

Distribution limited

CC-79/CONF.005/6
Paris, 20 July 1979
Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR
ON THE SECOND MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE
INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

(Unesco, Paris, 28-30 May 1979)

I - INTRODUCTION

1. The second meeting of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (later referred to as "the Committee") was held in Paris on May 28 to 30. It was attended by all members : the chairman : Mr. David Hales (U.S.A.) and the five Vice-Chairmen : Mr. Rodrigo Pallares (Ecuador), Dr. Shehata Adams (Arab Republic of Egypt), Mr. Michel Parent (France) accompanied by Mr. J.P. Bady, Mr. Charyar Adle (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Ekpo Eyo (Nigeria).
2. Representatives of the International Centre for Conservation (ICCRUM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended in an advisory capacity.
3. A full list of participants is given in Annex I.
4. Mr. Michel Parent (France) was elected as rapporteur.
5. The provisional agenda was adopted.

II. OPENING OF THE MEETING

6. Mr. M. Batisse, Deputy Assistant Director General (Science Sector) welcomed the members of the Bureau on behalf of the Director-General and reported on the present position with respect to the World Heritage Convention. Forty six States had now adhered to the Convention and the Committee had been enlarged to 21 members at the last General Assembly of States Parties. This was a crucial meeting of the Bureau in determining the standards that would govern admissions to the World Heritage List. Seventy-four nominations had been received, which, with the fifteen previously deferred, amounted to eighty-nine to be considered at this meeting of the Bureau. But of these, only 17 concerned natural properties, raising once again the question of balance between cultural and natural properties. The Fund now stood at more than 1 million dollars; most States had paid their contributions, and Austria and the Netherlands which are not yet parties to the Convention had made voluntary contributions. Expenditure had been well within the limits set by the Committee. Preparatory assistance had been given to five countries, and had been approved for three others. Emergency assistance had been given to Nepal and applications from four other countries for emergency assistance or fellowships were being considered or had been approved. Dr. Batisse stressed that the Convention had now entered its operational phase. Working relations with ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN had been tested and were excellent, as were those between the two divisions of Unesco involved. A critical feature was however the lack of staff to deal with the growing work associated with the implementation of the Convention.

7. In reply to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Batisse said that emergency measures had been taken to provide help to the Secretariat, but that he could not foresee a rapid resolution of the problem because of the timetable imposed by the preparation of the draft budget of Unesco.

III - REVIEW OF NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

8. The Bureau reviewed all the nominations of natural and cultural properties received by the Secretariat. Its recommendations to the Committee on each property are presented in Annex 2.
9. The Bureau recognized the great importance of the meeting in establishing the standards that would be applied in future for determining the properties to be admitted to the World Heritage List. After some initial discussion about the general philosophy of selection and about the procedures for dealing with nominations, it was decided to examine the files for each property with the comments of ICOMOS and IUCN thereon, in order to develop principles and precedents based on the consideration of individual cases. Natural properties were to be examined first, as it was thought that they posed simpler issues.
10. Rather than recording the discussion chronologically, this report draws together in paragraphs 11 to 23 the principal points that emerged.
11. It was suggested that a small standing committee, or other suitable mechanism, might be set up to define more precisely the criteria in the light of the nominations presented and of the decisions taken by the Committee thereon. It was agreed that Mr. Parent would prepare a paper on this question which would be considered by the Bureau and Committee in October. Another paper would be prepared by ICOMOS and IUCN on the procedures used by these organizations in evaluating nominations, since these questions were in fact closely linked.

Principles and Criteria

Imbalance between cultural and natural properties

12. The imbalance in this year's submissions was marked. This appeared to be due in part to publicity and information, in part to institutional factors in States parties, and in part to the much greater variety of cultural properties. However, the natural properties proposed were generally of vast size. IUCN was not unduly concerned at this stage but the position should be watched and States should be encouraged to nominate natural properties.

