and financial support from UNESCO to hold an international workshop in Canaima to make the Pemon native community and the other involved parties aware of the action plan recommended by the UNESCO - IUCN mission.**

Finally, we reaffirm the exceptional universal values that distinguish Canaima National Park as a World Heritage site for Humanity. We wish to thank again the UNESCO World Heritage Centre for this opportunity and particularly to thank the UNESCO – IUCN experts, Mr. Rosabal and Mr. Oliveira, who visited us recently.



## Statement by the Australian Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Senator the Hon Robert Hill to the World Heritage Bureau, UNESCO. Paris, July 7, 1999

Mr Chairman

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Bureau on an issue, which is important not only for Australia, but also for the further development of the World Heritage Convention.

I take the opportunity to reaffirm Australia's support for the principles espoused in the World Heritage Convention.

Australia remains, however, resolutely opposed to the listing of the Kakadu World Heritage Area on the "in danger" list.

We do so on two grounds.

Firstly, the facts, when presented free of the emotion which has surrounded this issue to date, simply do not support such a listing.

They indicate, in fact, that Australia has set in place a system of management and protective measures for Kakadu which represents world's best practice.

Secondly, Australia has said consistently that the Committee cannot list a property against the objections of a Member State. This has been confirmed by independent legal advice.

### **KAKADU HISTORY**

Kakadu is an issue which the Committee has addressed on three separate occasions dating back to 1981

The original inscription of Kakadu in 1981 was made with the knowledge that there were three separate, clearly defined uranium mining leases, one of which was Jabiluka.

The Committee revisited the issue in 1987 and 1992 as Stages II and III of the Kakadu National Park were assessed and accorded world heritage status.

These additional inscriptions were made at a time when the Committee had had several years to assess any impact of the Ranger uranium mine which had been operational since 1981.

Ranger, a large open cut uranium mine, has now been operational for more than 18 years. It is the most intensively monitored uranium mine in the world.

The independent office of the Supervising Scientist has advised that the Ranger Mine has had no adverse environmental impact on Kakadu National Park.

It would be directly inconsistent with the Committee's previous decisions to now rule that an underground mine

with a significantly smaller physical impact than Ranger could be considered a threat to world heritage values.

Under the preferred Jabiluka option, the mine would cover less than one square kilometre while the Park itself stretches over almost 20,000 square kilometres.

It has undergone a rigorous and transparent environmental assessment process lasting almost three years.

The monitoring systems and regulatory measures put in place for the operation of Jabiluka have drawn on the 18 years experience at Ranger.

The volumes of evidence from the operation of Ranger along with the additional information provided by Australia in response to the Committee's concerns about Jabiluka should give the Committee every confidence that the world heritage values of Kakadu will be managed and protected in a manner consistent with the Convention and consistent with world's best practice.

For the Committee to hold otherwise would be, in effect, to change the rules after nearly 20 years in a manner which is grossly unfair to the State party - Australia.

### **CULTURAL ISSUES**

Australia has also been a sensitive manager of the cultural values of Kakadu.

All recognised indigenous sacred sites on the Jabiluka lease will be protected under Australian law.

Australia recognises there is some disagreement, including disagreement between relevant indigenous communities, over the extent and significance of certain sites. These sites are not in the world heritage area.

Even so, Australia is committed to developing a comprehensive cultural management plan for the Jabiluka lease and is seeking the cooperation of the traditional owners.

Under Australian law, mining on indigenous land in the Northern Territory is prohibited without the consent of the traditional owners. This right is not available to non-indigenous Australians, reflecting a recognition of the special link between indigenous Australians and their land.

In this instance, the Mirrar, along with other affected Aboriginals, gave their informed consent to mining on the Jabiluka lease in 1982. This was reiterated in 1991. The current senior traditional owner does not support mining. However the regional Aboriginal body upholds the legitimacy of the agreement.

Australia is also conscious that there is a wide range of views among traditional owners of Kakadu on the issue of mining. The Mirrar are the traditional owners of less than five per cent of Kakadu National Park in addition to the Jabiluka lease. The traditional owners of the other 95% of Kakadu have not indicated support for the "in danger" listing, and many of them support mining for the economic, cultural and social benefits it can deliver.

Australia, and the Committee, must consider the hopes and aspirations of all traditional owners living within Kakadu National Park.

