

Limited distribution

WHC-95/CONF.203/5
1 October 1995
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Nineteenth session

Berlin, Germany

4-9 December 1995

Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of
properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

CONTENTS:

	Page
Background and progress report	2
A. Revised nomination form	6
B. Format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports	8
C. Work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee	10
D. Progress report on the preparation of regional synthesis reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties	12
E. Reports on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties with particular focus on properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger	18



BACKGROUND AND PROGRESS REPORT

At its eighteenth session in December 1994, the World Heritage Committee considered the scientific and technical problems raised by the state of conservation and rehabilitation of the cultural and natural heritage as defined in paragraphs 2 and 4 of Article 11 of the Convention. The Committee adopted the principles of monitoring and reporting and decided to include these in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Chapter II, paragraphs 69-76).

The Committee at its nineteenth session will be informed of the outcome of the discussions on monitoring and reporting at the General Assembly of States Parties (November 1995). This item was included in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly in response to a request of a State Party and considering the recommendation made by the Executive Board of UNESCO. The report of the General Assembly will be made available to the Committee under Working Document WHC-95/CONF.203.INF.6.

In order to prepare for the session of the Tenth General Assembly, the Bureau reviewed the principles of monitoring and reporting again at its nineteenth session in July 1995 (see the Report of the Rapporteur of the nineteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, July 1995, paragraphs VI.1-VI.7).

The Bureau recalled that the Committee defined the observation of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties as one of its main functions already at its sixteenth session in 1992 and that this was reflected in the UNESCO Work Plans for 1994-1995. It also recalled that the Committee adopted the principles of monitoring and reporting only after a long process of discussions, consultations and careful consideration of several practical experiences and with reference to specific articles of the World Heritage Convention:

1. Bearing in mind the provision of Article 4 of the Convention, under which "each State Party recognizes that the duty of ensuring the conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and situated on its territory belongs primarily to that State", the Committee was of the view that the establishment of systematic monitoring, the day-to-day observation of the sites by the States Parties, in close collaboration with the site managers or the agency with management authority, constituted a meaningful, active and effective operational method capable of countering the dangers that may threaten the cultural and natural World Heritage.
2. Bearing in mind also the provisions of Article 6, which provides that "whilst fully respecting the sovereignty of the states on whose territory the cultural and natural heritage mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 is situated, and without prejudice to property rights provided by national legislation, the States Parties to this Convention

recognize that such heritage constitutes a world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate" and Article 7, which provides that "for the purpose of this Convention, international protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve...that heritage", also in consideration of Articles 8, 11, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 29, and in pursuance of the intent of the Convention as reflected in the preambular clause 8 in "establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with scientific methods", the World Heritage Committee invited the States Parties to present every five years a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories, and decided that, to this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies and that the Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

The Bureau furthermore considered various articles in the Convention that call for international cooperation and the undertaking by the Committee of studies and research needed for the drawing up of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. Monitoring and reporting should be considered as a scientific and technical method to undertake the studies and research mentioned in Article 11.7.

The Bureau emphasized that the principles of monitoring and reporting as defined in paragraphs 69-76 of the Operational Guidelines fully respect the sovereignty of the States Parties and that these should be implemented by the States Parties themselves on a voluntary basis.

In order to implement its decisions, the Committee at its eighteenth session had requested the Secretariat to undertake a series of specific actions. As requested by the Committee, the Secretariat reported to the Bureau at its nineteenth session on the progress made in the implementation of these actions. The actions requested by the Committee and the subsequent activities undertaken by the Secretariat are the following:

- (1) Prepare a revised nomination format for presentation to the nineteenth sessions of the Bureau and the Committee, so as to provide adequate baseline information at the time of inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

ad (1) The basic structure of a revised nomination format was already presented to the Bureau and the Committee at their eighteenth sessions. An annotated version was examined by the Bureau at

its nineteenth session. The annotated format is presented in Section A of this working document.

- (2) **Develop a format for monitoring reporting as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base.**

ad (2) Following the structure of the revised nomination format, an annotated format for monitoring reporting was examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. This format is presented in Section B of this working document.

- (3) **Organize in early 1995, with the participation of the advisory bodies and other relevant institutions, a meeting of experts on World Heritage Information Management, in order to develop guidelines for the establishment of a World Heritage Data Base.**

ad (3) A preparatory meeting was held with the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and individual experts to draw up the terms of reference for an expert meeting on World Heritage Information Management. The draft working document for this meeting was made available to the Bureau at its nineteenth session.

The expert meeting was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 27 and 28 September 1995. The expert meeting was preceded by a technical meeting with the advisory bodies, the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and the Organization of World Heritage Cities to discuss the setting up of compatible data-base systems. The report of the expert meeting will be made available to the Committee as information document WHC-95/CONF.203/INF.10.

- (4) **Inform the States Parties of the principles established by the Committee, invite them to put monitoring structures in place and to report on the state of conservation of the property to the Committee on a 5-year basis.**

ad (4) The Secretariat informed the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention through a circular letter of the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee. In this letter the Secretariat also informed them that, in due time, they will be approached on a regional basis to establish jointly the modalities of monitoring and reporting and to define which actions are required to facilitate the observance of the Committee's decisions. Several States Parties have been approached already on an individual

basis. Regional seminars and meetings have also been utilised to inform States Parties on World Heritage monitoring and reporting.

- (5) Present to the nineteenth session of the Bureau an overall work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes so that States Parties will have sufficient time to prepare the state of conservation reports.

ad (5) A draft work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the Committee was examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. A revised workplan is presented in Section C of this working document.

- (6) Prepare work plans for and implement regional programmes to provide advice and assistance to the States Parties in setting up adequate monitoring and management systems, to promote the preparation of 5-year state of conservation reports, to handle and analyze these reports and to present 5-year Regional State of the World Heritage Reports to the World Heritage Committee.

ad (6) Detailed work plans for the implementation of each of the regional programmes will have to be prepared so as to meet the targets set in the overall work plan mentioned under ad (5) above. Summary progress reports are presented in Section D of this working document.

- (7) Incorporate monitoring as a management tool in World Heritage training courses and other activities.

ad (7) The Secretariat and other partners are taking several initiatives to promote monitoring as a management tool and to provide guidance to the States Parties and the site managers in putting day-to-day monitoring in place. The Committee will be informed as soon as possible of these initiatives.

The following sections of this working document present the annotated revised nomination format (Section A), a format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports (Section B), the work plan for the implementation of regional monitoring programmes and the examination of regional synthesis reports by the World Heritage Committee (Section C), progress reports on the preparation of regional synthesis reports (Section D) and reports on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat (Section E).

A. REVISED NOMINATION FORMAT

A.1. BACKGROUND

Sound baseline information on each of the World Heritage sites is indispensable for any reliable monitoring and reporting system, to maintain a credible World Heritage List, as well as for coordinated and meaningful World Heritage cooperation. The World Heritage Committee, at its eighteenth session, confirmed, therefore, that the nomination form should be revised in such a way that this baseline information be established at the time of the nomination and the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.

The information embodied in the nomination form, together with the evaluation report of the advisory body(ies) and the Committee's statement of the World Heritage values at the moment of inscription, would then serve as the first 'state of conservation report' on each World Heritage site. It should be regarded as the basic source of data. For that reason, if the Committee, the Secretariat or the advisory bodies have significant questions to raise about a nomination, they should be answered by way of a specific amendment or revision of the nomination form. No site should be recommended by the advisory bodies for inscription or inscribed by the Committee until they are satisfied with the contents of the nomination dossier.

The basic structure of a revised nomination format was presented to and endorsed by the Committee at its eighteenth session. In consultations with the advisory bodies, an annotated version was prepared which was examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. The Bureau decided that:

- the Secretariat should prepare a final draft of the nomination format for consideration by the Committee, taking into account observations made by the Bureau, States Parties and the advisory bodies;
- the Secretariat should prepare a draft revised text for paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines ('Format and Content of Nominations'); and
- the Committee should be asked to decide the date of introduction of the format, the Bureau being of the opinion that this should be as early as possible.

A.2. THE REVISED NOMINATION FORMAT

The annotated revised nomination format is annexed (Annex I).

In case of approval of this format by the Committee at its nineteenth session, it could be introduced either for nominations that would be submitted by 1 July 1996 and examined by the Bureau and the Committee in the course of 1997, or for nominations that would be submitted by 1 July 1997 and examined by the Bureau and the Committee in the course of 1998.

A.3. ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is requested to:

- examine the annotated nomination format;
- consider if and when this revised nomination format should be introduced, taking into account that the Bureau was of the opinion that this should be done as early as possible;
- invite the Secretariat to promote and diffuse this format as widely as possible among States Parties, cultural and natural national institutions, etc.; and
- examine the revised text for paragraph 65 of the Operational Guidelines ('Format and Content of Nominations') so as to reflect the new requirements for nomination dossiers. This revised text is included in Working Document WHC-95/CONF.203/14, Section C.

B. FORMAT FOR PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

B.1. BACKGROUND

The principles of systematic monitoring and reporting, as established by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session and reflected in paragraphs 69 - 76 of the Operational Guidelines, invite the States Parties to present periodically state of conservation reports of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. This implies that every five years the information in the nomination form (the baseline information) would be carefully reviewed and that up-to-date information would be provided to the Committee along with recommended actions to deal with problems or threats identified. These periodic state of conservation reports would, therefore, logically follow the structure of the revised nomination format. Consequently, in the case of sites which are already inscribed on the List, the main objective of the first monitoring and reporting cycle would be to establish or complete the baseline information on the site by preparing, as if it were, an updated nomination dossier.

The Committee, at its eighteenth session, requested the Secretariat to develop a format for the periodic monitoring reporting as an aid to the States Parties and to facilitate the processing of the reports and the information contained in them through a computerized data base. A draft annotated format was examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. The Bureau decided that:

- the Secretariat should prepare a final draft of the format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports for consideration by the Committee, taking into account observations made by the Bureau, States Parties and the advisory bodies;
- the Committee should be asked to decide the date of introduction of the format, the Bureau being of the opinion that this should be as early as possible.

B.2. THE FORMAT FOR PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

The proposed format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports is annexed (Annex II).

In case of approval of this format by the Committee at its nineteenth session, it could be introduced immediately.

B.3. ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is requested to:

- examine the format for periodic World Heritage state of conservation reports;

- consider if and when this format should be introduced, taking into account that the Bureau was of the opinion that this should be done as early as possible; and
- invite the Secretariat to promote and diffuse this format as widely as possible among States Parties, cultural and natural institutions, site managers etc.

C. WORK PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMMES AND THE EXAMINATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

C.1. BACKGROUND

The Committee decided that the site specific periodic state of conservation reports will be summarized by the Secretariat and be examined by the Committee on a regional basis. It will decide for which regions state of conservation reports should be presented to its forthcoming sessions so that the States Parties concerned can be informed at least one year in advance so as to give them sufficient time to prepare their reports. A global work plan, on the basis of a five-year cycle, will need to be established to this effect.

A first draft for such a work plan was examined by the Bureau at its nineteenth session. The Bureau, expressing some concern about the great number of reports to be examined on a yearly basis and the need for concerted reporting on the mixed properties, requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised work plan for consideration by the Committee at its nineteenth session.

C.2. WORK PLAN FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL MONITORING PROGRAMMES AND THE EXAMINATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Considering the invitation to the States Parties to report on a five-year basis on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, the following work plan is proposed for the examination of regional reports by the Committee:

Year	Natural properties	Cultural properties
1994	--	Latin America and the Caribbean
1995	--	--
1996	--	--
1997	Asia and the Pacific	Asia and the Pacific
1998	Latin America and the Caribbean	
	Central and Eastern Europe	Central and Eastern Europe

1999	Arab States	Arab States and the Mediterranean region
	Africa	Africa
2000	Western Europe	Western Europe
	North America	North America

2001	Latin America and the Caribbean	Latin America and the Caribbean
2002	Asia and the Pacific	Asia and the Pacific
2003	Central and Eastern Europe	Central and Eastern Europe
2004	Arab States	Arab States and the Mediterranean region
	Africa	Africa
2005	Western Europe	Western Europe
	North America	North America

C.3. ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee is requested to:

- examine the draft work plan proposed above and to establish a work plan for the examination of regional state of conservation reports by the Committee;
- to invite the Secretariat to inform the States Parties of the work plan adopted by the Committee and to enter into consultations with the States Parties on the implementation of the regional reporting activities as well as of the preparation of the regional state of conservation reports.

D. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF REGIONAL SYNTHESIS REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

This section of the working document presents short progress reports on the development of strategies and work plans for the preparation of regional synthesis reports, i.e. regional State of the World Heritage Reports. These proposals are preliminary drafts as further consultations will take place with the States Parties once the Committee has established the global work plan for the examination of regional reports (see Section C. above). Strategies and work plans for each of the regions will be revised and updated on a continuous basis so as to reflect the wishes and needs of the States Parties.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Natural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 1998

In Latin America a workshop on "Management of Natural World Heritage sites in Latin America" held from 29 September to 3 October 1995 at La Amistad National Park World Heritage site, Costa Rica, in close cooperation with the FAO Office Chile and the Park authorities. Twelve site managers from natural World Heritage sites in the region participate at this meeting. The participants were amply informed of the decisions of the Committee regarding monitoring and reporting. In 1996, the Secretariat will further develop the cooperation with FAO and will give the necessary follow-up to the meeting in Costa Rica so as to obtain the periodic state of conservation reports and prepare a regional State of the Natural World Heritage Report for presentation to the Committee in December 1998.

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report: 2001

The first regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report, as well as state of conservation reports prepared by the national authorities of Mexico, were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session (December 1994). They were also examined by the Directors of Cultural Heritage of Latin America and the Caribbean during their regional meeting in May 1995.