Universal value

13. The "universal value" criterion - in spite of the difficulty of defining it rationally - greatly influenced the evaluation of properties within a same category, such as wetlands, historic centres of cities, cathedrals, etc ... IUCN had interpreted it strictly deeming that only the best property of its kind should be included in the List. This implied a comparative survey. Such a selection was much more difficult in the cultural field where several properties of the same family might have intrinsic universal value. The representative of France also stressed the need for coherence in the nominations from each country. Furthermore, the fact that a property was not included in the List did not at all mean that it was not considered to be an important property and that it should not be preserved.

Moreo
the
th
r

Moreover property of equal value to those nominated may exist within the territory of States but its inscription may not be proposed and the World Heritage List must by that very fact remain open. In this respect, IUCN drew attention to the terms of the Convention which foresee that each State Party should submit to the Committee an inventory of properties situated in its territory which it considers as having outstanding universal value in terms of the criteria established by the Committee.

Criterion (vi) - (Cultural properties)

14. The consideration of Edison National Historic Site (N° 77) drew attention to the difficulties of using criterion (vi). As worded now it could lead to an unreasonably large number of nominations. It was therefore recommended that the formulation of this criterion and of (i) should be critically re-examined.

Cultural/natural sites

15. As far as sites of combined cultural and natural interest (N° 39, 64, 80, 99, 120) were concerned, it was proposed that these should be evaluated first in terms of their principal interest and that their secondary interest should be considered on a complementary basis. Some future proposals might, of course, be of equal interest for both their natural and cultural features.

Nominations comprising a series of properties of the same kind

16. Examples of such nominations are the Decorated Caves in the Vézère Valley (N° 85) and Forts and Castles in Ghana (N° 34). In both cases, the whole series represents more than the sum of its parts. These can be dealt with in a number of ways :

a) Selecting the best example, a procedure favoured by IUCN in dealing with wetlands;

b) Selecting a few good examples; it was considered that this might be the right course for Ghana to take in relation to the Forts and Castles;

c) Treating as one property a number of spatially separate elements; examples are the Decorated Caves in the Vézère Valley and the Rock Art of Valcamonica (N° 94); in this case each element must be precisely identified in the nomination and the measures for safeguarding each must be specified;

d) Protecting the zone in which they all occur; again each element must be separately identified.

17. The case of the Open Air Museum of Nubia and Aswan (N° 88), was recognized as being exceptional because the sites are so widely separated. The decision made was on the basis of the very high quality of the properties concerned and the important international support that had been given for the preservation of the series as a whole.

Later extension of a site

18. This principle was discussed in relation to the National Park of Białowieża (N° 33) and Chartres Cathedral (N° 81). It was considered that in certain instances it would be desirable to add adjoining areas of great value to a site that had already been included in the List.

Procedures

19. A number of issues were raised :

a) How rigidly should deadlines be insisted upon ?

It was considered essential that the Secretariat, ICOMOS and IUCN, stick to agreed deadlines. Only in this way could the workload be met.

b) How far could, or should, ICOMOS and IUCN themselves supplement nominations that were deficient ?

If the information were available, this could be done and considered as a form of preparatory assistance. It should, however, be done before the nomination was officially submitted, otherwise it would be placing on the NGO responsibility for the nomination that ought to rest with the State concerned.

c) Should the nomination submitted be sufficiently self-contained and persuasive to make the case without any additional advocacy, even in cases where the merits of the site were self-evident ?

Yes, even if the site was of very high quality, this should be reflected in the completeness and excellence of the nomination.

d) Should States be required to specify in the nomination form the precise criteria on which their case was based ?

States should present a carefully argued case for a property, itemising where possible the criteria on which they were basing their arguments, but this was not essential. It was for ICOMOS and IUCN to assess the arguments against the criteria.

Threatened properties and conditional acceptance

20. This question arose in the case of certain proposed properties that were threatened. It was thought that 'conditional acceptance' would cast doubt on the good faith of a State in making the nomination. Acceptance of a site for the World Heritage List should be based on its inherent quality at the time. If it was damaged later, the site should be deleted from the List.