### **AUSTRALIA'S RECORD**

Against this background, Australia has demonstrated a level of commitment to the World Heritage Convention that is second to none.

For example

- Australia was one of the first nations to ratify the Convention.
- Australia is the only nation in the world with domestic legislation that specifically implements the Convention.
- No country in the world has more natural sites on the World Heritage List than Australia.
- We have management plans in place or under preparation for all our World Heritage properties
- Australia spends more than \$50 million each year on our World Heritage properties (in addition to the amount spent by provincial governments).

We are particularly proud of our record in protecting Kakadu National Park.

We have established and maintained an innovative joint management arrangement with the traditional owners of the Park.

We are successfully protecting an area of 20, 000 square kilometres - an area nearly twice the size of Lebanon.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Jabiluka lease is outside of Kakadu National Park and was specifically excluded for the purposes of uranium mining, Australia would never have approved the new mine without being absolutely satisfied that it would not threaten a park we regard as a national treasure.

In order to be certain that Kakadu will not be damaged, we have imposed the world's most stringent and rigorous regulatory and monitoring regime. The regime is enforced by two levels of government - the national government and the government of the Northern Territory.

The Northern Territory Deputy Chief Minister is here today to reinforce the commitment from both levels of government to strictly enforce that regime.

### **ADDITIONAL MEASURES**

Australian governments at both national and provincial levels have the greatest confidence in our environment protection measures. We have, nevertheless, sought to respond in good faith to the issues raised by the Mission to Kakadu and subsequently by the ICSU and advisory bodies to the Committee.

Australia prepared a detailed response to the Mission report and through the Supervising Scientist we have undertaken further scientific analysis to refine environmental requirements and provide an even greater degree of certainty that Kakadu National Park is under no threat.

Having listened carefully to the comments from other state parties. Australia has also developed further assurances on the environmental, social and cultural issues which we will put to the Committee for its consideration.

These measures will:

- Enhance the existing environmental protection regime governing Jabiluka and Kakadu;
- Address the social and economic conditions of the Aboriginal communities living in Kakadu; and
- Provide additional assurance that the cultural values of the Park - including those of the Mirrar - are protected.

In addition, in consultation with ERA, the company which holds the Jabiluka lease, we will be responding to the expressed concerns of some Committee members about the potential impact on the natural values of the Park if both the existing mine at Ranger and the new mine at Jabiluka were in full commercial production at the same time. I can say now that this will not occur.

We would be prepared to respond constructively to any further reasonable requests that the Committee may put forward in discharging its duty.

### **CONCLUSION**

In summary, Australia has always been and remains firmly committed to the World Heritage Convention. We have addressed the issues raised in relation to Kakadu National Park in good faith.

We believe that Kakadu is securely protected and that there is no basis for listing it as "in danger". We urge the Bureau and the Committee to recognise the efforts Australia has made to protect Kakadu and to respect the provisions of the Convention which would prevent an "in danger" listing in the absence of Australia's consent.

We look forward to concluding this issue next Monday in a way which promotes the cooperation amongst parties on which the Convention is based.

## JOINT ICCROM, ICOMOS AND IUCN STATEMENT KAKADU NATIONAL PARK, AUSTRALIA

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
Twenty-third session

Mr Chairman

ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN thank you and the members of the Bureau for the opportunity to highlight a number of key issues concerning ascertained and potential dangers posed to Kakadu National Park by the Jabiluka mine.

We are of course aware of the political dimensions of this issue. However these factors lie outside of our mandate and competence. They underline however that when issues have a sharp political dimension, it is especially important to be objective and to ensure that the provisions and standards of the Convention are closely adhered to, so that procedural fairness and the expectations of the Contracting Parties, and the peoples they represent, may be achieved.

In light of this mandate the three advisory bodies believe it is also important to highlight the Committee's own guidelines for inclusion of cultural and natural properties in the list of World Heritage in Danger. Specifically:

- Cultural properties are held to face an Ascertained Danger when the property is faced with specific and proven imminent danger, such as .... Important loss of cultural significance.
- Cultural properties are held to face potential danger when the property is faced with threats which could have deleterious effect on its inherent characteristics.
- Natural properties are held to face an ascertained danger when the property is faced with specific and proven imminent danger, such as ... severe deterioration of the natural beauty or scientific value of the property, as by human settlement, ..... Industrial and agricultural development .... major public works, mining etc.
- Natural properties are held to face potential danger when the property is faced with major threats which could have deleterious effects on its inherent characteristics. Such threats include ... planned development projects within the property or so situated that the impacts threaten the property.