The Directors of Cultural Heritage welcomed the decisions of the World Heritage Committee on monitoring and reporting and emphasized that all institutional levels should be involved in the monitoring and reporting process. They recommended that specific (training) activities be developed for different types

of sites and that States Parties inform the World Heritage Centre on an annual basis on the state of the properties. The Directors also recommended that regional expertise should be utilised for the preparation of the regional State of the World Heritage Reports.

In response to the above recommendations, the Secretariat proposes to undertake the following actions:

- 1) consult with States Parties and regional experts to establish a regional work plan and define guidelines and working methods for monitoring and reporting (continuous process);
- 2) provide assistance, at the request of States Parties, in the preparation of periodic state of conservation reports (continuous process);
- 3) consult with States Parties with regard to the organization of seminars for site managers of archaeological sites and small and medium-sized historical cities (site manager seminars in 1996, 1997 and 1999);
- 4) prepare the second regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report in collaboration with regional experts (2000-2001).

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Natural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 1997

A systematic monitoring exercise for Asia started in Indonesia, in close cooperation with the States Parties concerned. Due to circumstances beyond their control, the monitoring exercise had to be postponed until 1996. A CNPPA Regional Forum for South East Asia will be held at Cisarua and Ujung Kulung National Park, Indonesia, (World Heritage site) in March 1996. The meeting will provide a forum for Protected Area site managers and specialists from the region and could contribute considerably to the monitoring and reporting exercise in the region. For Australia, a meeting with site managers, scheduled by the State Party, took place in October 1995 and a "World Heritage Tropical Forests Conference" will be organized in Cairns, North Queensland, Australia, from 2 to 6 September 1996. The latter aims to "identify priorities for future research and management necessary for fulfilling the goals of the World Heritage Convention."

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report: 1997

The majority of States Parties of the Asia-Pacific region responded enthusiastically to the Committee's request for the

enhancement of the national monitoring mechanism and the call for a 5-yearly periodic report on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties to be submitted to the Committee through the Centre. In the Asia-Pacific region, the Secretariat has provided both international expert and financial inputs for the periodic reports on cultural properties in the following States Parties: China, Indonesia, Iran, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and VietNam.

Funds have been reserved from the 1995 allocation for a Regional Meeting on Systematic Monitoring and Periodic Reporting which is being prepared for January 1996 in Thailand for the purpose of reviewing the experience of the monitoring exercise and the reporting work conducted by the eight countries in 1995. The participants targeted for this meeting are the cultural experts of the principle government agencies who, in some cases, are directors, but others are at the site manager level. The objective of this review is to discuss the means of strengthening the respective national monitoring mechanism and to discuss any problems identified in the draft reporting format during the evaluation activities.

In 1996, cooperation requested from other States Parties of the ASPAC Region will be responded to, taking into account the lessons learned from the 1995 experience and the Regional Meeting referred to above.

ARAB STATES AND THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION

Natural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 1999

A training seminar of protected area and World Heritage site managers from the Arab States was held in May 1995 and representatives of IUCN and the Centre explained monitoring and reporting procedures. It is planned to link the fourth Arab region training course scheduled for 1997 to a systematic monitoring and reporting exercise.

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report: 1999

In order to implement the new regional, systematic and decentralized monitoring modalities for the Arab States region, a three-year action programme was elaborated by the Centre with the different partners by taking advantage of the regional meetings already foreseen on their respective activities, in order to limit costs:

- a) Organized by ICCROM and the Italian Government in

cooperation with the Centre, a meeting took place in Morocco, in November 1995, to define a subregional cooperation programme closely linked to the systematic monitoring of properties inscribed on the List.

- b) In 1996, and again in 1997, it is foreseen to make good use of regional meetings for the conservation of cultural properties in the riverain countries of the Mediterranean which are being organized by the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan "100 Historical sites". These two meetings, originally aiming to bring together about fifteen countries, will be enlarged, at low cost, to encompass the Arab States, and will include a special session on the new systematic monitoring modalities and the elaboration of national reports. This session will be conducted with UNEP and the assistance of the ex-Coordinator of the Systematic Monitoring Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean, whose field experience and expertise will be most valuable. The regional reports should also be available at the date foreseen (1999).

AFRICA

Natural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 1999

Following the meeting with site managers in October 1994, a preliminary overview of conditions at the 25 natural sites in Africa south of the Sahel was provided to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The UNESCO Regional office in Dakar has scheduled a meeting with site managers of natural World Heritage sites for 4 to 9 December 1995, the programme of which will include information on monitoring and reporting procedures, management and conservation issues as well as the protection of biodiversity. A report will be presented to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Bureau.

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report: 1999

In order to implement the new regional, systematic and decentralised monitoring modalities for the African continent, a four-year programme of action was elaborated by the Centre with the different partners by taking advantage of the organization of workshops for site managers of the 17 cultural sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. Therefore:

- a) a meeting organized by the Centre and the Mali Government will be held in 1996 in Mali to define conceptual ideas linked to a systematic monitoring of

World Heritage sites, and to advise the site managers on aspects of conservation and management;

- b) in 1997 it is also foreseen to organize a similar meeting in Ethiopia for which financial assistance from the Italian Government has been requested. It should be recalled that six Ethiopian sites are inscribed on the World Heritage List;
- c) an evaluation of these two meetings will provide a basis to decide upon the value of such events, and if positive a third meeting would be organized in southern Africa.

Furthermore, in 1994 three conservation reports were prepared by international experts who, with the help of site managers, compiled basic documentation indispensable for the systematic monitoring exercise. These reports concern: Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin), Forts and Castles, Volta Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (Ghana) and Ashanti Traditional Buildings (Ghana).

It is foreseen to continue this exercise each year in order to provide consultant services to all African States Parties having sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and willing to work with the experts provided by the Centre.

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Natural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 1998

The Central and Eastern Europe region comprises 20 States Parties. At the present time (October 1995) 8 World Heritage Natural sites are located in this region. Two more sites are likely to be inscribed by the Committee in Berlin. Additional sites are likely to be added to the World Heritage List in 1997 and 1998. This means that some 12 to 15 sites will be reported on in December 1998. Of this group, two sites are on the List of World Heritage in Danger : Srebarna Nature Reserve, in Bulgaria, and Plitvice Lakes National Park, in Croatia.

A first meeting of World Heritage site managers is planned for the CNPPA Conference in spring 1997, to launch a systematic monitoring and reporting exercise for the European region and to establish a network of site managers. In the meantime, site managers and relevant national authorities will be alerted of the monitoring and reporting programme, and of the December 1998 target date for the Regional Report.

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural

Heritage Report: 1998

At the present time (October 1995), the Central and Eastern Europe region comprises 42 cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. It is expected that further sites will be added during the next two years. Analysis of these properties reveals that 16 are historical urban areas (Vilnius, Prague, Warsaw, Cracow, etc.), 15 are religious monuments and 11 are civic monuments. Three of these properties are on the List of World Heritage in Danger: Dubrovnik, in Croatia; the Salt Mines of Wieliczka, in Poland and the Natural and Historic Area of Kotor, in Yugoslavia.

National authorities and site managers will be informed of the monitoring and reporting programme, and of the December 1998 target date for the Regional Report.

WESTERN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**Natural properties**

Target for the regional State of the World Natural Heritage Report: 2000

A CNPPA meeting of managers of protected areas of Canada, the United States and Mexico was held in Banff, Canada from 14 to 19 October 1995. Considerable attention will be given to the state of the protected areas in the region, many of them being World Heritage sites. The participants were informed of the decisions of the Committee regarding monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. Consultations were initiated with the States Parties in order to draw up a detailed work plan for the preparation of the state of conservation report for North America.

Cultural properties

Target for the regional State of the World Cultural Heritage Report: 2000

States Parties and site managers will be informed of the plan accepted by the Committee for reporting. Further consultations are necessary for the drawing up of a detailed work plan for this region.

E. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES WITH PARTICULAR FOCUS ON PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Note:

The outgoing Bureau will examine the state of conservation reports included in this section of the working document at its session that will be held on 1 and 2 December 1995 in Berlin.

The Bureau will be requested to prepare a draft recommended 'action by the World Heritage Committee' in response to each of the reports and to recommend to the Committee which of these reports should be discussed in extenso at its session.

The recommendations of the Bureau will be included in a new working document no. WHC-95/CONF.203/5.e.add. that will be distributed at the Committee's session.

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION

2. NATURAL HERITAGE

2.1. Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

2.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List

3. MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Mixed Natural and Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

4. CULTURAL HERITAGE

4.1. Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

4.2. Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

1. INTRODUCTION

This section deals with **reactive monitoring** as it is defined in the Operational Guidelines: "The reporting by the Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the advisory bodies to the Bureau and the Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List (paragraphs 50-85 of the Operational Guidelines) and in relation to properties inscribed, or to be inscribed, on the List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 83-90 of the Operational Guidelines).

In this context, it should be recalled that the Committee at its eighteenth session decided that 'the highest priority will be given to the monitoring of and reporting on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger' and that 'the Secretariat will again report to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in 1995 on the state of conservation of all sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger with an assessment of the appropriateness of their continued inclusion in this List'.

This working document, therefore, includes reports on sites that are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as reports prepared in response either to requests of the World Heritage Committee or to information received by the Secretariat or the advisory bodies that specific World Heritage sites are under threat.

The eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee and the nineteenth session of the Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of the eight natural and seven cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and reports on twenty-six natural, one mixed and twenty-nine cultural properties on the World Heritage List.

As appropriate, the Secretariat informed the States Parties concerned of the observations made by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau and requested to be informed of any follow-up action taken. In those cases where relevant information has been received from the State Party or other sources, the Secretariat and/or the advisory bodies will report on it to the December session of the outgoing Bureau of the Committee.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau is requested to examine the state of conservation reports presented in this document and to

1. identify the state of conservation reports which it recommends should be examined by the Committee at its plenary session; and
2. to formulate a recommended 'action by the Committee' on each of the reports.

2. NATURAL HERITAGE

2.1. Natural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and IUCN reported on the eight natural sites which are now inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. These are: the Air-Ténéré Reserve, Niger (inscription 1981, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Manas Wildlife Sanctuary, India (inscription 1985, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire (inscription 1991, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Plitvice Lakes National Park, Croatia (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Sangay National Park, Ecuador (inscription 1983, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992); Srebarna Nature Reserve, Bulgaria (inscription 1983, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992), the Everglades National Park, United States of America (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1993) and Virunga National Park, Zaire (inscription 1979, List of World Heritage in Danger 1994).

The Secretariat presents the following information on the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

A substantive state of conservation report, prepared by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Bulgaria, was examined by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session. The report recalled the history of the site and the deterioration of the state of conservation, which led to the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 and the Montreux List of the Ramsar Convention in 1993. The measures taken to restore the ecological integrity of the site were research studies and the construction of a channel and a monitoring programme to review the status of the Reserve since 1994. The hydraulic connection between the lake and the Danube River was reestablished and the water level has now risen by 1m. Furthermore, it is indicated that the Dalmatian Pelican is continuing to nest in the site.

The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that they were awaiting a detailed monitoring report from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat and recalled that the previous Bureau felt that the site may no longer retain the values for which it was inscribed.

The Bureau took note of both the report received from the State Party and the comments made by IUCN and recommended that no decision could be taken until the monitoring report by the Ramsar Convention Secretariat is received. At the time of the preparation of this document, the report was not yet available, It will be presented to the session of the outgoing Bureau in December 1995.

Action by the Bureau: Depending on the content of the above-mentioned report the Bureau is requested to make a recommendation to the World Heritage Committee.

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)

The site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992. Missions to the site were carried out in 1992 and 1993.

The Committee at its eighteenth session decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that another fact-finding mission to this area, particularly to the Korkaova Uvala Virgin Forest is to be scheduled for 1995-96.

The Centre received information from both the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Croatia to UNESCO and the National Croatian Commission for UNESCO, that the site has been visited and that damage from the period of occupation was evident. The World Heritage Centre jointly with the authorities are now scheduling a management planning workshop for early 1996 which will address the future management of the Park.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to underline the need to review management planning for this Park with a recommendation that action should be taken to repair the serious damage to the infrastructure. The Bureau therefore recommends the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled at its nineteenth session that the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983 and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 due to threats from poachers, boundary encroachment and unplanned road construction. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre received a preliminary report by INEFAN (Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre) on the environmental impact of the construction of the Guamote-Macas road in the Park and a final report from the Commission (Ministry of Public Work/INEFAN) in May 1995. The Commission had studied the following issues: (1) the environmental impact of the first 7kms of the road, which have been constructed; (2) the measures to be taken to mitigate the environmental impact of the remaining 23 kms still to be constructed and (3) guidelines for the management of the Park to mitigate the negative impact of the new road.

From the report it is clear that the road has caused irreversible damage to the natural environment, as construction work has caused a number of landslides. The Commission recommended that the following measures should be taken: the road should be made narrower (6 meters); manual labour should be used and not heavy machinery, to take care of the disposal of excavated material; supervision by environmental experts; the setting-up of additional control posts at the entrance to the Park to halt

spontaneous settlements; intensification of patrols in the Park to allow only government controlled eco-tourism; the creation of a small visitor centre for tourists; an inventory of the legal land owners in the Park should be made, and the new part of the road should be considered as an "environmental pilot stretch".

The IUCN Representative underlined that the impact on the site was worse than expected and that the local IUCN office will provide an update on conditions at the site in September 1995.

At the time of the preparation of this document, no response had been received to the Centre's letter to the Government of Ecuador commending the authorities for their impact report, transmitting the concerns of the Bureau, and requesting clarification of the present situation with regard to the threats to this site.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau expressed its continuing concerns about the construction work causing negative environmental impacts and requested the State Party to take steps to ensure much stricter environmental regulations. The Bureau therefore recommends to the Committee that the site should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)

The Bureau recalled at its nineteenth session that the site was included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 because of negative impacts from a proposed iron-ore mining project and threats due to the arrival of a large number of refugees from neighbouring countries. An expert mission was undertaken in 1993 and proposals to revise the boundaries of the site were endorsed by the seventeenth session of the Committee in 1993. An international assistance project under the World Heritage Fund was recently carried out in 1994, and a report was presented to the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The French Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry for Cooperation, in cooperation with IUCN-France, have carried out a study and review of the site for the Government of Guinea with regard to priority needs and potential future investment.