IV - EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

Action taken by the Bureau

Guatemala (request N° 65-3)

21. The Government of Guatemala has requested emergency assistance for the town of "Antigua Guatemala" which has been damaged by an earthquake and torrential rains. This assistance amounting to US \$ 50.000 and intended for the purchase of equipment was granted by the Bureau.

V - TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION REQUESTS

22. After it had examined the requests for technical co-operation received from States Parties, the List of which was given in document CC-79/CONF/005/2, the Bureau formulated the following recommendations to the Committee.

Ecuador (request N° I.I.)

23. The Government of Ecuador has requested US \$ 50.000 for the purchase of the necessary equipment to eliminate animals which are foreign to the Galapagos Islands and which are destroying the local flora. The Bureau recommended that the Committee should grant this technical co-operation for the site which is included in the List.

Tanzania (request N° 39.I)

24. The Tanzanian Government has requested the services of an architect-museologist for three weeks in order to draw up a project for the conservation and presentation of the prehistoric sites of Olduvai and Laetolil. The Bureau recommended that the Committee grant this technical co-operation if the property is inscribed on the List.

Egypt (request N° 89.I)

25. The Egyptian Government has requested the services of specialists in cultural heritage (6 m/m) as well as equipment (amounting to a total cost of US \$ 30.000) to draw up a project for the restoration and development of the old Islamic Centre of Cairo. The Bureau recommends that the Committee accept this request if the property is entered on the List.

Ethiopia (request N° I8.I)

26. The Ethiopian Government has requested technical co-operation for the purpose of carrying out a photogrammetric survey of the monuments of Lalibela (at an estimated cost of US \$ 144.500). The representative of ICCROM recognized that a photogrammetric survey would be useful but considered that such a project should not be afforded priority over other conservation measures or the training of Ethiopian technicians and, in particular, over the preparation of a long-term maintenance plan for the monuments. In view of this opinion, the Bureau - while generally in favour of technical co-operation for the preservation of the Lalibela monuments - considered it advisable to defer its decision.

Ethiopia (requests N° III.I and II2.I)

27. The Ethiopian Government has requested the services of two experts (36 m/m) and equipment for two natural sites in order to systematically investigate these parks and to consider the possibility of reinstalling elsewhere the population living there. The Bureau decided to defer its decision until the nominations to the World Heritage List, which had been received too late, could be examined.

Syrian Arab Republic (requests N° 20.I, 21.I, 22.I, 23.I)

28. The Syrian Government has requested equipment (cranes, lorries, jeeps, etc ...) for the restoration of Damascus (20.I), Aleppo (21.I), Bosra (22.I) and Palmyre (23.I). However, since the additional information requested had not been received and only the site of Damascus had been recommended for inscription on the List, the Bureau preferred to defer its decision until the information required had been received.

VI - DRAFT TEXT OF STANDARD AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND STATES RECEIVING TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION

29. The revised text of the standard agreement was being elaborated by the Secretariat and would be submitted to the next Bureau meeting.

VII - PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

30. The provisional agenda (ref. document CC-79/CONF.005/I) was approved with the following additions :

a) study of a new procedure for the replacement of the rapporteur;

b) elaboration of guidelines for ICOMOS and IUCN on the procedures to be followed in evaluating nominations to the World Heritage List;

c) development of a procedure for the deletion of sites from the World Heritage List (Secretariat was entrusted with the task of preparing a draft text);

d) study of possibilities of strengthening the Secretariat of the World Heritage Committee;

e) revision of the nomination form.

VIII - DRAFT FORMS FOR REQUESTING PREPARATORY AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE AND FELLOWSHIPS

31. The draft forms could not be examined for lack of time; they will be re-submitted to the next Bureau meeting.

IX - OTHER BUSINESS

32. It was decided that the Bureau would meet again in Cairo on 21 October, prior to the meeting of the Committee; urgent and outstanding business could be dealt with on this occasion.

