

Limited Distribution

SC-88/CONF.007/13
10 August 1988

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
Twelfth Session
Unesco Headquarters, Paris, 14-17 June 1988

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The twelfth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris from 14 to 17 June 1988. It was attended by the members of the Bureau: Mr. J. Collinson (Canada), Chairman; Mrs. M. Stantcheva (Bulgaria), Rapporteur, and representatives of France, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Tanzania (United Rep. of), and Tunisia, Vice-Chairmen. Representatives of thirteen States Parties to the Convention took part in the session as observers. Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Monuments (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants appears as annex 1 to this report.

2. The representative of the Director-General, Mr. A. Kaddoura, Assistant Director General of the Science Sector, opened the session. He noted that there were now 102 States Parties to the Convention. The Republic of Congo, Cape Verde and Paraguay had joined the Convention since the eleventh session of the Committee, which was held at Unesco Headquarters from 7-11 December 1987. This would make the World Heritage Convention the most universal international legal instrument in the field of conservation. Mr. Kaddoura briefly commented on the challenging and interesting agenda before the Bureau and concluded by wishing success in its important work.

3. The agenda was adopted with the inclusion of an item on the revision of the operational guidelines, for which a working document had been prepared.

4. The Secretary, Mr. B. von Droste, reported on activities undertaken since the eleventh session of the Committee. He noted in particular the convening of a working group under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Guruge to study questions regarding the preparation, submission and evaluation of nominations of cultural properties, and the future organization of the agenda of the Committee and the Bureau. Mr. von Droste noted that all the projects for international assistance approved by the Committee were being implemented. He then reported on small scale projects which had been approved by the Chairman since the Committee. Training had been the most frequently sought type of international assistance. He also reported on promotional activities,

2

which had been focussed on the preparation of new materials to promote the Convention, including World Heritage exhibits. Finally, Mr. von Droste drew the Bureau's attention to the critical state of the World Heritage Fund due to the fact that States Parties had been slow in making their financial contributions at the beginning of the 1988-89 biennium. He therefore urged States Parties to pay in full their contribution to the World Heritage Fund as soon as possible to ensure continuity in World Heritage conservation activities.

II. REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ESTABLISHED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AT ITS ELEVENTH SESSION

5. Before inviting the Chairman of the Working Group to present the report, the Chairman of the Committee congratulated the Working Group for the remarkable results it had achieved with a view to improving the management of the Committee's work, particularly the examination of nominations in the light of the criteria established by the Committee. The Chairman of the Working Group wished to thank the Chairman of the Committee himself for the excellent suggestions he had provided. He also expressed his thanks to the representatives of three States members of the Group who had taken the initiative of drafting a set of extremely useful proposals and to the representative of ICOMOS for his very helpful cooperation. He expressed high praise for the truly exceptional quality of the contribution the Secretariat had made to the work of the Group.

6. The Bureau took note of document SC-88/CONF.007/2 summarizing the deliberations of the Working Group. The Bureau then examined its recommendations one by one, and approved them in their totality. A certain number of imperfections in the French translation were underlined and duly taken note of by the Secretariat. With respect to section 4.8 of the recommendations, one member pointed out a contradiction between its title and its contents, for paragraph 43 called for the postponement of considerations of new towns, not the suspension thereof, as stated in the title of the section. But another member pointed out that the Working Group's opinion had indeed been that the consideration both of new towns and of contemporary architecture should be provisionally suspended. In this connection, the representative of ICOMOS stressed that contemporary sites could be just as "vulnerable" as older towns, hence paragraph 29 of the Guidelines which had been used by the Working Group was incorrect in its assumptions. Summing up the discussion, the Chairman of the Committee observed that in fact further study appeared to be needed with regard to all the categories of properties mentioned in this section. The wording of the recommendations in paragraphs 42-43 should be harmonized accordingly. The Bureau so decided.