We reiterate that the World Heritage Mission to Kakadu believed these guidelines to have been met and noted "severe ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of Kakadu National

Park posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka". The Mission therefore recommended: "that the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed."

At its 22<sup>nd</sup> Session in Kyoto in November 1998, the World Heritage Committee "recognised the report of the mission to Kakadu National Park as being both thorough and credible

In reviewing the response of the Australian Government concerning the mitigation of threats posing ascertained and potential dangers to Kakadu National Park by the Jabiluka mine, we have sought to assess whether this response removes the concerns identified by the Mission and confirmed by the Committee relating to the ascertained and potential dangers to the site.

The concerns expressed by the Mission and recognised by the Committee at its 22<sup>nd</sup> Session focused upon three principal issues. These can be summarised as concerns over:

- (i) scientific uncertainties and the application of the Precautionary Principle (Recommendation 2);
- (ii) visual encroachment on the integrity of Kakadu National Park (Recommendation 3);
- (iii) a series of threats to the cultural values of the Park (Recommendations 4,5,6,7 and 8).

ICOMOS and ICCROM will focus on the threats to the cultural values. IUCN will therefore address the concerns for the natural values.

### 1. Scientific Uncertainties and the Precautionary Principle.

IUCN welcomes the report of the Australian Supervising Scientist Group which we believe responds to a number of the concerns identified by the World Heritage Mission. However we are concerned that this report confirms the existence of uncertainties despite the extensive process of EIA including the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Public Environmental Review (PER), that has been pursued in approving the Jabiluka mine project and allowing excavation of the mine decline to proceed over the course of the past year. Specifically the review of areas of scientific uncertainty by the Supervising Scientist has both identified "areas for improvement in the hydrological model" and highlighted issues that need to be

addressed in the “detailed design” of the water management system for Jabiluka. In other words, weaknesses in the mine design were recognised only following international review by the World Heritage Mission. Further the final design of the mine is not yet available, including for issues of major concern, notably the water retention system and disposal of tailings. While it may be argued that this level of uncertainty is normal in mine design, it is IUCN’s view that it is of serious concern for a mine physically located within the boundaries of a World Heritage site. We therefore believe that the potential threat to the natural values of Kakadu as identified by the World Heritage Mission remains.

## 2. Visual Encroachment.

In its response to the World Heritage Mission the Government of Australia expressed its view that the evidence did not substantiate the “case for visual encroachment as a significant issue or as a threat”. Having considered the arguments given for this response IUCN has reaffirmed its support for the view of the World Heritage Mission that the Jabiluka mine site “is readily visible from the air from where visitors making overflights are especially well able to appreciate the sweeping landscapes for which Kakadu was inscribed on the World Heritage List and is famous”. The Mission Report also argued that “the visual impact of Jabiluka, 22km north of Ranger and Jabiru, is a distinct and significant additional impact” and concluded that the visual impact of the Jabiluka mine constitutes “an ascertained danger for the natural World Heritage values of Kakadu in that it constitutes a deterioration of the natural beauty or scientific value of the property”.

Indeed these concerns have been strengthened by the report of the Supervising Scientist that recommends increasing the capacity of the retention pond at Jabiluka, an increase that has been estimated as being of the order of 50%. Similarly the 20km road has not yet been constructed, but will if the project proceeds. Both would aggravate the visual encroachment which we consider to already be severe.

In conclusion IUCN believes that Jabiluka does indeed constitute a significant additional impact on the visual integrity of the sweeping landscapes for which the Park is rightly recognised as being of universal natural value.



## Statement read by the representative of ICOMOS

L'ICOMOS a étudié avec attention les réponses circonstanciées du Gouvernement du Commonwealth d'Australie aux graves préoccupations exprimées à Kyoto, en particulier quant au respect des valeurs culturelles du Parc national du Kakadu. En dépit des importantes précisions apportées, l'ICOMOS considère que restent pertinentes la plupart des recommandations formulées par le Rapport de la mission UNESCO de 1998 et ses propres prises de position quant aux dangers réels et potentiels d'une exploitation minière sur le site de Jabiluka justifiant l'inscription du Parc national de Kakadu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger.