33. It was agreed that the Secretariat could transfer funds between heads of expenditure foreseen for work undertaken by IUCN and ICOMOS in evaluating nominations.

34. The Chairman expressed his concern at the setting up of a World Heritage Trust which was using the title of the Convention but had no connection with it. This would certainly cause confusion and might do damage to the objectives of the Convention because of the similiarity of the names and due to the fact that the Foundation was only concerned with cultural property. The Bureau shared the concern of the Chairman and it was decided to invite the Director General to study the matter, to take whatever measures proved necessary and to inform the Bureau at its next session on the action taken.

35. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that measures had been taken to register the world heritage emblem.

36. The Secretariat also acquainted the Bureau with the proposal received from a Swedish firm concerning the production of silverware, glassware and porcelaine commemorating world heritage sites. It was decided that the Secretariat would examine the different issues involved, ethical, legal and promotional and report to the Committee on the question.

X - CLOSING OF THE BUREAU MEETING

37. In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked all the members of the Bureau, the members of the Secretariat and the interpreters for their effective participation in ensuring the successful outcome of the meeting. Mr. Parent paid tribute to the Chairman for his firmness, patience and good humour in guiding the long and complex deliberations.

Annexe I / Annex I

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Représentants des Etats parties à la Convention /
Representatives of States Parties to the Convention

EGYPTE/EGYPT

Dr. Shehata Adams
President of the Egyptian Organization of Antiquities

EQUATEUR/ECUADOR

M. Rodrigo Pallares
Directeur
Direction nationale du patrimoine artistique

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE / UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

M. David Hales
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and
Wildlife and Parks
United States Department of the Interior

FRANCE

M. Michel Parent
Inspecteur général des Monuments historiques

M. Jean-Pierre Bady
Directeur de la Caisse nationale des Monuments historiques

REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'IRAN / ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

M. Charyar Adle
Chercheur au C.N.R.S.

NIGERIA

M. Ekpo Eyo
Director, Federal Department of Antiquities

Organisations ayant un statut consultatif auprès du Comité du patrimoine mondial /
Organization with an advisory status to the World Heritage Committee

Centre international pour la Conservation /
International Centre for Conservation (ICCROM)

M. Louis-Jacques Rollet-Andriane
Special representative of the Director

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

M. Raymond Lemaire
Président

M. Ernest A. Connally
Secrétaire général

Mme Anne Webster-Smith
Adjointe au Secrétaire général

M. Krzysztof Pawlowski
Vice-Président

M. François Leblanc
Directeur du Secrétariat

Union internationale pour la Conservation de la Nature et de ses Ressources (UICN) /
International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

M. Harold Eidsvik

Secrétariat de l'Unesco / Secretariat of Unesco

M. M. Batisse
Deputy Assistant Director General,
Science Sector

M. G. Bolla
Deputy Assistant Director General,
Sector of Culture and Communication

M. P. Stulz
Director,
Division of Cultural Heritage

M. B. von Droste,
Division of Ecological Sciences

M. D. Poore
Consultant,
Division of Ecological Sciences

Secrétariat

Mme A
Divi

Mr
C

Secrétariat de l'Unesco / Secretariat of Unesco

Mme A. Raidl
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mme A. Saurat
Consultant,
Division of Cultural Heritage

PROPERTIES RECOMMENDED

The following properties have been recommended to the Committee
for inscription on the World Heritage List