7. With regard to the availability of documents in advance of the Committee's sessions (paragraph 34), the Bureau recommended that the deadline for submission of nominations be brought forward to the date of 1 October of the year preceding their examination by the Committee. One member having requested a calendar showing the key dates in the different stages of processing of nominations, the Chairman of the Committee presented such a timetable that he had himself prepared. Finally, the representative of ICOMOS suggested that the Chairman of the Committee formally request ICOMOS to hold the meeting of its Bureau devoted to the examination of nominations of cultural properties in the month of February each year, so that the new time-table of work could be adhered to.

8. The Director of the Division of Ecological Sciences mentioned several implications for the examination of natural properties arising from the conclusions of the Working Group, particularly as concerns improving the processing of nominations. Also, certain questions raised by the Group such as the need for a global reference list and the question of rural landscapes were clearly pertinent in the consideration of natural sites.

9. The Chairman of the Committee requested ICOMOS and IUCN to kindly draft comments on the recommendations of the Working Group as well as implement proposals in cooperation with the Secretariat. The Working Group and the Secretariat should incorporate these proposals in the amended version of the Operational Guidelines in English and French by the end of September (see Section III).

III. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

10. The Bureau examined document SC-88/CONF.007/12 which contained two parts. The first section provided texts to be incorporated in the Operational Guidelines (document WHC/2 revised January 1987) following the decisions taken by the Committee at its eleventh session concerning the monitoring of cultural properties, the procedure for handling proposals for extensions to properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, and assistance for promotional activities. The second part was prepared to update the Guidelines to make them conform with current practice in the implementation of the Convention. The Bureau examined the texts of this second part and recommended their adoption by the Committee along with some amendments and additions, notably to draft a text guiding States Parties as to the requirements for adequate legal protection and management of cultural properties. The Bureau also recommended that the procedure for the allocation of emergency assistance should enable the Chairman to consult the other members of the Bureau by telex, as appropriate, for approving requests for emergency assistance above \$20,000. The Bureau requested that document SC-88/CONF.007/12 be revised in this manner and be submitted to the Committee for adoption at its next session.

IV. TENTATIVE LISTS

11. The Secretariat presented the information document prepared on this subject and informed the Bureau that since the document had been prepared, tentative lists had been received from Cuba, Egypt (in Arabic only), Iraq and Tunisia, while the Syrian authorities had provided an English translation of the tentative list they had provided earlier. The Secretariat reminded the Bureau that the entire process of submitting and analyzing the tentative lists had been discussed by the Working Group set up by the Committee at its eleventh session. Inviting the Bureau to take note of the document, the Chairman stressed that the tentative lists would be a helpful tool for the comparative analysis recommended by the Working Group. He recalled the Committee's interest in the tentative lists as a guide for historical analysis and possible thematic review. A member of the Bureau asked whether States Parties could still submit tentative lists. The Chairman replied in the affirmative and reiterated the invitation to States Parties which had not yet done so to submit their tentative lists as soon as possible.

V. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

12. The Bureau examined a total of 43 nominations and recommended that the Committee inscribe 26 properties on the World Heritage List: these are presented in section A below. The Bureau recommended to defer 8 nominations presented in section B below. Section C contains the 4 nominations which the Bureau recommended should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Section D refers to 5 nominations for which evaluations were not available at the time of the Bureau session. Section E concerns 2 nominations to the List of World Heritage in Danger. It should be noted that the nomination of Cerro Colorado was withdrawn by the Permanent Delegate of Argentina to Unesco on 14 June 1988.

A. Properties recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted</u> <u>the nomination of</u> <u>the property in</u> <u>accordance with</u> <u>the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Wet Tropical</u> <u>Rainforests of</u> <u>North East Australia</u>	486	Australia	N(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested the Australian authorities to provide clarifications and further information on the following points:

a) future management arrangements for the area. The Bureau noted that consultations were underway on the establishment of a joint Commonwealth/Queensland management authority to administer the site which were expected to be completed in September 1988;

b) revision of the delimitation of the nominated area in order to make the nomination more coherent. The Bureau considered this revision was required in order to trim the boundaries to make the site a more manageable conservation unit, and to excise areas where human modification was judged unacceptable and to omit areas which did not contribute significant natural value;

c) land ownership by Aboriginal peoples and private citizens, and land uses for military training and others such as stock grazing and mining, as outlined in section 4 of the IUCN evaluation.