The results of a 1994 mission to the site by the French IUCN Committee were presented to the Bureau, stating the lack of commitment by the Government of Guinea, and the fact that the site, for which responsibility is shared by four ministries, is legally not sufficiently protected or classified as a protected area on the national level.

The Bureau recalled that the boundaries were revised by the national authorities, and adopted by the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau requested the Centre, jointly with IUCN, to follow-up on the results of the mission, including a letter to the Guinean authorities to ask for clarifications on the legal protection and classification of the site. In their letter of 15 September 1995 the Ministry for Energy and Environment indicates that the Government had taken

several measures to develop and protect the site. This included the creation of a Management Centre "Centre de Gestion de l'Environnement des Monts Nimba (CEGEN)" responsible for all environmental and legal questions, as well as the international classification of the site, the monitoring of the water quality in the region, integrated rural development and socio-economic studies; CEGEN and the ITC (Institut de Topographie et de Cartographie de Guinée) are cooperating on thematic maps and the preparation of a Mount Nimba Foundation to obtain bi/multilateral financial resources.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to commend the States Party for their efforts. However, given the uncertainties concerning the adequate management of the site, and the shortcomings with regard to the on-site management, the Bureau may also wish to recommend to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

The Bureau recalled that at its eighteenth session, the World Heritage Committee took note of the information provided by the Indian Government through the Permanent Delegate that "if the representatives of the World Heritage Centre and of the World Heritage Committee desire to visit New Delhi, Assam and Manas for discussion, or see the site" then they "would be welcomed by the concerned authorities of the Government of India". In the same letter the Indian authorities also indicated that the Indian Government will involve local level NGOs in monitoring the state of conservation of the site. It was also noted that cooperation between the management authorities of the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary of India and Manas National Park in Bhutan should be encouraged. To enhance cooperation between India and Bhutan in the conservation of the Manas ecosystem, the Government of Bhutan should be invited to ratify the Convention as soon as possible.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre, in cooperation with the Government of India, to elaborate the terms of reference for a mission to New Delhi, Assam and Manas. No response has been received to the Centre's letter concerning a mission to the site.

Action by the Bureau: In the absence of any precise information, uncertainties remain concerning the state of conservation of the site, the Bureau may wish to ask the State Party for a detailed report. In the meantime, the Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Aïr-et-Ténéré Reserve (Niger)

The Bureau recalled at its nineteenth session that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992 as it was affected by civil disturbances and its staff held hostage. The World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session took note that a peace accord was signed on 9 October 1994 and encouraged the authorities to implement it and to undertake all efforts to

safeguard the site. The Centre, in cooperation with the authorities of Niger, sent a mission to review the protected area system of Niger and to prepare the nomination of a natural site. One of the results of this mission was a preliminary report on the Aïr et Ténéré World Heritage site. It indicated that due to a number of different factors (historical, socio-economic and political), armed conflict developed over the last years (Tuareg minority against the State). A major degradation of the site was noted, including poaching. In 1995, however, a dialogue was established between the two parties, which has paved the way for a return to a normal situation and may allow for a detailed evaluation of the state of conservation of the site, and examine how the World Heritage Fund could contribute to the action programme for the recovery of the site.

An IUCN project is under way to assist in re-establishing the management regime. The Ambassador of Niger underlined that his Government is now taking every step to enhance the management of the site and wishes, as soon as all conditions are met, that a mission be sent to the site, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. However, given the fact that IUCN is carrying out a project at the site, the Centre sees no necessity to field a mission at the present time.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to examine the report provided by IUCN on the site and may wish to consider whether the site should continue to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Everglades National Park (United States of America)

The Bureau at its nineteenth session recalled that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1993 due to an increasing number of threats since the date of its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1979. Federal State and local governments as well as private foundations have joined forces in providing significant financial support for the management of the site and for its long-term restoration.

The World Heritage Centre presented a monitoring report received from the National Park Service indicating that the Federal Government is engaged in restoration planning for the Everglades National Park under the aegis of a Federal Restoration Working Group.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau at its nineteenth session concluded that the site remains seriously threatened and recommended to the Committee that the site be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Virunga National Park (Zaire)

Virunga National Park, inscribed under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) in 1979, was included on the List of World Heritage in

Danger at the last session of the World Heritage Committee in December 1994, due to the tragic events in Rwanda and the subsequent massive influx of refugees from that country. Virunga National Park, situated on the border between Rwanda and Uganda, has been destabilized by the uncontrolled arrival of refugees, causing deforestation and poaching at the site. The Bureau recalled that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved a total of US\$ 50,000 emergency assistance for both Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Virunga National Park. The project is carried out in cooperation with IUCN, WWF and the International Gorilla Conservation Programme. A report on the project was received at the time of the Bureau session indicating the World Heritage Fund project was effective and crucial to help in maintaining the Park's management activities and to support the staff. However, the ecological situation at the Park is not improving, the bamboo forests have been cut and the number of elephants and hippos within the site are much reduced. The buffalo population is also threatened. The report indicated that the Park is a primary source of fuelwood and construction materials for the refugees and that 30 to 40,000 people are entering the Park daily.

The Bureau discussed the situation at length and recommended several actions to be taken, including letters to the Government of Zaire for greater operational support and the payment of salaries of the staff of the site. No response on these letters has been received so far. On 8 August 1995, the Centre received information that six Italian citizens were killed by poachers in Virunga National Park. The Centre wrote to the authorities to request that the World Heritage Committee be informed about any action to be undertaken to stop illegal poaching operations within the site and to improve control in the Park.

Action by the Bureau: Taking into account the presence of thousands of refugees, the Bureau expresses its concern about the degradation of the Park and recommends to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

2.2. Natural Properties on the World Heritage List

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

The Bureau at its nineteenth session recalled that this mixed site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982 and that the Bureau at its eighteenth session in July 1994, discussed reports received on logging operations in areas adjacent to the World Heritage area. The IUCN Representative gave an update on the situation and recalled two concerns which were raised: that there is forested land outside the site which may have World Heritage values, and logging and roading activities adjacent to the site could have an adverse impact on the existing World Heritage site. IUCN noted that both the 1990 and 1994 General Assemblies of IUCN had urged Australia to evaluate the World Heritage values of these areas and that recent concerns about the

negative impact of forestry operations had been expressed by the Australian and New Zealand Committees for IUCN and the Wilderness Society (Tasmania).

The Director-General of IUCN wrote to the Australian Government in March 1995 seeking advice on this issue. A detailed reply was received from Senator Faulkner, Australian Minister for the Environment, dated 28 June 1995, stating the commitment of the Australian and Tasmanian Governments to protecting World Heritage values and to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the Tasmanian forests.

The Bureau noted concerns which have been expressed about logging and road construction in forest areas which may impinge on World Heritage values, and resolved to thank the Australian Minister for the Environment for his encouraging response. In particular the Bureau noted: (1) the commitment of both the Australian and Tasmanian Governments to negotiate a Regional Forest Agreement which would involve a comprehensive assessment of a wide range of values, including World Heritage values, for forested areas in Tasmania; (2) that, in the meantime, the two governments have agreed to avoid activities that may significantly affect those areas of the old-growth forest or wilderness that are likely to have high conservation value; (3) that pending completion of a Regional Forest Assessment, the two governments have agreed to jointly undertake an assessment of those forest areas where commercial logging will be deferred, to allow among other things, an assessment of World Heritage values. The Bureau insisted that the integrity of the site be respected.

Furthermore, the authorities have provided information that negotiations to alleviate possible impacts are still underway and a report may be available in time for the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to take note of the action by the State Party to strengthen the protection of the site and may wish to make recommendations to the Committee depending upon the content of the full report, yet to be received.

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

In spite of repeated requests to the Ecuadorian authorities to provide detailed information on the state of conservation of the site, no information has been received. It is hoped that at the time of the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, information on the situation at the site can be made available by the State Party and IUCN.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to note that current information seems to indicate that the site is exposed to threats and that consideration should be given to placing it on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

The Centre informed the Bureau that a report was received from the Fundación Rio Platano concerning the site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1982. The report concerned the agricultural intrusion at the western border of the site. Additional information was obtained on 12 April 1995 on the land reform programme and its implementation in north-eastern Honduras. The settlement programme threatens several protected areas. The Centre contacted the authorities concerned to obtain further information and has received additional reports about shortcomings of the conservation of the site by the national government. The site is seriously threatened by planned and unplanned colonization having negative effects upon the indigenous cultures, unauthorized forest operations and poaching.

The Bureau asked IUCN to verify the situation and to report back to the World Heritage Committee in December. Subsequently, the Centre received a letter from the Minister for the Environment requesting a mission to the site to evaluate the situation. The Centre contacted IUCN to define the terms of reference for such a mission. At the time of the preparation of this document the mission was under preparation and IUCN will report to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

Action by the Bureau: On the basis of the report, the Bureau may reach the conclusion that the site is seriously threatened and may wish to recommend to the Committee that the site may be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Komodo National Park (Indonesia)

A mission to consider the state of conservation of Komodo National Park took place in July 1995 under the leadership of Prof. Soedomo, Chair of the Indonesian World Heritage Committee. He was accompanied by Ms. Suryati (World Heritage Committee Indonesia), Mr. Mulyana (Directorate General for Forest Protection and Natural Conservation, PHPA), Ms. Hartati (Directorate General for Forest Protection and Natural Conservation, PHPA), Mr. Putu Ngurah (Komodo Police chief) and Ms. Klein (UNESCO Jakarta). The party left for Komodo Island on a small boat provided under international assistance from the World Heritage Fund. Due to bad weather conditions and a rough sea, the boat capsized. The accident was fatal for four persons. Despite rescue operations only one body was recovered a few days later. The boat "Wardunia" was located, but is beyond repair. Further monitoring missions to Komodo and Ujung Kulong National Parks are postponed until 1996.

It may be of interest to the Bureau to note that with help of the World Heritage Fund, a Geographical Information Project was set up at Komodo National Park and a zonation map of Komodo National Park was prepared.

Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)

The Bureau took note of the oral report presented by the IUCN Representative on the site, indicating that the Mitsubishi Corporation in partnership with the Mexican Government has a project to convert a part of the lagoon into salt ponds for industrial salt production. A one-mile long pier is proposed, which would disturb the grey whales within the lagoon. No response has yet been received to a letter written to the authorities indicating the concerns raised at the nineteenth session of the Bureau concerning the situation at the site.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

The Bureau recalled that at the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, IUCN was requested to present to the Bureau an evaluation of the revised boundaries of this site, based on the report of the consultant working on the plan for the area. However, the Omani authorities, who had hired a consultant, requested a re-scheduling of the report for 30 July 1995. Upon receipt of the report, an evaluation would be prepared for presentation to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

IUCN raised concern that the report was still not available, although the World Heritage Committee had specifically requested this information and indicated that this concerns not only the boundary question, but also the management regime, the legal status of the different parts as well as a new map of the site. The Delegate of Oman indicated that the consultant could not start his work earlier due to factors beyond his control and indicated that the results will be presented in due course. At the time of the preparation of this document no further information was made available.

Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

The site was inscribed under natural criteria on the World Heritage List in 1990 and as a cultural landscape in 1993. In May 1995 the Centre received information from the local Maori community about the random dropping of 1080 poison on Mount Tongariro to combat the possum browse which threatens indigenous flora. The Centre contacted the New Zealand authorities and received an answer from the Department of Conservation indicating that the possum population had increased since its introduction to New Zealand and that its growing population is a matter of grave concern. From a Maori perspective, however, the notion of controlling the possum population is an alien one to their culture. The Department held consultations with the community, which agreed to a time-limited operation, which would not contaminate waterways and which would not threaten the community.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to take note of this report, commending the national authorities for their consultations with the Maori community.

Durmitor National Park (Yugoslavia)

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980. On 14 August 1995, the World Heritage Centre was informed by the Deputy Prime Minister of Montenegro, that a fire broke out on 16 June 1995 at the Centre of Durmitor National Park destroying a large part of the building.

Redwood National Park (United States of America)

The World Heritage Centre received on 15 September 1994 information on a proposed road project within the site, which involved 2 miles of highway relocation which has been subject to an Environmental Impact Study. The United States National Park Service and IUCN were requested by the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee to follow up this matter. The Centre informed the Bureau that in May 1995 a preliminary monitoring report from the National Park Service was received, indicating that the California Department of Transportation (CDT) has proposed the realignment of 3,2 Km (2 miles) of Highway 101 near Cushing Creek in Del Norte County to correct safety and operational problems. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by the National Park Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation and 76 comments were received, mostly opposing the alternative, which would have required the removal of at least 200 old growth redwood trees for highway widening. In response to the public and agency opposition, a Value Engineering Team considered other solutions and developed strategies to alleviate safety and traffic problems, which were presented at a public meeting in March 1995.

The Observer of the United States indicated that the original plans for the realignment have been abandoned. The National authorities indicated to the World Heritage Centre in their fax of 25 September 1995 that they are satisfied with the most recent outcome of the proposed realignment of Highway 101 through Redwood National Park as described in a new Alternative by the California Department of Transportation. This Alternative 4 will result in the removal of no more than five coniferous trees including redwoods (*Sequoia sempervirens*) greater than 36 inches in diameter. The modification of the original proposal in which 750 old growth redwoods would be removed to the current Alternative 4 illustrates a success in protecting World Heritage value and integrity.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to commend the States Party for their effort and to request that the World Heritage Centre be kept informed about the development of the project.

Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)

In February 1995 the World Heritage Centre was informed by a U.S. consortium of 14 prominent NGOs of a variety of internal and

external threats to the Yellowstone World Heritage site. The State Party responded by letter which was presented to the nineteenth session of the Bureau held at UNESCO Headquarters in July 1995. In the response, the State Party expressed similar concerns with respect to potential threats to Yellowstone and in lieu of a detailed monitoring report extended to the Chairman an invitation to send Committee and IUCN representatives on a monitoring mission to Yellowstone and invited the Committee to consider placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This could be accomplished under paragraph 72 (ii) (b & d) of the Operational Guidelines, as revised, February, 1994. The mission took place in September 1995.

A report is presently awaited on the Environmental Impact Assessment which is being prepared by U.S. Government officials as well as a report to be submitted by IUCN. It is expected that these will be available for the Committee meeting and a report will be made at that time.

3. MIXED NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Mixed Natural and Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List

Willandra Lakes Region (Australia)

The Bureau at its eighteenth session took note of the first mission report to the site. The report indicated problems with landowner residents, aboriginal concerns and delays in the preparation of a management plan. IUCN suggested a redefinition of the boundaries of the site and a revised nomination under cultural criteria. The Bureau asked the Centre to consult the Australian Government and both advisory bodies and to report back to the Committee.

In their letter of 29 September 1995, the national authorities advised the Centre of a proposed amendment to the boundary of Willandra Lakes Region. The present boundaries are defined on the basis of cadastral boundaries, including pastoral leases. A review of the boundaries was carried out, with the participation of relevant scientists and local landholder and Aboriginal communities, and a report was prepared out on behalf of the "Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee" for the site, in May 1995. Following detailed consideration and consultation with the landholders and the three aboriginal groups, it was recommended to revise the boundary to reflect the area within which the cultural and natural values originally recognized for the listing are located. The new boundary will reduce the total area by about thirty percent and a number of small areas will be added to the property. The revised boundary will gain credibility with regard to World Heritage values. The boundary review is part of a package of management and planning measures being developed for a sound future management of the site. The Centre transmitted this information and maps to both advisory bodies, IUCN and ICOMOS, for review.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to consider the proposed reduction of one third of the size of the World Heritage area, which would constitute a major change in relation to the original nomination. The Bureau therefore, may wish to consult ICOMOS and IUCN with regard to what this boundary revision may imply for cultural and natural values and either endorse the proposed changes or request the States Party to resubmit the site as a new nomination.

4. CULTURAL HERITAGE

4.1. Cultural Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat and ICOMOS reported on the state of conservation of seven of the nine cultural sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger: Royal Palaces of Abomey, Benin (inscription 1985, List of World Heritage in Danger 1985), Angkor, Cambodia (inscription 1992, List of World Heritage in Danger 1992), the Old City of Dubrovnik, Croatia (inscription 1987, List of World Heritage in Danger 1991), Timbuktu, Mali (inscription 1988, List of World Heritage in Danger 1990); Bahla Fort, Oman (inscription 1987, List of World Heritage in Danger 1988); Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, Peru (inscription 1986, List of World Heritage in Danger 1986) and Wieliczka Salt Mines, Poland (inscription 1978, List of World Heritage in Danger 1989).

The Secretariat provides the following information on sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)

In accordance with the recommendation adopted by the Bureau at its eighteenth session, the mission comprising two Italian experts: Professor Spini (architect) and Ms Antongini (archaeologist), visited Benin from 3 to 28 July 1995. The mission reviewed and completed the nomination documents by making recordings of the entire nominated site, that is 44 hectares. The state of conservation of the enclosing wall, the entrance doors of the twelve palaces, the two palaces of the museum area and the remains of the ten other palaces, as well as buffer zones around the site, were examined. This completes the diagnostic provided by CRATerre-EAG/ICCROM in the framework of their intervention on site, and which also includes a pathological analysis of the "banco".

This report is illustrated by abundant unpublished cartographic material and a wealth of photographic documentation which in particular allows the comparison of the state of conservation of the buildings between 1987 and 1995. The state of conservation of the bas reliefs was also examined. Furthermore, the report presents an anthropological analysis of the site and an interpretation of the inner and outer areas. This anthropological dimension is thus emphasized. It will give

meaning to possible itineraries on the site and facilitate the visitor's comprehension.

With this report, the Benin authorities possess all the necessary documentation for the preparation of a management and conservation plan for the site.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee recommends that the Benin authorities prepare, as soon as possible, and in cooperation with CRATERre-EAG and ICCROM, a conservation management plan which could be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 21st session (December 1997), at the latest".

Angkor (Cambodia)

The UNESCO Secretariat is assisting the Royal Government of Cambodia in carrying out its obligations following the inscription of the site of Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger during the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Santa Fe, on 14 December 1992. Remedial action has paved the way for the creation of permanent boundaries and significant buffer zones, the establishment of an Authority for the Protection of the site and the development of the region of Angkor (APSARA) thanks to the Royal Kret (decree-law) promulgated by the Cambodian authorities on 19 February 1995, as well as the monitoring and coordination of international efforts in the field of conservation. In this respect, the third and fourth meetings of the Technical Committee created by the International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguard and the Development of the Historic Site of Angkor (CIC), co-chaired by France and Japan, and for which UNESCO provides the secretariat, were held on 31 March in Phnom Penh, and 7 October 1995 in Siem Reap-Angkor.

With regard to the adoption of legislation for the protection of cultural property, a UNESCO consultant visited Cambodia, in March 1995, to finalize the draft text of the cultural property protection law with a view to its adoption and application whilst ensuring its harmonization with existing legal texts.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to request the Cambodian Government for an early adoption of the cultural property protection law.

Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)

At its nineteenth session, the Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat about the progress made in the setting up of a documentation centre and coordination unit for the restoration works in the Old City and the Secretariat's cooperation with the national and local authorities in training

the necessary personnel and purchasing equipment for this unit. It requested the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the assistance and to present a progress report to the World Heritage Committee at its nineteenth session. The Bureau recommended the Committee to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Since then, the Croatian National Commission for UNESCO informed the Secretariat that due to the recurrent attacks of this summer, the setting up of the documentation and coordination unit was slowed down and that the meeting of the experts on Dubrovnik's future tourism and development which was planned for August 1995 had to be postponed until 1996.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee, having taken note of the difficulties which hindered the execution of the programme for which it had approved funds in 1994, requests the Secretariat to continue monitoring its implementation and to present a progress report to the Bureau at its twentieth session. The Committee decided to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Timbuctu (Mali)

The Mali authorities have submitted a preliminary report on the first phase of the pilot project for the preservation of the three mosques inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Djingareiber, Sankore and Sidi Yahia), providing information on the seasonal maintenance work on the mosques. Furthermore, an awareness programme among the local populations and religious authorities has been carried out concerning the risks which threaten these mosques during this seasonal work effected by the local population who are not skilled in elementary rules of conservation. Therefore, the need to proceed with a diagnostic for the conservation of each mosque was accepted by the Management Committee for the mosques. Prior to the preparation of the second phase of the project, which is the subject of a request for technical assistance and which will be examined by the Bureau and the Committee, the national authorities have granted as an emergency measure an allocation of 500,000 CFA which has permitted the intervention of an architect designated by the Ministry of Culture and Communications and who will direct the works to be financed from the World Heritage Fund.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee supported the organization of a pilot project and congratulated the Mali Government for its commitment to define a coherent conservation policy adapted to the problems of each mosque, and to have provided national funds for emergency work".

Bahla Fort (Oman)

Since the eighteenth session of the Committee in December 1994, two missions were fielded to the Sultanate of Oman to monitor and evaluate the ongoing restoration work at the Fort.

The first of these missions was carried out in December 1994 and resulted in observations and recommendations which are set out in a Consolidated Report transmitted to the national authorities, following a meeting with the Permanent Delegation. At that point, it was confirmed that the work carried out over the last two years was of a clearly "renovation" type, risking to irretrievably compromise the authenticity of this historic monument. The UNESCO expert advised that a reorientation both conceptual and technical be implemented without delay.

Following this report, and in order to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations concerning the use of materials and traditional construction procedures, - particularly the manufacture of mud bricks (adobe), the mixture and the use of mortar and plaster - the Omani authorities proposed to the World Heritage Centre to share the costs of a second mission of two consultants, one of whom being an internationally renowned specialist in mud brick constructions from the CRATERRE Group. This mission took place from 27 May to 11 June 1995.

This specialist was able to provide valuable advice to the responsible architects and staff working at the site with regard to the choice of material, its preparation and utilization. Together with the architects and two civil engineers mandated by the Ministry of Culture, solutions were found for the conservation and/or restoration of certain very dilapidated parts, including the "mihrab" of the small outer mosque and the reception rooms of the ancient residence of the Governor.

During the working sessions held with high officials of the Ministry of Culture, including the Under-Secretary of the Heritage Office, crucial questions concerning the progress of the project and its outcome were discussed: carrying out of architectural surveys with the use of photogrammetry and archaeological research; establishment of historical records, cartography and iconography on Bahla, setting up of a rehabilitation project and enhancing the group comprising the Fort and the oasis, establishment of a Management Plan for the oasis of Bahla requiring the involvement of several ministries.

The responsible Omani authorities have clearly indicated their willingness to safeguard Bahla in accordance with the recognized standards of the international community. They have openly welcomed advice and recommendations from the consultants and have expressed their wish for continued cooperation with UNESCO, especially through a further monitoring mission. The technical report established following the second mission was transmitted to the Permanent Delegation of Oman on 11 July 1995.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau could recommend that the Committee adopt the following text:

"The Committee thanked the Omani authorities for their active collaboration with UNESCO towards the preservation of Bahla fort. They particularly appreciated their desire to follow the advice of the experts, specialists in mud-brick architecture, who were sent to the site. This action seemed to be the only way to preserve the authenticity of the monument, to which continued importance is accorded. It thanked the authorities for their financial support towards the safeguarding of this heritage and requested that the outer mosque and the ancient residence of the Governor be also considered for restoration in accordance with the international recommendations for the preservation of authenticity.

The Committee suggested to the Omani authorities that a further mission of two experts be organized in 1996 under the same cost-sharing conditions, in order to evaluate the work and the state of conservation of the monument and to examine whether Bahla Fort may be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the future."

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

The Chan Chan Archaeological Zone was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1986 in view of the fragility of its adobe structures. An extensive monitoring report on the conditions of the site, prepared in the context of the regional monitoring programme for Latin America, was presented to the seventeenth session of the Committee. It was concluded that the conservation and maintenance of the site required continuous efforts as well as the recuperation of the land within the protected area that is presently being occupied by farmers.

In order to carry the research and training in adobe conservation further, the Peruvian authorities have taken the initiative to organize in late 1996 a regional/international training course in Chan Chan jointly with ICCROM, CRATerre and the Getty Conservation Institute. Parallel to the course, the participants and international experts will also evaluate the conservation practices and experiences in Chan Chan and define new conservation policies.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau at its nineteenth session in July 1995 took note of this information and may wish to recommend the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee decided to await the results of the assessment of the conservation policies and practices at the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, to be undertaken in the context of the course on adobe conservation that will be held at Chan Chan, late 1996. The Committee decided to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)

The Bureau, at its nineteenth session, took note of the information provided by the Secretariat on the action taken to implement the technical cooperation project that was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session. Specifically, the approved action was to provide a US\$ 100,000 financial assistance in order to help procure dehumidifying equipment required for the preservation of the salt sculptures in the Wieliczka Salt Mines.

To purchase this equipment, a call for tender was sent to 16 specialized companies; three quotations were received from companies in France, the U.S.A. and Germany. An analysis of these quotations was made by UNESCO (CLT/CH) and sent to the Polish authorities.

Moreover, the Bureau recommended to the Committee to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the results and a report of the impact of Technical Assistance on the project are known.

As requested by the Bureau, the Secretariat is monitoring this project. As no further information was available at the time when this working document was being finalized, it is proposed that complementary information be given orally to the Committee at its nineteenth session.

Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor (Yugoslavia)

The Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1979 after an earthquake caused severe damage to the site. No recent information is available on its state of conservation.

4.2. Cultural Properties on the World Heritage List**Asia-Pacific Region****Borobudur (Indonesia)**

The state of conservation report on Borobudur and Prambanan, both inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 was submitted by the Indonesian National Committee for World Cultural and Natural Heritage to the Centre in September 1995 for the attention of the Committee. The systematic monitoring exercise was conducted by the National Committee in July 1995 together with the UNESCO Office in Jakarta as a follow-up to the request of the nineteenth session of the Bureau. The monitoring of the natural properties could not be conducted due to the tragic accident referred to above under Komodo National Park.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to commend the Indonesian World Heritage Committee for the importance it has attached to the systematic monitoring exercise and rapid completion of the state of conservation report on the cultural properties. The Bureau may wish to request the Committee to express their condolences for the demise of the four officials of the Indonesian World Heritage Committee whose dedication to the cause of World Heritage protection and preservation will strengthen the resolve of the Committee to uphold the spirit of the Convention.

Meidan Emam of Isfahan (Iran)

The Bureau requested the Iranian authorities to consider the establishment of meaningful buffer zones to protect the World Heritage site and expressed its concern over the impact of the various proposed transportation infrastructure and to inform the Committee through the systematic monitoring report to be prepared by the Government.

In following up this request, the Iranian Cultural Organization invited the participation of international experts in an assessment of the state of conservation of all three World Heritage cultural properties in Iran. The Centre, with the approval of the Iranian authorities, requested ICCROM to take part in this exercise. A mission was carried out in September 1995 and the draft report on the state of conservation of the Meidan Emam of Isfahan, Tchogha Zanbil and Persepolis is currently under preparation.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to express its appreciation to the Iranian authorities for using the systematic monitoring exercise as an opportunity for furthering international cooperation in the protection and preservation of World Heritage.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

The technical cooperation grant approved by the Committee at its eighteenth session in December 1994, enabled the deployment in October 1995 of an International Technical Adviser (ITA) to Kathmandu for a period of five months to assist the authorities in the preparation of project proposals for international funding and to establish a development control unit within the Department of Archaeology. Three national professionals will be trained as development control officers by the ITA during this assignment and subsidies for 12 months will be provided for them under the Fund's technical cooperation grant on the understanding that they will be integrated as DOA staff beyond that period.