Trois considérations majeures fondent, entre autres, cette conviction:

### 1. L'impact physique et symbolique de l'exploitation minière sur le patrimoine culturel.

Nul ne conteste le fait que l'enclave minière dans le site du patrimoine mondial renferme des lieux sacrés pour la population aborigène de la région ni l'importance spirituelle du site du Boiwek-Almudj et des pistes du "Dreaming" qui y sont associées. L'ICOMOS est persuadé que les opérations minières dans le sous-sol de cette zone de grande signification spirituelle pour le peuple Mirrar entraîneraient des dommages irréparables, à la fois tangibles et non tangibles, en violation des principes généraux de la conservation du patrimoine et, en particulier, du prescrit de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

### 2. La relation de l'enclave minière avec les valeurs culturelles du site inscrit sur la Liste.

Les lieux sacrés situés dans l'enclave font partie d'un réseau bien plus étendu de sites d'importance spirituelle et de sentiers de "Dreaming" qui couvrent toute la région en une seule et même entité culturelle. Depuis la dernière extension du site, le cadre conceptuel de la Convention s'est enrichi du concept de paysage culturel qui, au titre de "paysage évolutif", caractérise le Parc national de Kakadu en tant que témoignage exceptionnel d'une tradition culturelle et d'une civilisation vivante. Aux yeux de l'ICOMOS, toutes dégradations importantes de ces sites sacrés, qu'elles soient physiques ou symboliques, à l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur du site inscrit, doivent être considérées comme une atteinte à l'intégrité du paysage culturel du Parc national de Kakadu dans son ensemble.

### 3. Les droits des propriétaires traditionnels.

Une occupation traditionnelle du site par la population aborigène depuis plus de 50.000 ans fonde la légitimité des relations particulières des Mirrar avec leurs terres, relations que reconnaît d'ailleurs le droit australien. Au-delà de droits fonciers ou coutumiers, une forme de droits culturels fondamentaux requiert leur participation aux décisions qui les concernent. L'ICOMOS considère qu'une reconnaissance effective des droits des propriétaires traditionnels est nécessaire pour que soient prises en compte les valeurs singulières dont ils assument l'héritage et qui sont inhérentes aux qualités culturelles du site. Comme le recommandait déjà le rapport de la mission UNESCO de 1998, il est impératif de restaurer la confiance et la communication et d'inviter instamment tous les partenaires concernés, autochtones ou non autochtones, à s'engager dans un dialogue interculturel pour assurer la conservation des valeurs patrimoniales exceptionnelles de Kakadu pour les générations futures.

## Statement read by the representative of ICCROM

ICCROM has thus far focussed its attention on process and the necessary elements for objective analysis of the issues involved. ICCROM recognizes that objectivity in assessing cultural values and the impact of proposed actions on cultural values involves close attention to those for whom the values hold most meaning. In this context, the Preamble to the WHC's 1998 mission report emphasized the fundamental importance of "ensuring thorough and continuing participation, negotiation and communication with Aboriginal traditional owners.....in the conservation of the outstanding universal values of Kakadu for future generations."

The Mirrar people are legally the undisputed traditional owners and custodians of the Jabiluka area and hence are the undisputed spokespeople for the outstanding universal cultural associations cited under criterion (vi) of the Operational Guidelines. In this, they share with the Australian government the weight of responsibility for the conservation of the cultural values in this part of Kakadu.

*Australia's Kakadu*, the Australian Government's report of April 15, 1999, does not claim that the Government has fulfilled the WHC mission's above request for ensuring thorough and continuing dialogue with the traditional owners. The Mirrar, as traditional owners, continue to voice their strong belief that the cultural values of Kakadu are threatened by site works at Jabiluka.

We cannot dismiss these voices as coming from a negligibly small group of indigenous owners. The Mirrar, through the oral transmission of their traditions, beliefs and values, bear witness to a rare strand of human memory, unbroken for some 50,000 years. Indeed we believe that the Committee holds a responsibility to protect the vulnerable link between the Mirrar people and the land which has nourished them physically and spiritually for so long. Their claim, that the current site operations, particularly in the sacred Boyweg-Almudj area, are destroying the very fabric of their culture, deserves the most serious attention of the Committee.

ICCROM is of the opinion accordingly, that the outstanding cultural values of Kakadu National Park are, at this moment of time, in danger from ascertained and potential threats and that the site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.