The Bureau requested the Australian authorities to provide this information to the Secretariat by 1st October 1988 which would transmit it to IUCN in order to enable IUCN to prepare a revised evaluation by mid-October. This revised evaluation should be sent to the members of the present Bureau for comment. A synthesis of these comments and the revised evaluation as well as the positive appraisal by the Bureau at this session would then be transmitted to the Committee at its twelfth session.

The Bureau furthermore recommended that the name of this property be reconsidered better to reflect the nature of the area. Finally, the Bureau urged the Australian authorities to pursue a public awareness campaign to promote greater understanding of the aims of the Convention and to generate increased support for the nominated site.

<u>Parc national du</u>	475	Central African	N(ii)(iv)
<u>Manovo-Gounda</u>		Republic	
<u>St. Floris</u>			

The Bureau recognized that this property had the potential to meet two of the natural World Heritage criteria but that at the present time, the conditions of integrity were not fulfilled, notably due to activities which conflict with the conservation objectives such as grazing, poaching and hunting by a concession. The Bureau noted, however, that the Central African Republic authorities were fully committed to improve the protection of this site and that a ten-year project funded by the EEC/FED at a cost of \$27 million was just starting which would improve anti-poaching measures, access to the park and also develop research and basic infrastructure (provision of housing and staff). The Bureau encouraged the Central African Republic authorities to implement this project and requested that once it began to show results, they provide a progress report which would be submitted to the Committee. The Committee would then be in a position to follow the Bureau's recommendation to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List.

<u>Strasbourg - Historic</u>	495	France	C(i)(ii)
<u>Centre</u>			(iv)
<u>Mt. Athos</u>	454	Greece	C(i)(ii)(iv)
			(v)(vi)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this site. Moreover, it requested that IUCN communicate to the December 1988 session of the Committee its evaluation of the natural aspects of Mt. Athos.

<u>Meteora</u>	455	Greece	C(i)(ii)
			(iv)(v)

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed, on condition that the Greek authorities provide before the twelfth session of the Committee, confirmation that the protection of the entire area proposed for inscription is guaranteed by adequate legal measures.

<u>Monuments of</u>	456	Greece	C (to be
<u>Thessalonika</u>			determined)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property, on condition that a new nomination focussing specifically on early Christian and Byzantine monuments be presented to the Committee's December session. The list of monuments proposed for inscription should be drawn up by the Greek authorities in consultation with ICOMOS.

<u>Archaeological site</u>	491	Greece	C(i)(ii)
<u>of Epidaurus</u>			(iii)(iv)(vi)

Medieval City of Rhodes 493 Greece C(ii)(iv)
(v)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property, having been informed that all conservation work on the architectural heritage of Rhodes would be carried out under the control of the Greek Ministry of Culture and in accordance with the Venice Charter and the Toledo International Charter for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas.

Nanda Devi National Park 335 India N(iii)
(iv)

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested the Indian authorities to provide further information on the following points:

- a) the present status of the management plan;
- b) the frequency and the extent of patrolling within the "Inner Sanctuary";
- c) the future policy regarding provision for tourism, which should not detract from the wilderness qualities of the site;
- d) the present status of wildlife populations, particularly the large mammals such as the blue sheep, for which preparatory assistance could be provided under the World Heritage Fund.

Old Towns of Djenné 116 rev. Mali C(iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property and, at the same time, encourage the Malian authorities to ensure the long-term protection of Djenné, paying particular attention to preserving the balance between the built and unbuilt spaces of the town.

Old Town of Timbuktu 119 rev. Mali C(ii)(iv)
(v)

The Bureau recommended inscription of the mosques, cemeteries and mausoleums of Timbuktu, and encouraged the Malian authorities to ensure a global protection of the whole town. In view of the threat of sand encroachment at Timbuktu, the Bureau felt that the Malian authorities might wish to consider nominating this property to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau regretted the absence of slides of this site and hoped that these would be made available to the Committee.