n°	Name of property	State Party	N C
8	Ichkeul National Park	Tunisia	N
19	Fasil Ghebbi, Gondar region	Ethiopia	C
20	Ancien city of Damascus	Syrian Arab republic	C
31	Auschwitz concentration camp	Poland	C
33	National park of BiaXowieza	Poland	N
36	Medina of Tunis	Tunisia	C
37	Site of Carthage	Tunisia	C
38	Amphitheatre of El Jem	Tunisia	C
39	Ngorongoro conservation area	Tanzania	N-C
42	Church of Boyana	Bulgaria	C
44	Thracian tomb of Kazanlak	Bulgaria	C
45	Rock-hewn churches of Ivanovo	Bulgaria	C
58	Urnes Stave Church	Norway	C
59	Bryggen, Bergen town	Norway	C
64	Tikal national park	Guatemala	C-N
65	Antigua Guatemala	Guatemala	C
71	Dinosaur provincial park Alberta	Canada	N
72	Kluane national park, Wrangell-St Elias National monument	Canada and U.S.A	N
75	Grand Canyon national park	U.S.A.	N
76	Everglades national park	U.S.A.	N
78	Independence hall	U.S.A.	C
80	Mont St.-Michel and its Bay	France	C-N
81	Chartres cathedral	France	C
83	National domain of Versailles	France	C

N : natural

C : Cultural

n°	Name of property	State Party	N C
84	Vezelay, the Basilica and the Hill	France	C
85	The decorated caves in the Vezere valley	France	C
86	Memphis and its Necropolis	Egypt	C
87	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis	Egypt	C
88	Open air museum of Nubia and Aswan	Egypt	C
89	Islamic Cairo; the historic center of the City	Egypt	C
90	Abu Mena	Ethiopia	C
92	St. Guilia /St. Salvator's Monastery	Italy	C
94	The Valcamonica rock art	Italy	C
95	The Old City of Dubrovnik	Yugoslavia	C
96	The Old Ras with Sopocani	Yugoslavia	C
97	Split historical centre with Diocletian's Palace	Yugoslavia	C
98	Plitvicka Jezera national park	Yugoslavia	N
II3	Tchogha Zanbil	Iran	C
II4	Persepolis	Iran	C
II5	Meidan-e Shah, Esfahan	Iran	C
II20	Sagarmatha national park	Nepal	N
I2I	Kathmandu valley	Nepal	C

NOMINATIONS DEFERRED

For the following sites, the Bureau considered either

- (i) that the documentation was inadequate ; or
- (ii) that a sufficiently persuasive case had not been made.

It was recommended to the Committee that consideration be deferred. Specific questions on certain properties would be formulated to be addressed to the State concerned. Notes on these follow the Table.

The nominations for any of these properties could be considered at a Bureau meeting immediately preceding the third session of the World Heritage Committee, if documentation were received in time for adequate processing by the Secretariat, ICOMOS and IUCN.

N°	Name	State Party	N C *
10	Lower Valley of the Awash	Ethiopia	C
11	Adulis	Ethiopia	C
12	Tiya	Ethiopia	C
13	Melka-Kontoure	Ethiopia	C
14	Matara	Ethiopia	C
15	Aksum	Ethiopia	C
16	Yeha	Ethiopia	C
17	Lower Valley of the Omo	Ethiopia	C
21	Ancient City of Aleppo	Syrian Arab Republic	C
22	Ancient City of Bosra	Syrian Arab Republic	C
23	Site of Palmyre	Syrian Arab Republic	C
25	Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary	Senegal	N
30	Historic Centre of Warsaw	Poland	C
34	Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions	Ghana	C
35	Asante traditional buildings	Ghana	C

* N = Natural
 C = Cultural

N°	Name	State Party	N C *
43	Horseman of Madara	Bulgaria	C
55	Røros	Norway	C
56	Valley of Heidal	Norway	C
57	Kjerringøy	Norway	C
60	Eidsvoll Building	Norway	C
61	Vingen	Norway	C
62	Mølen	Norway	C
63	Virunga National Park	Zaire	N
77	Edison National Historic Site	U.S.A.	C
79	Paphos, Birthplace of Aphrodite	Cyprus	C
91	The Historic Centre of Rome	Italy	C
93	Wall Painting representing "The Last Supper" by da Vinci	Italy	C
99	Natural and Culturo-Historical Area of Ohrid	Yugoslavia	C (N)
100	Durmitor National Park	Yugoslavia	N
111	Bale Mountain National Park	Ethiopia	N
112	Abijatta Shalla Lakes National Park	Ethiopia	N