In addition the results of the studies of the impact of dust and vibration from site works on significant rock art and archaeological sites are not yet available. With respect to these potential threats, ICCROM is therefore not in possession of evidence to discount the impact of these threats. Accordingly, in the terms of

the Convention, ICCROM must state that the existence of these potential threats also serves to warrant inscription of Kakadu on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The justification for inscription stated, ICCROM remains uncomfortable with the heavily polarized nature of this debate. In such a debate, which ends without reconciliation, the real loser is the World Heritage Convention and its moral power, as a unifying force for humanity. For that reason, inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in Danger should be accompanied by strenuous efforts to support dialogue between the Government of Australia, the Mirrar people and other key stakeholders, in order to foster approaches to site use which can meet their respective interests.

In conclusion Mr Chairman, and speaking now on behalf of the 3 advisory bodies (ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN), having reviewed the response of the Australian Government concerning the mitigation of threats posing ascertained and potential dangers to Kakadu National Park, we agree unanimously that the concerns identified by the World Heritage Mission and confirmed by the Committee remain. We therefore believe that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu on the List of World Heritage in Danger immediately.

We further believe that failure to do so after such an extensive process of analysis and review would risk diminishing the standards for which the World Heritage Convention enjoys such high international prestige.

## Report from the leader of the independent scientific panel established by ICSU, Professor Brian Wilkinson

### WORLD HERITAGE SITE - KAKADU

Chairman - Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation relating to the Independent Science Panel Report. This report is available in your Information Document WHC-99/CONF-204/INF.9E. At the outset it is important that the Bureau understands the Scientific Panel's structure and method of analysis. There were four members of the Independent Scientific Panel, which was established by ICSU:

Dr. John Rodda - President of the International Association of Hydrological Sciences and formerly Director of Water Resources at the World Meteorological Organisation;  
Professor Gene Likens - Director of the Institute of Ecosystem Studies in New York;  
Professor Jane Plant - Assistant Director, British Geological Survey; and  
 myself Professor Brian Wilkinson - Professor at the University of Reading and formerly Director of the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology.

The panel members were selected by ICSU and I was asked by ICSU, and the Panel agreed, that I should act as Team Leader.

The Panel's work began on 22 April as soon as the first documentation became available and our Report was submitted on 14 May against a deadline of May 15. Our brief was to make a scientific review of the report - "Assessment of the Jabiluka Project" (WHC-99/CONF.204/9C) from the Supervising Scientist Environment Australia which had been called for by this Bureau. We also saw a number of other supporting documents, but in time available there was a limitation on the information that was readily accessible; Our insights may have been restricted by not having visited Jabiluka or the Kakadu World Heritage Site.

The Panel's method of operation was based on a work plan which identified a Panel member to make a first response to a specific section of the Supervising Scientific Report particularly relevant to his or her expertise. These responses were then circulated by e-mail to all members for their comments which were then consolidated into the first Draft.

All Panel members approved the Final Report prior to its transmission to ICSU and UNESCO. Other than the presentation of its Report to the Bureau which the Panel made today, the Panel has discharged its remit to ICSU and the delivery of its report on 14 May.

However, during June Dr Arthur Johnston the Supervising Scientist contacted me to say he would like some clarification on the Recommendations in the Independent Scientific Panel Report. I obtained agreement from the Panel members and from ICSU and UNESCO to hold a telephone conversation and this took place on 3 June with a subsequent approved conversation on 11 June. There are agreed notes of these conversations available.

Towards the end of June I received a 62 pages report giving the response of the Supervising Scientist to the Independent Scientific Panel Review. I forwarded this document to my fellow Panel members but they have had no time to make a formal assessment of this and furthermore believe such a consideration is outside their original brief from ICSU. I understand that this response document has been made available to the Bureau.

Turning to the Independent Scientific Panel Report, we considered that we could conveniently divide the work into four activity areas as follows:

- a. Hydrological modelling and the assessment of the retention ponds design capacity
- b. Risk assessment for the ERA proposal
- c. Long term storage of the mine tailings
- d. General environmental protection issues

However, there is strong interaction between these areas and the panel took these interactions into account in making its 17 Recommendations, which are given at the end of our Report. I don't intend going through our findings for each of these activity areas now. I understand there is to be an extended debate on Monday 12 July and I will take the opportunity to expand the Panel's views on that occasion. The conclusions in our Report and the Recommendations can, however, be placed in four broad categories as follows:

First Category, some of the analyses in the Supervising Scientists Report do lead to the assessment of impacts of the proposed Jabiluka mining operation being made with a higher degree of certainty than formerly. For example, the hydrological method of analysis using a stochastically generated data set, linked into a multiple run-off model using a Monte Carlo approach follows good international scientific practice. It gives greater confidence in the design method to be used for determining the pond capacity against extreme rainfall events.