Historic Centre of Guanajuato and adjacent mines 482 Mexico C(i)(ii)
(iv)(vi)

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the assurances given by the Mexican authorities concerning protection of the mining operations of Guanajuato and its surroundings.

<u>Pre-Hispanic City of Chichen-Itza</u>	483	Mexico	C(i)(ii) (iii)
----------------------------------------------	-----	--------	-------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this property and, at the same time, request that the Mexican authorities ensure that the tourism and hotel installations are not allowed to become obtrusive and that the site and its environment are adequately protected.

<u>Archaeological sites of Bat, Al-Khutm and Al-Ayn</u>	434	Oman	C(iii)(iv)
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------	------------

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the extension of the original nomination and recommended that the Committee stress to the Omani authorities the necessity of ensuring the long-term protection of the whole area inscribed.

<u>Convent Ensemble of San Francisco de Lima</u>	500	Peru	C(ii)(iv)
------------------------------------------------------	-----	------	-----------

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed, on condition that the Peruvian authorities provide assurances before the twelfth session of the Committee concerning the protection of the entire zone surrounding the convent.

<u>Old City of Salamanca</u>	381 rev.	Spain	C(i)(ii)(iv)
------------------------------	----------	-------	--------------

The Bureau recommended inscription of Salamanca, the perimeter of which has been extended, in accordance with the wishes of the Committee in 1987, and the exemplary nature of which clearly emerged from the comparative study carried out by ICOMOS on the old European university cities. The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Spanish authorities to take all possible steps to ensure that the laws concerning the protection of the town be strictly applied.

<u>Sinharaja Forest Reserve</u>	405	Sri Lanka	N(ii)(iv)
-------------------------------------	-----	-----------	-----------

The Bureau recalled that at its sixth session in 1982, this nomination had been deferred due to inadequate legal protection although it was recognized that the site had the potential to meet criteria (ii) and (iv). The Bureau noted that the required legislation, the National Wilderness Heritage Act, had recently been passed in Sri Lanka but that the Sinharaja Forest Reserve had not yet come under the provisions of this Act. In the event that this legal matter were resolved by the time of the Committee session in December 1988, the Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List.

<u>Sacred City of Kandy</u>	450	Sri Lanka	C(iv)(vi)
-----------------------------	-----	-----------	-----------

The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the landscape surrounding the site was given an important protection guaranteed by legal texts. The Bureau regretted the absence of slides on this site and hoped that these would be made available to the Committee.

<u>Old Town of Galle and its fortifications</u>	451	Sri Lanka	C(iv)
-----------------------------------------------------	-----	-----------	-------

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property but greatly deplored the absence of any visual documentation that could have sufficiently testified to the unique nature of the architectural syncretisms of this fortified colonial city. The Bureau requested that a set of slides on this site be made available to the Committee.

<u>Medina of Sousse</u>	498	Tunisia	C(iii)(iv)(v)
-------------------------	-----	---------	---------------

The Bureau recommended inscription of this site after having noted that the Tunisian authorities had provided assurances that it was adequately protected. *

<u>Medina of Kairouan</u>	499	Tunisia	C(i)(ii)(iii) (v)(vi)
---------------------------	-----	---------	--------------------------

The Bureau recommended inscription of this site after having noted that the Tunisian authorities had provided assurances that it was adequately protected.*

<u>Xanthos-Letoon</u>	484	Turkey	C(ii)(iii)
-----------------------	-----	--------	------------

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on the World Heritage List, on condition that the Turkish authorities extend the perimeter of protection of the site so that the zones of necropolises be included and that assurances be given that the environment will be protected.

<u>Hierapolis-Pamukkale</u>	485	Turkey	C(iii)(iv)
-----------------------------	-----	--------	------------

The Bureau noted that this property had been evaluated by both ICOMOS and IUCN. Although IUCN did not recommend the inscription of this site on the basis of natural criteria, the Bureau nevertheless felt that recognition should be given to the combination of natural and cultural elements of this property. The Bureau agreed with ICOMOS that this site could be recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (iii) and (iv). The Bureau recognized however that at present, the site did not benefit from adequate legal protection. The Bureau encouraged the Turkish authorities to approve the proposal for a national park for the site and to update and adopt the management plan which would enable this nomination to be re-considered by the Committee for inscription on the World Heritage List.