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the following properties should not be considered further for the World Heritage List :

N°	Name	State Party	N C *
5	Zembra and Zembretta Islands National Park	Tunisia	N
73	National Park of the Madeleine Island	Senegal	N (C)

* N = Natural
C = Cultural

NOMINATIONS DEFERRED

<u>Lower Valley of the Awash</u>	- n° 10 -	Ethiopia
<u>Adulis</u>	- n° 11 -	"
<u>Tiya</u>	- n° 12 -	"
<u>Melka Kontoure</u>	- n° 13 -	"
<u>Matara</u>	- n° 14 -	"
<u>Aksum</u>	- n° 15 -	"
<u>Yeha</u>	- n° 16 -	"
<u>Lower Valley of the Omo</u>	- n° 17 -	"

These nominations had already been examined by the Bureau at its first meeting in 1978 ; the necessary complementary documentation has not been received. For this reason, consideration thereof was once more deferred.

<u>Ancient City of Aleppo</u>	- n° 21 -	Syrian Arab Republic
<u>Ancient City of Bosra</u>	- n° 22 -	" " "
<u>Site of Palmyre</u>	- n° 23 -	" " "

ICOMOS felt that some additional information and documentation was necessary in support of these nominations and the Bureau consequently decided to re-examine them once they have been completed.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary - n° 25 - Senegal

The Bureau decided to defer its decision with respect to this site. In making this decision, the Bureau was influenced by two factors : the quality and the threats hanging over the site. According to IUCN, other wetlands exist in the same region which surpass Djoudj in universal importance. Furthermore, there is an additional serious threat of damage to the site from the development works on the delta of the River Senegal.

Historic Centre of Warsaw - n° 30 - Poland

The inscription of this site on the List was supported by ICOMOS. The documentation is excellent and the centre of Warsaw is an exceptional example of reconstruction. Furthermore, it has been made into a symbol by the patriotic feeling of the Polish people. However, opinion was divided in the Bureau, since the site did not meet the criteria of authenticity, and the Bureau deferred its decision so that the questions raised in this respect could be thoroughly studied.

Forts and castles, Volta Greater
Accra, Central and Western Regions - n° 34 - Ghana

ICOMOS had expressed a favourable opinion with respect to the inscription of the Forts and Castles proposed by Ghana on the World Heritage List because they represent unique artistic or esthetic achievements and constitute characteristic examples of architectural styles. However, the Bureau considered it necessary to have further details on this nomination. Since it concerns a series of thirty-six forts and castles which do not have the same legal status and of which the state of conservation varies considerably, the nomination should include a complete inventory of all the monuments and a map showing their geographical location as well as the protection zone around the buildings. The Bureau was of the opinion that in view of the bad state of conservation of some of the monuments, it would be preferable to enter in the List only those which are the most representative of the series and it felt that the Government of Ghana should be invited to reconsider the nomination in the light of these comments. The Bureau considered that it would be desirable to obtain a complete proposal in time to enable the Bureau and the Committee to discuss the matter next October. In this connection, preparatory assistance for the elaboration of the nomination could be provided to the Government of Ghana if it so wished.

Asante traditional buildings - n° 35 - Ghana

The Bureau wished to receive more information on these buildings ; a map of the region, a list of the buildings and photographs would be welcome.

Horseman of Madara - n° 43 - Bulgaria

The decision on this nomination was deferred at the suggestion of ICOMOS which considered that a comparative study was necessary in order to evaluate this property.

<u>Røros</u>	- n° 55 - Norway
<u>Valley of Heidal</u>	- n° 56 - "
<u>Kjerringøy</u>	- n° 57 - "
<u>Eidsvoll Building</u>	- n° 60 - "
<u>Vingen</u>	- n° 61 - "
<u>Mølen</u>	- n° 62 - "

Following the report of ICOMOS, the Bureau deferred examination of these nominations for which complementary information should be obtained. A site such as the Eidsvoll Building, n° 60, was undoubtedly of national importance but the justification of the universal value of all these sites should be further developed.