Under the on-going UNESCO/Japan Trust Fund project, the hand- and photogrammetric recording of Patan Durbar Square was completed in June 1995 and transferred to the Department of Archaeology for its documentation unit currently being established under the same

project. Five-month training of three documentalists will be carried out from the systematic monitoring budget allocated to the Centre for 1995.

The official gazette of the revised boundaries of the monuments zones has not yet been issued despite repeated indication by the DOA of its imminent publication.

The Bureau at its nineteenth session expressed its concern over the continued demolition of and alterations to historic buildings within the World Heritage protected zones and in areas pending official inclusion and requested the inter-ministerial task force and the International Technical Adviser to report, through the official Government channels, to the nineteenth session of the Committee. At the time of writing, this report has not reached the Secretariat.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to reiterate the request to His Majesty's Government of Nepal to provide a report on the progress in the implementation of the November 1993 UNESCO/ICOMOS recommendations.

Taxila (Pakistan)

The Bureau at its nineteenth session requested the Department of Archaeology & Museums, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, to (i) carry out the required scientific studies on vegetation control to minimize the damage to the masonry and structure of the monuments, and (ii) appraise the impact of the heavy industries and the stone quarrying in the Taxila Valley areas, identified during the systematic monitoring mission carried out in March-April 1995.

The Government of Pakistan has submitted a technical cooperation request to carry out the vegetation control study. The Centre is currently assisting the DOAM to prepare a project proposal to address the issues referred to under (ii) above, and to redefine if necessary, the boundaries of the Taxila World Heritage Site including a thorough study of the legal regimes protecting the Taxila Valley. This project proposal would be submitted to donors for extrabudgetary funding considerations.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to commend the DOAM and other concerned bodies of the Government of Pakistan for their enthusiastic undertaking of the systematic monitoring exercise which enabled the joint DOAM-UNESCO teams to complete within 1995, the state of conservation draft reports on four of the five World Heritage cultural properties in Pakistan. The Bureau may wish to approve the technical cooperation and preparatory assistance requests submitted by Pakistan to enable the DOAM to take immediate and tangible action to address the problems identified by the monitoring exercise.

Hue (VietNam)

The 8th Session of the Hue-UNESCO Working Group for the Safeguarding of Hue held in August 1995 in Hue attended by a number of international technical advisers, including Dr Adul Wichiencharoen, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, issued a set of recommendations upon a review of the activities carried out over the past year. Among the issues addressed was the threat on the World Heritage protected area by the increasing urbanization of Hue, fast becoming one of the major tourist destinations of Southeast Asia. The Working Group endorsed the recommendations of the *Workshop on World Heritage Preservation and Sustainable Tourism Development-Planning for Hue*, organized in May 1995 by the Government in cooperation with the UNESCO Bangkok Office and the World Heritage Centre with funding support from UNDP, Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD) and the UNESCO Regular Programme.

The Vietnamese authorities confirmed that the many projects for the upgrading and construction of new roads will not be affecting the World Heritage area of Hue despite numerous rumours concerning the upgrading of a road cutting through the site. The Working Group adopted *inter alia*, a recommendation to protect the integrity of the site and its surrounding landscape as a whole by redefining the boundaries under World Heritage protection for eventual submission to the Committee, as well as the promulgation and enforcement of strict building codes for not only Zone I but also for Zones II and III constituting the buffer zone.

The Geographical Information System (GIS) on the Hue Monuments established thanks to earmarked contributions to the World Heritage Fund by Soka Gakkai (Japan) and the Republic of Korea, will be expanded to cover the entire province of Thua Thien-Hue through a multi-bilateral cooperation arrangement with the French Government DATAR Mission in VietNam. The utility of the GIS as a planning and management tool was widely recognized and the limited training activities conducted by UNESCO are expected to be further developed by DATAR.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to express its concern over the impact of road upgrading and rapid tourism development on the Hue World Heritage site and commend the Vietnamese Government for the integrated development approach it is adopting to address both the safeguarding and development concerns of the region.

Africa

Churches of Lalibela (Ethiopia)

In the framework of the implementation of Resolution 27 C/20 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO in 1993, concerning an appeal for assistance to Ethiopia, a project for the "restoration and preservation of the churches of Lalibela" (539/ETH/70) was formulated. This project falls within the

framework of the International Campaign for the Conservation and Preservation of the Monuments of Ethiopia which was launched in 1981. In 1994, the European Union financed a mission of four international consultants whose mandate was to examine the situation of the site in the wake of Ethiopia's long period of instability, and make proposals for the restoration of the churches. Their preliminary report was submitted to the national authorities so they might decide on activities to be undertaken for the conservation and preservation of the site. A second mission, also financed by the European Union, presented and discussed the report with the local authorities, the E.E.C. and representatives of the FINNIDA which had expressed interest and wished to be associated, financially and technically, in the implementation of this important project.

Beforehand, UNESCO had sent a mission of eight Spanish experts from the Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain, to study various aspects of the safeguarding and conservation of the site. They concentrated on the monuments of Biet-Maryam, Biet-Amanuel, and Biet-Abba-Libanos, and prepared preliminary proposals for their restoration and enhancement, together with a budget estimate for the cost of the work and a provisional time table. These were included in the global report for financing by the European Union.

Thus, the project for the "Restoration and Preservation of the Churches of Lilibela" for which the European Union reserved approximately 2 million Ecu, was defined in a technical report containing recommendations, a work plan and a detailed budget for the implementation of the recommended activities.

At the same time, UNESCO initiated cooperation with the Ministry of the Environment of Finland, under the umbrella of FINNIDA, in order to carry out a project for rehabilitating the site of Lalibela, for which 10 million Finnish Marks (about US\$ 2.2 million) were earmarked over a period of four years. The project, which concentrates particularly on environmental issues concerning the site of Lalibela, nevertheless contains several aspects where close cooperation with the European Union and UNESCO project will be indispensable.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee congratulated the Ethiopian authorities for their efforts which have led to a restoration and conservation project for the entire site, which takes account of its environmental dimension."

Ihla de Mozambique (Mozambique)

1. Background

At the eighteenth session of the World Heritage Committee, a report on the state of conservation of Ihla de Mozambique was

presented. The report was part of the Systematic Monitoring Exercise, undertaken in collaboration with the, then existent, UNDP/Unesco Regional Project for Cultural, Urban and Environmental Heritage, Lima (1991-1994). Subsequently, the Government of Mozambique requested a mission, whose task was to:

- make the necessary arrangements to prepare an "international call" for "funding" a **global rehabilitation programme** - on the basis of concrete projects in restoration "infrastructure, housing, economic activities (including tourism)".

- Draw up a list of urgent conservation works to be undertaken in the Island.

The World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the authorities, fielded a mission to Mozambique in July 1995. The main findings are summarized below.

2. Present situation

The economic base of the Island remains precarious - reflecting the overall situation in the country. The cyclone in 1993 has seriously affected the built-architecture and urban fabric of the Island. The Ihla always had two kinds of distinct habitations (North : stone/lime and the city of Straw-Macuti); they are in precarious conditions. Self-help projects in Macuti City and some parts of the Stone City are underway. The infrastructure of the Island in water/sanitation, drinking water, sewage system, adequate electricity - energy, transport and communication is below the poverty line. So is the situation of ill-housing, including some squatters in the Stone City, environmental problems on beaches (waste disposal and defecation on the beaches); garbage collection. The human element of the Island is enthusiastic - good - willing, with a desire to rehabilitate their Island and conserve their heritage.

Some bilateral projects OIKOS (EU) for boat construction, water - sanitation (Switzerland - Canada - France) are in their initial stages with relatively good results.

3. Funding

All funding for the Island at present is international. No substantial matching fund in cash or even in kind are available. The mission met with the donor community. Generally there is a "Donor Fatigue" and set of priorities. However, with the Prime Minister's statement of political will following the mission's visit, there is good hope for joint ventures with the Mozambique authorities for a future Sustainable - Urban Integral Cultural Heritage Project with different components.

As to **Monitoring**, with the exception of the systematic exercise carried out in 1994, there is no monitoring in place and there cannot be - until such time that a management/project execution office is put in place in the Island *in situ*.

4. Outcome of the mission

The consultants have provided the outline of a programme which includes:

- 1) Physical restoration and maintenance programme of the Cultural Heritage;
- 2) Economic sustainability;
- 3) Rehabilitation of the human settlement;
- 4) Infrastructure, habitat, environment;
- 5) Education/training of local artisans.

This "Comprehensive - Integral - Sustainable Conservation and Rehabilitation" Agenda has to be set up for the Island (1995-2000), and funded by external donors. The mission already identified a series of projects within the Integral Conservation Programme. These include :

- a) The urban pattern gardens, squares and street furniture, sea-front and beaches.
- b) Monuments and Public Buildings (Restoration and readaptive use)
 - * Adaptation of the Fortress - readaptive use
 - * The palazzo - now a museum
 - * The Custom's house - Al Fandinga
 - * The warehouses
 - * Church of Misericordia
 - * The School of Arts and Crafts
 - * The mosque and market place
 - * The hospital
 - * Upgrading residential monumental buildings.
- c) Infrastructure (water, sewage, electricity, environment, transport, etc).

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee requested the World Heritage Centre to follow up with the Government of Mozambique on the results of the mission, and ensure that detailed architectural drawings are prepared in order to submit these to donor countries for small-scale restoration projects (funds are available for this action). The Committee also encouraged the Government of Mozambique to submit a technical cooperation request in order to prepare detailed projects with cost estimates for the restoration of each monument and the basic infrastructure of the Island."

Europe and North America

Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)

The Historic Centre of Vilnius was inscribed on the World Heritage List in December 1994. Located in the centre of the

Lithuanian capital at the confluence of the Neris and Vilnia Rivers, this 359ha historic area is an outstanding example of Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque architectures, as well as the blending of Eastern and Western European cultures.

As it is in need of restoration, the Lithuanian Government, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, launched a comprehensive rehabilitation programme. Heritage and real property laws were amended. A series of studies were initiated and experts' meetings were scheduled. The first of those meetings took place in April 1995, the next one is planned for November 1995. The World Heritage Centre was instrumental in securing for the City of Vilnius a financial assistance of the amount of \$US 180,000 granted by the World Bank in order to develop a comprehensive Revitalization Strategy. An international team of consultants has been selected for this task; the World Heritage Centre was invited to evaluate the consultants' proposals.

In June, the Director of the World Heritage Centre travelled to Vilnius and met with the President of Lithuania, the Prime Minister, the Chair of the National Assembly, the Leader of the Opposition, the Mayor of Vilnius and several other Lithuanian dignitaries in order to discuss the broad principles of the Old Town Revitalization Plan, in accordance with UNESCO standards. The Vilnius Old Town Rehabilitation Programme is backed by a strong consensus and unflinching political will.

This ambitious undertaking raised considerable interest in several States Parties, notably in Scandinavia, Canada and the U.S.A. The New York-based World Monuments Fund has, for instance, initiated an activity regarding the rehabilitation of the Bernardine Convent.

The Lithuanian Government has offered premises in the Old Town in order to set up a UNESCO House, that is new office space for the UNESCO National Commission as well as exhibition space, meeting rooms and a documentation centre. The Vilnius UNESCO House is scheduled to open its doors in 1996.

With the help of PROCEED and private sponsors, a promotional brochure on Vilnius Old Town will be published. Likewise, it should be noted that several secondary schools of Vilnius will participate as of 1996, in UNESCO's "Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion" project which includes students' involvement in on-going restoration projects.

Following the Revitalization Strategy Report, an International Donors and Investors Conference will take place in 1996, in order to secure international financing for the rehabilitation programme.

Action by the Bureau : The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee took note of the report on the comprehensive rehabilitation programme for the City. It commended the Government of Lithuania and the municipal authorities of Vilnius for their timely and appropriate initiative and commended UNESCO, its World Heritage Centre and donor institutions for their support."

Megalithic Temples (Malta)

During its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the very preoccupying situation at the site: the collapse of a wall of the monument and extensive limestone quarrying adjacent to Mnajdra, the risk of collapse of a part of the Ggantija Temple, and the general lack of surveillance. By letters of 6 January and 13 July 1995, the Centre transmitted to the Maltese authorities the requests expressed by the Committee and the Bureau, to undertake the necessary safeguarding measures without delay and to provide a detailed report.

By letter of 7 September, the Permanent Delegation of Malta transmitted to the Centre a detailed report dated 4 September, from the Director of the Museums Department of Malta concerning the measures already undertaken, or being undertaken, to ensure the safeguarding of the site.

a) Mnajdra

Following consultations with the University of Malta and a group of experts regarding the necessary measures to be undertaken to reconstruct the partially collapsed parts of the Temple, and to prepare a future strategy to ensure the stability and conservation of the Megalithic Temples, public tenders for the work were issued. This reconstruction work should commence shortly and should be completed in 1996, at a cost of US\$ 120,000. The Museums Department has also obtained the cancellation of a permit for limestone quarrying.

b) Ggantija

Following consultation with the University of Florence (Italy), measures to ensure the structural stability and the conservation of the temple, short- and long-term safeguarding work, including work on the walls, the protection of the floors, a visitors' parking area and the establishment of a buffer zone, should be completed in 1996, at a cost of US\$ 60,000.

c) Hagar Quim

Work amounting to US\$ 150,000 has already commenced, in collaboration with the Ministry of Tourism, for the development of an archaeological park at Hagar Quim and Mnajdra. Land has been expropriated and a dry-stone wall has been erected. Parking facilities are being constructed, situated sufficiently far away from the site to blend in with the environment, at a cost of US\$ 180,000. Plans for a well-located interpretation centre are

being studied.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee warmly thanked the Maltese Government and in particular the Minister for Culture, for the considerable financial support and manpower provided for the conservation of this World Heritage site, as well as the Museums Department for its continued commitment and for the quality and success of its work. The Committee, noting that a complete and coherent plan for the group of temples was under preparation and that these monuments will soon benefit from long-term conservation measures, congratulated the authorities. It requested them to keep the Centre informed by 1 April 1996, of progress accomplished."

Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

The Committee was informed, during its eighteenth session, of the very serious situation at this site, which is partially flooded and in a state of accelerated dilapidation due to numerous leaks in the adjacent water and drainage systems. It had been closed to the public for three years, and the air-conditioning work, partially financed by the World Heritage Fund two years ago, had not yet commenced.

By letter of 6 January 1995, the Centre transmitted to the Maltese authorities the requests of the Committee and Bureau to proceed with the repair work of the drainage system in order to evacuate the water from the Hypogeum and to commence the conservation and equipping, particularly that which is financed by the World Heritage Fund, and to provide a detailed report of the work undertaken.

By letter of 7 September, the Permanent Delegation of Malta transmitted to the Centre a detailed report from the Director of the Museums Department of Malta on all the measures already undertaken to ensure the safeguarding of this site.

a) Water systems and sewage

After carrying out the necessary survey, the Museums Department has succeeded in obtaining, thanks to its insistence, that the cost for the repair or replacement of the damaged drainage be calculated and prepared by the Department concerned. This work should commence during September and be completed in December 1995, at a cost of US\$ 278,000.

b) Protection of the entrance to the monument

Glass panels will be installed at the end of 1995 or the beginning of 1996 to protect the original entrance to the monument, at a cost of US\$ 198,000.

c) Improvement to the visitors' rooms

These rooms are being completely refurbished with all the necessary commodities. The work will be completed by end-1995 or the beginning of 1996, at a cost of US\$ 89,800.

d) Lighting and air-conditioning

Appropriate equipment to combat the deterioration of the ochre wall paintings will be installed during 1996, once all the water has been evacuated from the monument, at a cost of US\$ 700,000. The US\$ 30,000 allocated by the Committee in 1993 will be used to complement national funds.

e) Fire detection and related equipment

All surveillance, protection and detection equipment will be installed in 1996, at a cost of US\$ 55,000.

f) Improvement of the area surrounding the monument

The streets and the roads surrounding the monument will be repaved and improved upon completion of the repair work on the water system.

In general, all this work should be completed during 1996, and it is foreseen that the monument be reopened to the public in an excellent state of conservation by the end of 1996. The Maltese Government will have allocated an amount of over US\$ 1.3 million for this work.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee warmly thanked the Government of Malta and in particular the Minister of Culture, for the considerable financial and human commitment undertaken for the preservation of this World Heritage site, as well as the Museums Department for its continued commitment and for the quality and success of its work. It congratulated the authorities on the complete and coherent management plan being undertaken and noted with satisfaction that the monument would soon be reopened to the public. It requested the Maltese authorities to keep the Centre informed of progress accomplished, by 1 April 1996."

Taos Pueblo (United States of America)

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992. The World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session was informed by the Delegate of the United States on the actions taken by the Taos Pueblo and the US National Park Service to ensure the conservation and the integrity of the site. The Committee reiterated its concerns about the airport extension plans and invited the authorities to report back to the nineteenth session of the Committee.

The Centre received a preliminary monitoring report and information on the airport extension from the Taos Pueblo Warchief and the National Park Service. The major issues are the size of the area determined to be affected by the proposed airport improvements. On 9 May 1995, Taos Pueblo received a document from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) which defined the geographical area to be studied for impacts to traditional cultural properties resulting from the proposed airport extension. The Taos Pueblo Land Tracts immediately surrounding the proposed flight routes and the Pueblo village were included for the study, whereas the Blue Lake Wilderness, a federally protected area for Tribal religious activity was excluded. Most of the Tribe's complaints about expected impacts relate to this sensitive area. Neither the Taos Pueblo nor the National Park Service have been consulted by the FAA.

The above report was presented to the Bureau at its nineteenth session in July 1995. The Bureau recommended to the authorities of the United States that an impartial professional review of the area defined by the Federal Aviation Administration for the impact study be carried out with the cooperation of ICOMOS, the Taos Pueblo, the United States National Park Service and the Federal Aviation Administration, and that a report be submitted to the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to consult with the State Party regarding the possible extension of the World Heritage site to include the culturally valuable areas related to the Taos Pueblo under the cultural landscape criteria.

To date, no response has been received from the United States authorities on the above recommendations.

Action by the Bureau: The Secretariat will present an up-dated state of conservation report to the Bureau, on the basis of which the Bureau may wish to revise the above recommendation. In case no new information is made available to the Bureau, the Bureau may wish to recommend the Committee to adopt the following:

"The Committee recalled that the potential impact of the extension of the Taos Airport on the World Heritage site of Taos Pueblo was discussed at various Bureau and Committee meetings and that the Committee's concerns were transmitted to the United States authorities. The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had received preliminary monitoring reports from the Taos Pueblo War Chief and the US National Park Service. Both reports indicated that the major issue was the size of the area determined to be affected by the proposed airport extension. It was reported that this area was defined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) without consultations with the Taos Pueblo or the United States National Park Service (USNPS) and did include the Taos Pueblo Land Tracts immediately surrounding the proposed flight routes, whereas the Blue Lake Wilderness, a federally protected area for tribal religious activity, was excluded. Most of the Tribe's complaints about expected impacts related to this sensitive area.

The Committee recommended to the authorities of the United States that an impartial professional review of the area defined by the Federal Aviation Administration for the impact study be carried out with the cooperation of ICOMOS, the Taos Pueblo, the United States National Park Service and the Federal Aviation Administration, and that a report be submitted to the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. The Committee also requested the State Party to consider the possible extension of the World Heritage site to include the culturally valuable areas related to the Taos Pueblo under the cultural landscape criteria."

Arab States

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)

The Permanent Delegation of Algeria informed the World Heritage Centre that the national authorities were continuing to devote all their efforts to the preservation of the world heritage values of the Kasbah of Algiers, to which they accord special interest.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee warmly thanked the authorities of Algeria for informing them of their firm intention to preserve the Kasbah of Algiers and requested them to continue to devote their efforts towards the conservation of this World Heritage property."

Islamic Cairo (Egypt)

Precise and concordant information from several sources was brought to the attention of UNESCO that the restoration work at the three Fatimid mosques of Al Aqmar, Al-Guyushi and Lu-lu-a (11th and 12th centuries, and among the most ancient in Cairo), carried out by the Bohra community had in fact resulted in the destruction of most of their historic elements and an almost total reconstruction, causing the loss of their authenticity and World Heritage values. In fact, the plaster, woodwork and ancient painted walls, inside and outside, have been destroyed and replaced by new material, concrete has been used as a substitute for the old structures, and even the shape and configuration of the monuments have been completely transformed, in breadth and height, through the addition of levels and rooms. Furthermore, the traditional techniques have been totally ignored.

A report was requested in June 1995 from the Supreme Council of Antiquities. By September 1995, it had not yet been received.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee regarded the renovation and reconstruction works which have destroyed the authenticity of the three Fatimid mosques of Al Aqmar, Al-Guyushi and Lu-lu-a, situated within the World Heritage site of Islamic Cairo, with grave concern. It drew the attention of the Egyptian authorities to Articles 4 and 5 of the World Heritage Convention by which States Parties should endeavour to ensure the protection and conservation of their heritage, and that this conservation should be carried out in accordance with international standards, such as the Charter of Venice, in order to ensure respect of authenticity. It also recalled Article 24(b) of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention regarding the respect of authenticity of inscribed properties, and requested that, in the future, the authorities should conform to Article 58, inviting "States Parties to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention, major restorations or new constructions".

"It finally reminded the Egyptian authorities that UNESCO is always willing to provide, whenever necessary, international expert advice prior to any restoration work."

Memphis and its Necropolis -- the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)

Following an exchange of correspondence between the Director-General of UNESCO, the Government of Egypt and the World Heritage Committee, which was informed during its eighteenth session in Phuket of the very serious problems which threatened the site, a UNESCO expert mission visited Egypt from 1 to 6 April 1995, at the invitation of the national authorities. Its terms of reference were to propose safeguarding measures for the World Heritage site of the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur, after studying with the Egyptian authorities concerned the possibilities of adopting a new route for the motorway under construction which at the present time cuts across the site.

Following in-depth discussions and field visits, an agreement was reached with all parties concerned with regard to the choice of a new route for the motorway completely avoiding the World Heritage site, suppression of the two refuse dumps, the halting of all new housing constructions at Kafr-el-Gabal and the suppression of numerous encroachments on the site and its buffer zone.

The UNESCO mission report was transmitted to the Bureau during its nineteenth session in July 1995.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"After having noted the results of the mission of the UNESCO experts invited by the Government of Egypt, from 1

to 6 April 1995, to assist in identifying measures to ensure the conservation of the World Heritage site of the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur, the Committee congratulated and warmly thanked the Egyptian authorities for the decisions taken to date and action already undertaken:

- 1) the choice of a new route passing north of the World Heritage site for the highway link to the ring-road, which will follow, once the necessary detailed studies are achieved, either the Mariouteyya Canal, the Mansoureyya Canal, or both of them;
- 2) work already undertaken to improve one of the rubbish dumps and work foreseen to abolish the second;
- 3) actions to halt all further housing construction at Kafr-el-Gabal and to eliminate, in the coming years, the unauthorized buildings and roads encroaching on the buffer zone of the World Heritage site.

"It requested them to examine carefully, with the authorities concerned, the relocation of the different military camps and army factories which encroach upon the site and its buffer zone.

"It thanked the Egyptian authorities represented at the Joint Committee meeting for their excellent cooperation with the mission, their comprehension and high level of expertise made available, which contributed towards a successful outcome.

"It extended thanks to President Hosni Moubarak, the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Federico Mayor, and the Minister of Culture of Egypt, Mr. Farouk Hosni, for their instrumental role in seeking and reaching a satisfactory solution to the problems caused by the branch of the motorway, as well as to Dr. Abdel Halim Nur el Din, Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, for his personal commitment to the site, the manner in which he organized the work of the mission and chaired the meetings. It requested the Egyptian authorities to keep the World Heritage Committee informed, through its Secretariat, of the progress made in the implementation of the safeguarding measures already undertaken or foreseen, and in particular the question concerning the encroachment of military camps on the World Heritage site and its buffer zone".

Petra (Jordan)

During its eighteenth session, the Committee was informed of the different threats (hotel constructions near the site, insufficient waste water evacuation systems, uncontrolled urban development, proliferation of shops....) menacing the preservation of the integrity of the site.

By letter of 5 January 1995, the Centre informed the Jordanian authorities of the grave concerns of the Committee and transmitted its requests, notably the prohibition of all new hotel constructions near the site, the official creation of the Petra National Park and the implementation of the Petra National Park Management Plan prepared by UNESCO experts, including the establishment of eight protective zones, a buffer zone and a management authority, and requested them to send to the Centre by 1 May, a full report on the safeguarding measures undertaken.

By letter of 13 March, the Permanent Delegation of Jordan had sent the Centre a proposal for an extension of the site under the name Petra Natural and Archaeological Park, which was subsequently withdrawn pending completion of the proposal; and by letter of 18 March, the Minister of Tourism and Antiquities had informed the Centre of a certain number of measures undertaken to improve the protection of the site: limiting the daily intake of visitors and horses, improvement of sanitary arrangements, regrouping of street stalls, recruitment of a refuse team, creation of a centre for stone conservation and a team to study rock erosion, the improvement of some sites through descriptive panels and trails, establishment of a special bureau to follow up these different projects.

During its nineteenth session in July 1995, the Bureau thanked the Jordanian authorities for having undertaken the measures outlined by the Committee without delay and congratulated them on their desire to ensure long-term preservation of the site. In order to have available all the necessary elements for the evaluation of the proposed extension of the site, it requested the authorities to confirm, by 1 October, that no new hotel construction would be authorized at Wadi Musa and along the Taybeh road, that the Petra National Park Management Plan will be fully implemented, and that a specific management authority will be created at the site. These recommendations were transmitted by the Centre by letter of 13 July.

During a working meeting held on 14 September at the Ministry of Antiquities and Tourism, the Director of the UNESCO Office in Amman was informed that the Jordanian authorities were fully aware of the problems caused by the construction of new hotels and that the deliverance of building permits had been halted. The Minister emphasized the importance of establishing zoning regulations and guidelines for constructions at Wadi Musa which would be prepared with assistance from The World Bank.

Several of the short-term recommendations contained in the Management Plan had already been implemented, as already mentioned, but the long-term recommendations will be the subject of further studies. A Regional Planning Council for the Petra Region was established, chaired by the Minister of Antiquities and Tourism. It is responsible for all action in the region, including that for Petra. A Technical Committee was established to draw up the zoning regulations, as the first step towards the creation of an independent authority for the site.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee warmly thanked the Jordanian authorities and in particular the Minister of Antiquities and Tourism, for all their efforts and the measures undertaken to ensure the long-term preservation of Petra. It gave them its full approval of proceeding as quickly as possible with the establishment of zoning regulations and construction guidelines in order to avoid the proliferation of hotels and buildings, as well as the setting up of an independent local protection and management body endowed with the necessary authority. It requested them to devote all their efforts towards the active implementation of the UNESCO experts' Petra Management Plan and to the extension of this World Heritage site, whilst ensuring its preservation. It requested the national authorities to keep the Committee informed by April next, through its Secretariat, of progress accomplished."

Tyr (Lebanon)

UNESCO was informed of a land fill project in part of the bay adjacent to the old port north of Tyr, in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage site, in order to build a tourist complex. A project of that kind would irremediably destroy the underwater archaeological remains located near the old port and would be a major threat to the immediate vicinity of the listed site.

Action by the Bureau: The Bureau may wish to recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The World Heritage Committee expressed grave concern to the Lebanese authorities with regard to the land fill project in a part of the bay alongside the old port north of Tyr, in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage site of Tyr, for the construction of a tourist complex. This project would irremediably destroy the underwater archaeological heritage of this area and would be a major threat to the adjacent World Heritage site.