<u>Henderson Island</u>	487	United Kingdom	N(iii)(iv)
-------------------------	-----	----------------	------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested that the British authorities provide a description of the extent of the marine boundaries of the nominated site. The Bureau also wished to encourage the British authorities to:

a) work with the Pitcairn islanders to ensure on-site protection;

* N.B. The Bureau suggested that a summary of the conclusions reached at the meeting for harmonizing the tentative lists of Northern African countries organized in 1985 by ICOMOS be presented at the next session of the Committee.

b) review the legal status of the island and consider up-grading this status to a nature reserve and prepare a management plan for the site;

c) consider more involvement in the strengthening the protection of the site within the framework of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Convention on the Protection of Natural Resources in the South Pacific and the Convention on the Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific.

The Tower of London 488 United Kingdom C(ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property, on condition that assurances be given that the area surrounding the Tower of London is duly protected by the British authorities so that the site and its environment are safeguarded without further damage.

Canterbury Cathedral, 496 United Kingdom C(i)(ii)(vi)
St. Augustine's Abbey
and St. Martin's Church

The Bureau recommended inscription of this site and suggested that the Cathedral, St. Augustine's Abbey and St. Martin's Church be included in one and the same protection area.

B. Nominations deferred by the Bureau

Bemaraha Strict 494 Madagascar
Nature Reserve
and adjacent forests

The Bureau welcomed this nomination which had the potential to meet criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. However, the Bureau requested the Malagasy authorities and particularly the "Departement des Eaux et Forets" to revise the nomination to focus primarily on the Bemaraha Strict Nature Reserve and to provide further information on the precise limits of the site and the status of the natural resources of the reserve. The Bureau also wished to encourage the Malagasy authorities in their efforts to strengthen the protection of the site and to draw up a management plan, for which preparatory assistance could be provided under the World Heritage Fund.

Male Hukuru Miskiy 461 Maldives
Utheemu Gaduvaru 462 "
Eid Miskiy 463 "
Fenfushi Hukuru 464 "
Miskiy
Vadhoo Hukuru Miskiy 465 "

The Bureau recommended that the examination of these nominations be deferred, considering the insufficiency of the documentation available. Furthermore, it suggested that the Committee encourage the Maldivian authorities to reformulate these nominations, with the technical assistance of Unesco and ICOMOS.

New Lanark 429 United Kingdom

The Bureau recognized the qualities of this site. However, it felt that inscription of this site would be premature until an overall view of the sites where social doctrines of the contemporary world evolved in connection with the industrial or agricultural revolutions had been realized and a comparative study on the industrial sites of the nineteenth century had been carried out by ICOMOS.

Pueblo of Taos 492 United States of America

The Bureau recommended that the examination of this site be deferred until: a comparative analysis of the sites of Pueblo culture had been carried out; a study on the complementarity between the site and its environment had been completed; the United States and Mexico had had a consultation with a view to harmonizing the question pertaining to Pueblo culture.

C. Properties not recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Hortobagy National Park 474 Hungary

The Bureau noted that this site is of national and regional importance and has been designated under the Ramsar Wetland Convention and is also a biosphere reserve under Unesco's Man and the Biosphere Programme. The Bureau was of the opinion however that the site did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

SS "Great Britain" 489 United Kingdom

Although the Bureau noted the interest of this type of property, it considered that it did not meet with the criteria of authenticity set up by the Convention. Furthermore, the Bureau recalled Article 22 of the Guidelines according to which nominations concerning immovable property which are liable to become movable will not be considered.

Navan Fort 490 United Kingdom

Although the Bureau recognized the importance of this property for the cultural heritage of the United Kingdom, it considered that Navan Fort did not possess the outstanding universal value which would justify its inscription on the List.