Second Category, there are some recommendations that we suggest should be followed out of prudence e.g. the data for rainfall should be increased by 5% because it is recognised that raingauges often under record and the retention pond design capacity is crucially dependent on this rainfall data.

Third Category, there are some areas in the Supervising Scientist Report where we were unable to make a judgement on ascertainable or potential impacts due to lack of information or data. For example, the applicability of the Ranger radiation model to the Jabiluka Site.

Finally, there were some elements dealt with an unsatisfactory way in the Supervising Scientist Report, and some important issues that were missing for example, the failure to recognise the need for a full landscape/ catchment assessment extending outside of the mine lease area. There was also the lack of any impact analysis in the event of the mine life being extended from 30 to 50 or 60 years. In the later case we consider that such analysis should be undertaken now.

It may well be that some of our concerns are addressed by the Supervising Scientist's response to the Independent Scientific Panel Report – but this response would require detailed consideration by the Panel and as such it lies outside our brief. We are therefore unable to make appropriate comment on this document at this time.

Overall, the Panel felt there was a theme running through some part of the Supervising Scientist Report of 'Trust us' and we will ensure that it will be well even though there are uncertainties for example in the final ERA design. Perhaps this is based on the 18 years of satisfactory operational experience at the Ranger mine. The scientific community must clearly take note of this. However, Kakadu is such a rich and important site interns of World Heritage values that we believe that such a assurances should be accompanied with firm and binding commitments, not just on the present administration but also on those in the future. These are particularly important for both short and long term monitoring and reparation in the event of this monitoring exposing some presently unforeseen event or threat.

10 July 1999

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (PARIS, 5- 10 JULY 1999)**

PREPARED BY THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP CHAIRED BY THE RAPPORTEUR (HUNGARY) AND COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU (BENIN, ITALY, JAPAN, MOROCCO, REPUBLIC OF KOREA), THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE (CANADA, FINLAND, FRANCE, ZIMBABWE), THE FOLLOWING OBSERVERS (BELGIUM AND UNITED KINGDOM) AND THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF ICOMOS

**THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

- **Considering** that the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, referred to here under as the 1972 Convention, is a general framework for international co-operation,

- **Underlining** the importance of finding the correct balance between the various activities linked to the implementation of the Convention, in particular nominations of properties on the List, reporting on the state of conservation, training of specialists, and improving public awareness to safeguard the heritage of humankind,

- **Noting** that the representative nature of the World Heritage List has been the subject of numerous debates by the World Heritage Committee since 1979,

- **Recognizing** that since the adoption of the Global Strategy by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994 with a view to improving the representativity of the List, this objective has not been attained, despite the remarkable efforts of the Secretariat and States Parties concerned,

- **Noting** that at present **two-thirds** of the States Parties have fewer than three sites on the List and that their heritage of outstanding universal value is still under-represented or not represented,

1. **Agrees** to give its full support for the implementation of the Convention, in the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List,

2. **Recognizes** the interest of all the States Parties and the advisory bodies in preserving the authority of the 1972 Convention, by improving, through appropriate means, the representativity of the World Heritage List which must reflect the diversity of all cultures and ecosystems of all regions,

3. **Endorses** the objectives of the Global Strategy while **reaffirming** the sovereign rights of the States Parties and the sovereign role of the General Assembly,

4. **Shares** the will expressed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session in December 1998 "to move from recommendations to action" and to improve the representativity of the List, and therefore:

**A. Invites all the States Parties to:**

i) Give the highest priority to the "*adoption of a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes*", according to Article 5 of the 1972 Convention,

ii) Take measures to redress the imbalance and improve the representativity of the World Heritage List, in order to reinforce the authority of the 1972 Convention,

iii) Prepare or re-examine their tentative lists in the light of the methodology developed and regional and thematic definitions by focusing on categories of heritage which are still under-represented on the List,

iv) Rigorously establish the outstanding universal value of properties when preparing the tentative lists,

v) Give priority to the submission of nominations resulting from regional consultations in the categories under-represented that highlight notably the interaction between human beings and their environment and human beings in society, expressing the diversity and richness of living or past cultures.