It reminded the Lebanese authorities of Article 58 of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention stipulating that: 'The World Heritage Committee invites the States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, to inform the Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention, major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions

to ensure that the world heritage value of the site is fully preserved.'

"It therefore requested the national authorities to halt this project until technical advice may be provided by UNESCO in the framework of the Campaign for the Safeguarding of Tyr, with regard to the impacts on the preservation of the world heritage values of the site inscribed on the List."

Medina of Fez (Morocco)

Last June, UNESCO received information and photographs to the effect that nearly one hectare of gardens and buildings had been demolished in the spring of 1995 at Aïn Azliten, in the northern part of the classified perimeter of the Medina of Fez, in order to make way for a tarmac road and the construction of a prefecture and a dispensary, and that work had already begun.

However, at the request of the Moroccan authorities, and in close collaboration with the Ministry of Culture of Morocco, UNESCO organized an international seminar on "Heritage and Urbanism" which was attended by about 40 national and international experts, from 16 to 20 January 1995, in Fez. Having been informed at the outset of the meeting of the proposed road projects, and following discussions on the subject, the participants expressed grave concern and reiterated their opposition to further road projects which would entail the irremediable destruction of the social and urban fabric, and requested that innovative and global solutions be studied for the urban development, harmoniously associating the safeguarding of the cultural heritage riches of the Medina and the socio-economic development of the agglomeration as a whole.

These recommendations were seconded by the Executive Board and by the Director-General of UNESCO during the closing session of the 146th session, held in Fez on 3 and 4 June 1995. At Fez, the Executive Board also adopted the Fez Declaration which stressed the importance of conserving the cohesion of the historic urban fabric of the cities inscribed on the World Heritage List, with particular reference to the model of Fez.

By a joint letter dated 4 July, the World Heritage Centre and the Division of Cultural Heritage transmitted to the Moroccan authorities their deep concern with regard to this destruction, and requested them to provide all additional information regarding this matter.

Action of the Bureau: The Bureau may wish recommend to the Committee to adopt the following text:

"The Committee expressed its grave concern to the national authorities of Morocco concerning the road construction projects within the World Heritage site of the Medina of Fez, which still appear to be ongoing, as well as on the

demolition which has already taken place at Aïn Azliten. It reminds them that too many examples throughout the world have unfortunately shown that the brutal intrusion of the automobile has had an irremediably destructive effect on the social and urban fabric of historic cities. It emphasized that the pursuance of this type of brutal urban intervention constituted grave threats to the preservation of the characteristics for which the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. It requested them to immediately halt all further demolition and to prepare, if necessary with the assistance of international experts, an integrated project taking into consideration the different architectural, cultural, sociological, technical and financial aspects for the urban rehabilitation, and measuring the potential impacts on the multiple aspects of world heritage values in the Medina. Finally, it requested the national authorities to keep them informed, through its Secretariat, before 1 April 1996, of the situation and the measures undertaken to ensure the long-term preservation of the cultural heritage in all its dimensions in the Medina of Fez."

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

**NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON
THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

Table of Contents

1. Identification of the Property
 - a. Country (and State Party if different).
 - b. State, Province or Region
 - c. Name of Property
 - d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
 - e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
 - f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

2. Justification for Inscription
 - a. Statement of significance
 - b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)
 - c. Authenticity/Integrity
 - d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

3. Description
 - a. Description of Property
 - b. History and Development
 - c. Form and date of most recent records of site
 - d. Present state of conservation

4. Management
 - a. Ownership
 - b. Legal status
 - c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
 - d. Agency/agencies with management authority
 - e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes

- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone.
- f. Other

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film/video
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

8. Signature on behalf of the State Party

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES FOR INCLUSION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Explanatory Notes

INTRODUCTION

(i) These notes are intended to provide guidance to those nominating sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List. They relate to the headings under which information is sought, which appear in front of each section of notes. Nomination dossiers should provide information under each of these headings. They should be signed by a responsible official on behalf of the State Party.

(ii) The nomination dossier is intended to serve two main purposes.

First it is to describe the property in a way which brings out the reasons it is believed to meet the criteria for inscription, and to enable the site to be assessed against those criteria.

Secondly it is to provide basic data about the property, which can be revised and brought up to date in order to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the site.

(iii) In spite of the wide differences between sites, information should be given under each of the categories set out at the head of sections 1 - 7 of these notes.

General Requirements

(iv) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.

(v) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.

(vi) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.

- (vii) Dossiers should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm). States Parties are also encouraged to submit the full text of the nomination on diskette.

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area proposed for inscription and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site proposed for inscription (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) if any.

1.1 The purpose of this section is to provide the basic data to enable sites to be precisely identified. In the past, sites have been inscribed on the list with inadequate maps, and this has meant that in some cases it is impossible to be certain what is within the World Heritage site and what is outside it. This can cause considerable problems.

1.2 Apart from the basic facts at 1a - 1d of the dossier, the most important element in this section of the nomination therefore consists of the maps and plans relating to the nominated site. In all cases, at least two documents are likely to be needed and both must be prepared to professional cartographic standards. One should show the site in its natural or built environment and should be between 1:20,000 and 1:100,000. Depending on the size of the site, another suitable scale may be chosen. The other should clearly show the boundary of the nominated area and of any existing or proposed buffer zone. It should also show the position of any natural features, individual monuments or buildings mentioned in the nomination. Either on this map, or an accompanying one, there should also be a record of the boundaries of zones or special legal protection from which the site benefits.

1.3 In considering whether to propose a buffer zone it should be borne in mind that, in order to fulfil the obligations of the World Heritage Convention, sites must be protected from all threats or inconsistent uses. These developments can often take place beyond the boundaries of a site. Intrusive development can harm its setting, or the views from it or of it. Industrial processes can threaten a site by polluting the air or water. The construction of new roads, tourist resorts or airports can bring to a site more visitors than it can absorb in safety.

In some cases national planning policies or existing protective legislation may provide the powers needed to protect the setting of a site as well as the site itself. In other cases it will be highly desirable to propose a formal buffer zone where special controls will be applied. This should include the immediate setting of the site and important views of it and from it. Where it is considered that existing zones of protection make it unnecessary to inscribe a buffer zone, those zones also should be shown clearly on the map of the site.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- b. Comparative analysis (including state of conservation of similar sites)
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)

2.1 This is the most crucial aspect of the whole nomination dossier. It must make clear to the committee why the site can be accepted as being "of outstanding universal value". The whole of this section of the dossier should be written with careful reference to the criteria for inscription found at paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. It should not include detailed descriptive material about the site or its management, which come later, but should concentrate on what the site represents.

2.2 The statement of significance (a) should make clear what are the values embodied by the site. It may be a unique survival of a particular building form or habitat or designed town. It may be a particularly fine or early or rich survival and it may bear witness to a vanished culture, way of life or eco-system. It may comprise assemblages of threatened endemic species, exceptional eco-systems, outstanding landscapes or other natural phenomena.

2.3 The comparative analysis (b) should relate the site to comparable sites, saying why it is more worthy than they are for inscription on the World Heritage list (or, if they are inscribed, what features distinguish it from those sites). This may be because the site is intrinsically better, or possessed of more features, species or habitats.

It may also be because the site is a larger or better preserved or more complete survival or one that has been less prejudiced by later developments. This is the reason for the requirement for an account of the state of conservation of similar sites.

2.4 The section relating to authenticity/integrity (c) should flow from the account of the present state of conservation. In the case of a cultural site it should record whether repairs have been carried out using traditional materials and methods and whether the principles of the Venice Charter and other international standards have been observed. In the case of natural sites it should record any intrusions from exotic species of fauna and flora and by human activities which may have compromised the integrity of the site. This section should demonstrate that the site fulfills the criteria of authenticity/integrity set out in paragraphs 24 (b) (i) or 44 (b) (i) - (iv) of the Operational Guidelines, which describe the criteria in greater detail.

2.5 Section 2 (d) is therefore the culmination of the section, relating the specific site to one or more individual criteria and saying unambiguously why it meets the specific criterion or criteria.

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation

3.1 This section should begin with a description (a) of the property at the date of nomination. It should refer to all the significant features of the property. In the case of a cultural site this will include an account of any building or buildings and their architectural style, date of construction and materials. It should also describe any garden, park or other setting. In the case of an historic town or district it is not necessary to describe each individual building, but important public buildings should be described individually and an account should be given of the planning or layout of the area, its street pattern and so on. In the case of natural sites the account should deal with important physical attributes, habitats, species and other significant ecological features and processes. Species lists should be provided where practicable, and the presence of threatened or endemic taxa should be highlighted.

The extent and methods of exploitation of natural resources should be described. In the case of cultural landscapes it will be necessary to produce a description under all the matters mentioned above.

- 3.2 Under item (b) of this section what is sought is an account of how the property has reached its present form and condition and the significant changes that it has undergone. This should include some account of construction phases in the case of monuments, buildings or groups of buildings. Where there have been major changes, demolitions or rebuilding since completion they should also be described. In the case of natural sites and landscapes the account should cover significant events in history or pre-history which have affected the evolution of the site and give an account of its interaction with humankind. This will include such matters as the development and change in use for hunting, fishing or agriculture, or changes brought about by climatic change, inundation, earthquake or other natural causes. In the case of cultural landscapes all aspects of the history of human activity in the area will need to be covered.
- 3.3 Because of the wide variation in the size and type of properties covered by properties nominated as World Heritage Sites it is not possible to suggest the number of words in which the description and history of properties should be given. The aim, however, should always be to produce the briefest account which can provide the important facts about the property. These are the facts needed to support and give substance to the claim that the property properly comes within the criteria of paragraphs 24 and 44 of the Operational Guidelines. The balance between description and history will change according to the applicable criteria. For example, where a cultural site is nominated under criterion 24 a (i), as a unique artistic achievement, it should not be necessary to say very much about its history and development.
- 3.4 Under section 3 (c) what is required is a straightforward statement giving the form and date of the most recent records or inventory of the site. Only records which are still available should be described.
- 3.5 The account of the present state of conservation of the property [3 (d)] should be related as closely as possible to the records described in the previous paragraph. As well as providing a general impression of the state of conservation dossiers should give statistical or empirical information wherever possible.

For example, in a historic town or area the percentage of buildings needing major or minor repair works, or in a single major building or monument the scale and duration of any recent or forthcoming major repair projects. In the case of natural sites data on species trends or the integrity of eco-systems should be provided. This is important because the nomination dossier will be used in future years for purposes of comparison to trace changes in the condition of the property.

4

Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised (e.g., on site, regionally) and name and address of responsible person for contact purposes
- f. Agreed plans related to property (e.g., regional, local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)
- g. Sources and levels of finance
- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives (copy to be annexed)
- k. Staffing levels (professional, technical, maintenance)

4.1

This section of the dossier is intended to provide a clear picture of the protective and management arrangements which are in place to protect and conserve the property as required by the World Heritage Convention. It should deal both with the policy aspects of legal status and protective measures and with the practicalities of day-to-day administration.

4.2

Sections 4 (a) - (c) of the dossier should give the legal position relating to the property. As well as providing the names and addresses of legal owners [4 (a)] and the status of the property [4 (b)], it should describe briefly any legal measures of protection applying to the site or any traditional ways in which custom safeguards it. Legal instruments should be given their title and date. In addition, the dossier should say how in practice these measures are applied and how responsibility for dealing with potential or actual breaches of protection is exercised. For example, it should say whether the police, army or local authorities have the responsibility for enforcement and whether in practice they have the necessary resources to do so.

It is not necessary to set out all the elements of legal protection, but their main provisions should be summarized briefly. In the case of large natural sites or historic towns there may be a multiplicity of legal owners. In these cases it is necessary only to list the major land- or property-owning institutions and any representative body for other owners.

4.3 Sections 4 (d) and (e) are intended to identify both the authority or authorities with legal responsibility for managing the property and the individual who is actually responsible for day-to-day control of the site and for the budget relating to its upkeep.

4.4 The agreed plans which should be listed at 4 (f) are all those plans which have been adopted by governmental or other agencies and which will have a direct influence on the way in which the site is developed, conserved, used or visited. Either relevant provisions should be summarized in the dossier or extracts or complete plans should be annexed to it.

4.5 Sections 4 (g) and (h) should show the funds, skills and training which are available to the site. Information about finance and expertise and training should be related to the earlier information about the state of conservation of the site. In all three cases an estimate should also be given of the adequacy or otherwise of what is available, in particular identifying any gaps or deficiencies or any areas where help may be required.

4.6 As well as providing any available statistics or estimates of visitor numbers or patterns over several years, section 4 (i) should describe the facilities available for visitors, for example:

- (i) interpretation/explanation, whether by trails, guides, notices or publications;
- (ii) site museum, visitor or interpretation centre;
- (iii) overnight accommodation;
- (iv) restaurant or refreshment facilities;
- (v) shops;
- (vi) car parking;
- (vii) lavatories;
- (viii) search and rescue.

4.7 Section 4 (j) in the dossier should provide only the briefest details of the management plan relating to the site, which should be annexed in its entirety. If the plan provides details of staffing levels it is not necessary to complete section 4 (k) of the dossier and other sections may also be omitted where the plan provides adequate information (e.g. on finance and training).

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

5.1 This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4 (c) or otherwise.

5.2 Section 5 (a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.

5.3 Environmental pressures [5 (b)] can affect all types of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.

5.4 Section 5 (c) should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the site and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)

5.5 In completing section 5 (d) what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects, i.e. its carrying capacity.

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure to be considered are:

- (i) Damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces;
- (ii) Damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
- (iii) Damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things;
- (iv) Damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life;
- (v) Damage to visitor experience as a result of over-crowding.

5.6 Section 5 should conclude with the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants within the nominated site and any buffer zone, any activities they undertake which affect the site and an account of any other factors of any kind not included earlier in the section which have the potential to affect its development or threaten it in any way (e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict).

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

6.1 This section of the dossier is intended to provide the evidence for the state of conservation of the property which can be reviewed and reported on regularly so as to give an indication of trends over time.