Menai and Conwy 497 United Kingdom
Suspension Bridges

While noting the importance of Menai Bridge for the heritage of the United Kingdom, the Bureau felt that it did not meet with the criteria of authenticity set up by the Convention.

As far as Conwy Bridge is concerned, the Bureau considered that it would constitute a complement of great interest to Conwy Castle, inscribed in 1986 as one of The Castles and Town Walls of King Edward. The Bureau considered

that the authorities of the United Kingdom might perhaps wish to propose an extension of this property, so as to include the suspension bridge.

D. Nominations for which evaluations were not available at the time of the Bureau session

<u>Trinidad and the Valley de los Ingenios</u>	460	Cuba
------------------------------------------------	-----	------

The Bureau agreed that the evaluation of Trinidad and the Valley de los Ingenios by ICOMOS could be directly presented to the Committee at its twelfth session, since the Cuban authorities had informed the Secretariat that their tentative list of cultural properties consisted of this property alone.

<u>Petrified Forest on Lesbos</u>	453	Greece
-----------------------------------	-----	--------

The Bureau noted that IUCN would provide an evaluation of this nomination after a field review in September 1988. In order to help IUCN make this evaluation, the Bureau suggested that a working group be set up to make a global review of fossil sites including petrified forests, using the preparatory assistance allocation of the World Heritage Fund if required.

<u>Port Royal</u>	457 Rev.	Jamaica
-------------------	----------	---------

<u>Seville</u>	458 "	"
----------------	-------	---

<u>Spanish Town</u>	459 "	"
---------------------	-------	---

The Bureau noted that ICOMOS would only be in a position to provide its evaluation of these three nominations after completion of its field review in August, 1988.

E. Nominations to the List of World Heritage in Danger

Since ICOMOS was not yet in a position to evaluate the threats to the integrity of the following two properties, the Bureau recommended that the Committee take a decision on the nominations after further study has been carried out (cf. paragraph 24 below).

<u>Bahla Fort</u>	433	Oman
-------------------	-----	------

<u>Wieliczka Salt Mine</u>	32	Poland
----------------------------	----	--------

VI. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS WITH A COMBINATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL ELEMENTS

13. The Bureau realized that it had spent considerable time in examining nominations of properties with an indissociable combination of cultural and natural elements. The difficulty in the examination of such nominations arose from the fact that "culture" and "nature" were evaluated separately by ICOMOS and IUCN respectively, using separate sets of criteria. In order to facilitate the work of the Committee in examining such nominations, the Bureau requested that ICOMOS, IUCN and the Secretariat work together to agree on joint criteria for the evaluation of such nominations in time for submission to the Committee. The Bureau also considered that it would be useful if this group

could also draft some notes on how to handle such nominations in the future, including the necessity of making a comparative study to place such nominations in a global context.

VII. MONITORING THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

a) Natural properties

14. The representative of IUCN reported on the status of three natural sites, two of which are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as follows:

Manu National Park (Peru): A commercial discovery of natural gas had been made next to the park and further exploration work was imminent. This work would bring in many workers and settlers next to the western boundary of the park and could result in encroachments and associated problems. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Peruvian authorities and to seek further explanation.

Djoudj National Park (Senegal): The water supply to this park which was modified by dam construction was now being assured by a sluice which had been built with the support of the World Heritage Fund. A management plan was also under preparation with funds from WWF. Although there was still a need to improve the management of this site, the Bureau recognized that the main threats were under control and requested the Secretariat to contact the Senegalese authorities with a view to removing this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania): The general situation of this site had greatly improved. Equipment had been made available through the World Heritage Fund and IUCN was working to strengthen policy, planning and training activities for the site with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Tanzanian authorities with a view to removing this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

b) Cultural properties

15. The Secretariat summarized the report on this question (document SC-88/CONF.007/5), which described the progress achieved in the implementation of the experimental monitoring system decided by the Committee at its eleventh session. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that completed questionnaires on four Bulgarian sites had in fact been received before the date of completion of the report but, due to an error of transmission, had not reached the Secretariat of the Committee. After the completion of the report, replies had been received from the Federal Republic of Germany concerning one property and from Tunisia concerning two properties. The Bureau took note of the Secretariat's report.