**B. Invites the States Parties that already have a substantial number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List to:**

i) Apply paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention:

a) by spacing voluntarily their nominations according to conditions that they will define, and/or

b) by proposing only properties falling into categories still under-represented, and/or

c) by linking each of their nominations with a nomination presented by a State Party whose heritage is under-represented, or

- d) by deciding, on a voluntary basis, to suspend the presentation of new nominations,

and to inform the Committee of the measures taken,

- ii) Initiate and encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation with States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented in the List within the framework of the preparation of tentative lists, nominations and training programmes,
- iii) Give priority to the re-examination of their tentative lists within the framework of regional consultations and to the preparation of periodic reports.

**C. Invites the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List to:**

- i) Give priority to the preparation of tentative lists and nominations,
- ii) Initiate and consolidate at regional level, partnerships based on the exchange of technical expertise,
- iii) Encourage bilateral and multilateral co-operation so as to increase their expertise and the technical capacities of institutions in charge of the protection, safeguard and management of their heritage,
- iv) Participate, as much as possible, in the meetings of the World Heritage Committee.

**D. Invites the advisory bodies to:**

- i) Pursue their collaboration with the Secretariat for the preparation and co-ordination of regional consultations,
- ii) Pursue their programmes of thematic studies and the classification of the themes into sub-themes, on the basis of the tentative lists prepared by States Parties and the recommendations of the regional experts meetings,
- iii) Observe the greatest scientific rigour during the evaluation of the proposals for inscription, so that the decisions of the Committee can reflect more systematically the positive results of the implementation of the Global Strategy,
- iv) Develop mechanisms that would give experts of the regions under-represented on the List the necessary training to prepare and evaluate nominations and ensure the state of conservation of properties.

**E. Invites the World Heritage Committee to:**

- i) Continue its actions undertaken within the framework of the Global Strategy,
- ii) Provide the necessary resources from the World Heritage Fund to support the efforts of the States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List, in order to increase the number of their nominations,
- iii) Adopt a regional and multi-year Action Plan for the implementation of the Global Strategy, as a follow-up to the Action Plan adopted in 1999,
- iv) Evaluate the progress in the implementation of the Global Strategy Action Plan with the participation of all States Parties and define, should the need arise, adjustment measures to fulfil its objectives.

**F. Invites the Secretariat of the Convention to:**

- i) Pursue its collaboration with the advisory bodies in the framework of regional consultations,
- ii) Support in particular the efforts of States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List in the preparation of their tentative lists and nominations,
- iii) Ensure that the human resources allocated to the implementation of the Action Plan are consistent with its objectives,
- iv) Submit to the General Assembly a progress report on the implementation of the regional and multi-year Action Plan.

**G. Invites the international community and more particularly the donor agencies to:**

- i) Support, in co-operation with the advisory bodies and the Secretariat, the protection of cultural and natural heritage and the implementation of the 1972 Convention,
- ii) Give priority to the actions directed towards the implementation of the Global Strategy, undertaken in States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List.

**The General Assembly invites all States Parties, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat to transmit this resolution to the concerned agencies.**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-third extraordinary session  
Marrakesh, Morocco**

**26 - 27 November 1999**

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
4. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
5. Requests for international assistance
6. Other business
7. Closure of the session

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-third session  
Marrakesh, Morocco**

**29 November - 4 December 1999**

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA**

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Report by the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee
4. Reports of the Rapporteurs on the sessions of the World Heritage Bureau
5. Report on the decision of the General Assembly of States Parties with regard to "Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List"
6. Progress report on the implementation of the regional actions described in the Global Strategy Action Plan adopted by the Committee at its twenty-second session
7. Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee
8. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
9. Periodic Reporting: Regional Strategies for periodic reporting
10. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger and on the List of World Heritage sites
  - 10.1 State of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
  - 10.2 State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
11. Activities concerning World Heritage documentation, information and education



12. Evaluation of International Assistance: Examination of the recommendations of the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee concerning prioritization in granting International Assistance to States Parties
13. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
14. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 2000, and presentation of a Provisional Budget for 2001
15. Requests for international assistance
16. Date, place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
17. Date and place of the twenty fourth-session of the World Heritage Committee
18. Other business
19. Adoption of the report of the session
20. Closure of the session