Virunga National Park - n° 63 - Zaire

Virunga National Park was recognized as worthy of inscription on the List, but the nomination is incomplete. Supplementary information and documentation should be made available to the Bureau to enable it to re-examine the dossier at its meeting in October.

Edison National Historic Site - n° 77 - U.S.A.

Although inscription of this property on the List had been recommended by ICOMOS under criterion (vi) relating to cultural property, examination of this nomination had brought to light the difficulty of applying that criterion. In fact, the Bureau considered that its present wording could lead to an inordinate number of nominations. The decision on this nomination was consequently deferred pending revision of criterion (vi) which seemed necessary. It was moreover suggested that the Government of the United States of America reconsider which criteria the proposal is based on.

Paphos, Birthplace of Aphrodite - n° 79 - Cyprus

In view of ICOMOS' opinion that more precise information should be made available on the delimitation of the sites and on their unique character, the Bureau deferred its recommendation until supplementary information had been provided.

The Historic Centre of Rome - n° 91 - Italy

There was no doubt that the historic centre of Rome was of outstanding universal value. But the Bureau, in agreement with ICOMOS, considered that the documentation was insufficient. A precise inventory of what should be preserved and a description of the safeguarding measures foreseen for the centre should be provided. It was considered that the nomination of a site of such importance should be accompanied by very precise documentation, and the hope was expressed that a more detailed proposal would be available for the next Bureau meeting.

Wall Painting representing "The Last Supper" by da Vinci - n° 93 - Italy

The inscription of this property on the World Heritage List was recommended by ICOMOS. However, the Bureau felt that complementary information was necessary with respect to preservation and restoration plans, and indeed on any plans to transfer the painting. The recommendation on this nomination was deferred until such information has been received. If the property came to be considered as "movable property" it could not be considered to fall within the terms of Article 1 of the Convention.

Natural and Culturo-Historical - n° 99 - Yugoslavia
Area of Ohrid

IUCN was of the opinion that as the natural features were concerned, the site could not be recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List because it did not possess the necessary integrity, since only half of the lake and a small part of the basin are in Yugoslav territory. ICOMOS, on its side, felt that the cultural elements in the proposal should be examined more thoroughly before a recommendation on their universal value could be formulated. Given these viewpoints, the Bureau decided to defer its decision to enable ICOMOS to complete its study of the proposal.

Durmitor National Park - n° 100 - Yugoslavia

The Bureau deferred its recommendation on the advice of IUCN which would like a more precise technical report on the different zones of the Park.

Bale Mountain National Park - n° 111 - Ethiopia

The Bureau deferred its recommendation in view of the lack of documentation and since IUCN considered it necessary to undertake a more thorough evaluation of the site.

Abijatta Shalla Lakes National Park - n° 112 - Ethiopia

The Bureau deferred its recommendation at the request of IUCN which would like further information to enable it formulate its recommendation.

NOMINATIONS RECEIVED TOO LATE

Nominations for the following properties were received too late to be considered by the Bureau :

N°	Name	Country	N C
101	The Dey's Palace at Alger	Algeria	C
102	Kalaa Beni Hammad	Algeria	C
103	Setif Citadel	Algeria	C
104	Iglesia de Orosi	Costa Rica	C
105	Monumento Nacional de San José	Costa Rica	C
106	Parque Nacional arqueológico de Guayabo de Turrialba	Costa Rica	C
107	Casona Historica de Santa Rosa	Costa Rica	C
108	Teatro Nacional de San José	Costa Rica	C
109	Ruinas de Ujarras	Costa Rica	C
110	Iglesia de Nicoya	Costa Rica	C
116	Town of Djenne	Mali	C
117	National Park of the Baoulé Loop	Mali	N
118	Dogon Land	Mali	N/C
119	Tombouctou	Mali	C
122	Birni Gazargamu and Gambaru	Nigeria	C
123	Kainji Lake National Park	Nigeria	N
124	The Town of Ouro Preto	Brazil	C