16. The Permanent Delegate of Iran to Unesco made a statement regarding the damages incurred by the Meidan Emam (Meidan Nagh Cheh Jahan) at Isphahan which was hit by a rocket during the recent attacks on Iranian cities. In the Permanent Delegate's opinion, the Meidan Emam should be considered for the List of World Heritage in Danger.

VIII. STATUS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

17. The Bureau took note of document SC.88/CONF.007/8 presenting the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau in particular noted that relatively few of the contributions of States Parties to the Fund had as yet been received at the beginning of the 1988-89 biennium. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to remind States Parties of the need to pay their contributions in full and as soon as possible in the biennium in order to allow the World Heritage Committee to plan its work effectively.

IX. REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND TRAINING

18. The Bureau examined document SC-88/CONF.007/9 presenting requests for technical cooperation and training under the World Heritage Fund.

19. The following requests were approved by the Bureau:

1. Consultancy services for the preparation of a plan for Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal) and purchase of equipment for implementing three prototype projects recommended by the plan: \$ 30,000

2. Financial contribution to the purchase of a "UNIMOG", an all-terrain vehicle, for use in field training activities at the Mweka College of African Wildlife Management (Tanzania): \$ 30,000

3. Purchase of two portable micro-earthquake systems and a micro-climatological device for the Temple of Apollo Epicurius at Bassae (Greece): \$ 30,000

20. The Bureau approved US\$25,000 for training in Madagascar under the condition that the training workshop will have a special focus on the "Tsigny de Bemaraha" area nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested that this workshop be used to revise the nomination of the Tsigny de Bemaraha.

21. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the following request:

1. Equipment for a visitor's centre and an all-terrain vehicle for Tassili n'Ajjer National Park (Algeria): \$ 53,000

2. Equipment essential for better patrolling the Virunga National Park (Zaire): \$ 40,000

3. Equipment and spare parts for Toyota vehicle to strengthen anti-poaching measures in Garamba National Park (Zaire): \$ 50,000

22. The Bureau recommended that the Committee be informed of other international assistance projects for these World Heritage sites such as projects funded by the EEC.

23. The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the following request, on the understanding that further details be provided on the amounts requested:

Equipment for restoring the World Heritage properties of Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa and Sigiriya (Sri Lanka) and for training activities pertaining to those sites.

24. Since ICOMOS was not yet in a position to provide an accurate evaluation of the threats to the integrity of the following two properties, the Bureau recommended that the Committee's decision on the two requests be taken after further study has been carried out:

1. Urgent measures for strengthening the foundations of the wall and to study methods of reconstructing doors, windows and other wooden elements at Bahla Fort (Oman).

2. Equipment and technical assistance needed for restoration work at Wieliczka Salt Mine (Poland).

25. With regard to a request from Brazil submitted on 16 June 1988 for \$30,000 towards a project for the conservation and management of the Jesuit missions of the Guarani, the Bureau agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that he approve project components up to an amount of \$20,000. The remaining \$10,000 for the project, which would bring its value to a total of \$30,000, should be requested from the Committee at its next session.

X. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

26. The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the Secretariat's report on promotion (document SC.88/CONF.007/10) which presented the different activities undertaken since the last session of the Committee. Emphasis had been particularly laid on the production and diffusion of general information material on the Convention and also on the preparation of new exhibit materials on the Convention. These exhibits had been sent out to a number of States Parties. In this connection the representative from Mexico expressed his gratitude to the Secretariat for having provided one of these exhibits to his country.

27. The Bureau also noted that the Secretariat would henceforth concentrate its efforts on improving the information basis for individual World Heritage properties and that in this respect the Secretariat planned to produce short descriptive texts for each property.

28. Concerning the establishment of national associations for the promotion of the aims of the Convention, the Bureau took note of recent initiatives in two States Parties. The Bureau expressed the hope that many more States Parties would follow these examples.