6.2 Section 6 (a) should set out those key indicators which have been chosen as the measure of the state of conservation of the whole site. They should be representative of an important aspect of the site and relate as closely as possible to the statement of significance. Where possible they should be expressed numerically and where this is not possible they should be of a kind which can be repeated, for example by taking a photograph from the same point. Examples of good indicators are:

- (i) the number of species, or population of a keystone species on a natural site;
- (ii) the percentage of buildings requiring major repair in a historic town or district;
- (iii) the number of years estimated to elapse before a major conservation programme is likely to be completed;
- (iv) the stability or degree of movement in a particular building or element of a building;
- (v) the rate at which encroachment of any kind on a site has increased or diminished.

6.3 Section 6 (b) should make clear that there is a regular system of formal inspections of the property, leading to the recording, at least annually, of the conditions of the site. This should result, every five years, in a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Committee.

6.4 Section 6 (c) should summarize briefly earlier reports on the state of conservation of the site and provide extracts and references to published sources.

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

7.1 This section of the dossier is simply a check-list of the documentation which should be provided to make up a complete nomination.

- 7 (a) There should be enough photographs, slides and, where possible, film/video to provide a good general picture of the site, including one or more aerial photographs. Where possible, slides should be in 35mm format. This material should be accompanied by a duly signed authorization granting free of charge to UNESCO the non-exclusive right for the legal term of copyright to reproduce and use it in accordance with the terms of the authorization attached.
- 7 (b) Copies of and extracts from plans should be provided.
Management plan.
Legal protection, if necessary summarized.
Maps and plans.
- 7 (c) The Bibliography should include references to all the main published sources and should be compiled to international standards.
- 7 (d) One or more addresses for inventory and site records should be provided.

8. Signature on behalf of the State Party

The dossier should conclude with the signature of the official empowered to sign it on behalf of the State Party.



WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION
PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT

Table of Contents

0. Executive Summary

1. Identification of the Property
 - a. Country (and State Party if different).
 - b. State, Province or Region
 - c. Name of Property
 - d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
 - e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area inscribed and of any buffer zone
 - f. Area of site inscribed (ha.) and buffer zone (ha.)

2. Justification for Inscription
 - a. Statement of significance
 - b. Comparative analysis
 - c. Authenticity/Integrity
 - d. Criteria under which site was inscribed

3. Description
 - a. Description of Property
 - b. History and Development
 - c. Form and date of most recent records of site
 - d. Present state of conservation

4. Management
 - a. Ownership
 - b. Legal status
 - c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
 - d. Agency/agencies with management authority
 - e. Level at which management is exercised
 - f. Agreed plans relating to property
 - g. Sources and levels of finance

- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives
- k. Staffing levels

5 Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture)
- b. Environmental Pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change)
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)
- d. Visitor/tourism pressures
- e. Number of inhabitants within site, buffer zone
- f. Other

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises

7 Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film/video
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts of other plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

8. Conclusions and recommended actions

9. Signature on behalf of the State Party

WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

PERIODIC WORLD HERITAGE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORT

Explanatory Notes

INTRODUCTION

- (i) One of the essential functions of the World Heritage Committee is to monitor the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

At its eighteenth session, held in Phuket, Thailand from 12 to 17 December 1994, the World Heritage Committee adopted the principles of monitoring, making a distinction between 'systematic monitoring and reporting' and 'reactive monitoring'. These principles are reflected in chapter II of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention which reads as follows:

A. Systematic monitoring and reporting

70. Systematic monitoring and reporting is the continuous process of observing the conditions of World Heritage sites with periodic reporting on its state of conservation.

The objectives of systematic monitoring and reporting are:

World Heritage site: Improved site management, advanced planning, reduction of emergency and ad-hoc interventions, and reduction of costs through preventive conservation.

State Party: Improved World Heritage policies, advanced planning, improved site management and preventive conservation.

Region: Regional cooperation, regional World Heritage policies and activities better targeted to the specific needs of the region.

Committee/Secretariat: Better understanding of the conditions of the sites and of the needs on the site, national and regional levels. Improved policy and decision making.

71. It is the prime responsibility of the States Parties to put in place on-site monitoring arrangements as an integral component of day-to-day conservation and management of the sites. States Parties should do so in close collaboration with the

site managers or the agency with management authority. It is necessary that every year the conditions of the site be recorded by the site manager or the agency with management authority.

72. The States Parties are invited to submit to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, every five years, a scientific report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites on their territories. To this end, the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat or the advisory bodies. The Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties.

73. To facilitate the work of the Committee and its Secretariat and to achieve greater regionalization and decentralization of World Heritage work, these reports will be examined separately by region as determined by the Committee. The World Heritage Centre will synthesize the national reports by regions. In doing so, full use will be made of the available expertise of the advisory bodies and other organizations.

74. The Committee will decide for which regions state of conservation reports should be presented to its forthcoming sessions. The States Parties concerned will be informed at least one year in advance so as to give them sufficient time to prepare the state of conservation reports.

75. The Secretariat will take the necessary measures for adequate World Heritage information collection and management, making full use, to the extent possible, of the information/documentation services of the advisory bodies and others.

B. Reactive monitoring

76. Reactive monitoring is the reporting by the World Heritage Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the advisory bodies to the Bureau and the Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage sites that are under threat. To this end, the States Parties shall submit to the Committee through the World Heritage Centre, specific reports and impact studies each time exceptional circumstances occur or work is undertaken which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the site. Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the eventual deletion of properties from the World Heritage List as set out in paras. 50-58. It is also foreseen in reference to properties inscribed, or to be inscribed, on the List of World Heritage in Danger as set out in paras. 83-90.

The States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are, therefore, invited to put on-site monitoring structures in place and to report, every five years, on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties on their territories.

- (ii) The purpose of these periodic state of conservation reports is two-fold:

to assist site managers and States Parties to maintain systematic records of the state of conservation of each site, identify problems and solutions;

to enable the World Heritage Centre to maintain a database of information relating to the state of conservation of sites, identifying trends and common issues and brief the Committee accordingly.

- (iii) The primary document in respect of each site is the nomination dossier. The format for the periodic state of conservation reports follows, therefore, the format for the nomination dossier. Consequently, where a periodic state of conservation report is being prepared for the first time a complete dossier should be prepared in accordance with the new nomination format that was adopted by the Committee at its nineteenth session in 1995. These notes are intended to be read in conjunction with the notes prepared for the nomination dossier, which should be consulted by those preparing periodic state of conservation reports.

- (iv) The preparation of periodic state of conservation reports should involve those who are responsible for the day-to-day management of the site. It could also include external expert advice if and when the State Party concerned so wishes.

- (v) The format for periodic state of conservation reports repeats the headings under which information is required for a nomination dossier, indicating the extent to which each should be considered in respect of state of conservation reports. The nomination dossier and/or any previous state of conservation report is the basic reference material for the preparation of a state of conservation report. The executive summary and the conclusions and recommended actions are specific requirements for the state of conservation reports.

General Requirements

- (vi) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where that can be done and fully referenced.
- (vii) Documents should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.
- (viii) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.
- (ix) Dossiers should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm). States Parties are also encouraged to submit the full text of the state of conservation reports on diskette.

0. Executive Summary

A summary with a maximum length of one page should precede the state of conservation report.

1. Identification of the Property

- a. Country (and State Party if different).
- b. State, Province or Region
- c. Name of Property
- d. Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- e. Maps and/or plans showing boundary of area inscribed and of any buffer zone
- f. Area of site inscribed (ha.) and buffer zone (ha.)

- 1.1 The information under 1(a)-1(d) should be verified and repeated in all state of conservation reports because it provides the basic information from which sites can be identified.
- 1.2 Particular attention should be paid to the existence and accuracy of maps and plans showing the boundary of the site and any buffer zone (1(e)). Where the monitoring process has led to a proposal that the boundary of the site and/or buffer zone should be altered, this should be stated clearly and the existing and proposed boundaries should both be marked clearly on the map.

2 Justification for Inscription

- a. Statement of significance
- b. Comparative analysis
- c. Authenticity/Integrity
- d. Criteria under which site was inscribed

- 2.1 In this section it is necessary to review under item 2(a) if the values on the basis of which the site was inscribed are retained. Under 2(b) and 2(c) it is only necessary to record significant changes since inscription or since the previous state of conservation report. Examples might include further deterioration of similar sites not on the list (under 2(b)) or a programme of repair which has improved the authenticity of the site by removing work using unauthentic techniques and materials and replacing it with traditional ones (under 2(c)).

3. Description

- a. Description of Property
- b. History and Development
- c. Form and date of most recent records of site
- d. Present state of conservation

- 3.1 In each state of conservation report information should be provided under 3(a) and 3(b) about any new significant data on the site or major events that have occurred since the nomination or previous report such as new archaeological excavations, scientific discoveries, natural disasters etc. Information under 3(c) and 3(d) should relate back to the nomination dossier or previous report. When the records described at 3(c) are the same as those previously mentioned this should be made clear. In the case of the state of conservation (3(d)) comparisons should be made with the nomination dossier or previous report. (This subject will also be illuminated by the information provided under section 6 below).

4. Management

- a. Ownership
- b. Legal status
- c. Protective measures and means of implementing them
- d. Agency/agencies with management authority
- e. Level at which management is exercised
- f. Agreed plans relating to property
- g. Sources and levels of finance

- h. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques
- i. Visitor facilities and statistics
- j. Site management plan and statement of objectives
- k. Staffing levels

- 4.1 In the case of headings 4(a) - 4(e) it is only necessary to record information which has changed since nomination or the previous report.
- 4.2 State of conservation reports should review the information about management provided in nomination dossiers or previous reports and draw attention to any significant changes which have taken place. Information should always be provided under headings 4(f) - 4(k) so that trends in levels of finance and staffing and training can be established and up-to-date copies of plans relating to the site will always be provided.
- 4.3 In analyzing the sources of expertise and training under heading 4(h) an assessment should be provided of short and long term training needs of site-staff on all levels.
- 4.4 In the case of all statistics which are available on an annual basis (e.g. income, visitor numbers, staff numbers) information should be provided for each year since nomination or the previous report, so that complete runs of figures can be maintained.

5. Factors Affecting the Site

- a. Development Pressures
- b. Environmental Pressures
- c. Natural disasters and preparedness
- d. Visitor/tourism pressure
- e. Number of inhabitants within site/buffer zone
- f. Other

- 5.1 Each state of conservation report should provide up-to-date information under each of the headings 5(a) - 5(f), as indicated in the nomination document. This section of the dossier should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect or threaten a site. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described at Section 4(c) or otherwise. Once again, where it is possible to do so figures should be provided over a number of years so that trends can be established as accurately as possible.

- 5.2 Section 5(a) deals with development pressures. Information should be given about pressure for demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; the introduction of exotic species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centres of population on or near sites so as to harm them or their settings.
- 5.3 Environmental pressures [5(b)] can affect all types of site. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section of the dossier is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the site, or may do so in the future, rather than an historical account of such pressures in the past.
- 5.4 Section 5(c) should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the site and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)
- 5.5 In completing section 5(d) what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects, i.e. its carrying capacity.

An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Amongst possible forms of visitor pressure to be considered are:

- (i) Damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces;
- (ii) Damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
- (iii) Damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things;
- (iv) Damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life;
- (v) Damage to visitor experience as a result of over-crowding.

- 5.6 Section 5 should conclude with the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants within the nominated site and any buffer zone, any activities they undertake which affect the site and an

account of any other factors of any kind not included earlier in the section which have the potential to affect its development or threaten it in any way (e.g. terrorist activity or the potential for armed conflict).

6. Monitoring/Inspection

- a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation
- b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property
- c. Results of previous reporting exercises and follow-up to recommendations made by the advisory bodies and/or the World heritage Committee at the time of inscription

- 6.1 This section is one of the keys to the report, because it should provide the scientific basis for measuring the state of conservation of the property over time. Up-to-date information should be provided in respect of each of the key indicators identified under heading 6(a) in the nomination dossier. Care should be taken to ensure that this information is as accurate and reliable as possible, for example by carrying out observations in the same way, using similar equipment and at the same time of the year and day. This should minimize such factors as the different impression given by photographs taken with different light levels or lengths of shadow.
- 6.2 It is also important for the reporting process to question the validity of the indicators, especially at the early stages in the monitoring and reporting cycle. The robustness and reliability of the data should be examined, as should its suitability as an indicator of the general state of conservation of the site. If there are doubts on these points the possibility of adopting alternatives should be considered.
- 6.3 As well as reviewing the data, reports should under heading 6(b) review the administrative management in place for regularly monitoring the state of conservation of the property, proposing amendments if that appears desirable.
- 6.4 Section 6(c) reviews the results of previous monitoring exercises and should, over time, provide the account of the steps taken to improve the state of conservation of the property. It should also review if any action has been taken in response to the recommendations made by the advisory bodies and/or the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription.

In the first report provided according to the format, this section should include a list of all the issues identified in the monitoring and reporting process.

7. Documentation

- a. Photographs, slides and, where available, film/video
- b. Copies of site management plans and extracts from the plans relevant to the site
- c. Bibliography
- d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

7.1 The documentation which is provided with state of conservation reports should include all plans revised or completed since inscription or the previous report and any other new material of relevance: photographic records or new references for the bibliography, for example. The audio-visual material should be accompanied by a duly signed authorization granting free of charge to UNESCO the non-exclusive right for the legal term of copyright to reproduce and use it in accordance with the terms of the authorization attached.

8. Conclusions and recommended actions

8.1. The main conclusions under each of the sections of the report, should be summarized and tabulated together with the proposed action to be taken, the agencies responsible for taking the action and the time within which the action should be taken. A column should be left to record the outcome. Once successful action has been recorded in a report, the recommendation can be deleted from the subsequent reports.

9. Signature on behalf of the State Party

9.1. The report should conclude with the names and signatures of all those who have been responsible for compiling it.