XI. PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE TWELFTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

29. The Bureau approved the Provisional Agenda prepared by the Secretariat (SC-88/CONF.007/11) in accordance with the recommendations of the Working Group set up by the Committee at its eleventh session. The Chairman recalled that one of the tasks of the Working Group had been to suggest means of better managing the agenda of the Committee's sessions.

30. With regard to the place of the twelfth session (5-9 December 1988), the Secretariat explained that the agreement required for the organization of the session in Brasilia could be signed upon confirmation that the host country would meet the extra cost to the Secretariat of organizing the session away from Headquarters. The Deputy Permanent Delegate of Brazil to Unesco informed the Bureau that all the elements needed in order to sign the agreement would soon be available. Expressing his satisfaction that the next session of the Committee would be held in Brasilia, one member requested the observer from Brazil to urge his authorities to take all possible measures to provide low-cost arrangements that might facilitate the participation of qualified specialists from States Members of the Committee as well as from other States Parties.

XII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

31. As he was closing the session, the Chairman informed the Bureau that he had met with the Director-General who had confirmed his commitment to the work of the World Heritage Convention as a major activity of Unesco. The Director-General had agreed to augment the capacity of the Secretariat of the Convention by the establishment of six additional posts under Unesco's Regular Programme.

32. The Chairman thanked all participants for their contribution to a successful session and closed the meeting.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee

Twelfth Session

(Unesco Headquarters, 14-17 June 1988)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mme Magdalina STANTCHEVA
Professeur, Université de Sofia

Rapporteur

M Konstantin PACHEV
Attaché à la Délégation
permanente auprès de l'Unesco

CANADA

Mr James D. COLLINSON
Asst. Deputy Minister
Canadian Parks Service
Environment Canada

Chairman / Président

Mrs Christina CAMERON
Director-General
National Historic Parks
Environment Canada

FRANCE

M Jean-Pierre BADY
Directeur du Patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication

M François ENAUD
Inspecteur général
des monuments historiques
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication

M Alain MEGRET
Ministère de l'Environnement

Mme Muriel DE RAISSAC
 Direction du Patrimoine
 Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication

M Gilbert SIMON
 Ministère de l'Environnement

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

Mme Anita DAVIDENKOFF
 Chef du Bureau de l'Unesco
 Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

Mlle Françoise DESCARPENTRIES
 Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

MEXICO / MEXIQUE

S.E. M Miguel LEON-PORTILLA
 Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent
 auprès de l'Unesco

M Salvador DIAZ BERRIO
 Chef des Projets techniques
 Institut national d'anthropologie et histoire

Mme Guadalupe UGARTE de BERNARD
 Deuxième Secrétaire
 Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

SRI LANKA

H.E. Mr Ananda GURUGE
 Ambassador and Permanent Delegate to Unesco

TUNISIA / TUNISIE

M Azzedine BESCHAOUCH
 Président, Fondation nationale académique

M Adnan ZMERLI
 Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

Mme Sophie ZAUCHE
 Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA / REPUBLIQUE UNIE DE TANZANIE

Mr Amini Aza MTURI
 Principal Conservator of Antiquities

Mr Joseph MUWOWO
 Minister Plenipotentiary
 Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

II. OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

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

ALGERIA / ALGERIE

M Noureddine GAOUAOU
Deuxième secrétaire
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

ARGENTINA / ARGENTINE

S.E. Mme Elsa KELLY
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire
Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

Mlle Stella PELAEZ AYERRA
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIE

Hon. E. G. WHITLAM
Member, Unesco Executive Board

H.E. Mr. E. R. POCOCK
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr P. BRIDGEWATER
First Assistant Secretary
Natural Heritage and Environment Protection
Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment,
Tourism and Territories

Mr W. NICHOLLS
Rainforest Unit
Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment,
Tourism and Territories

Mr J. L. LANDER
Alternate Permanent Delegate to Unesco

BRAZIL / BRESIL

M Luiz Filipe MACEDO SOARES
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

Mrs Isis DE ANDRADE
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

4

CHINA (People's Republic of) / CHINE (République populaire de)

Mr LI Wenhua
Chairman, MAB-ICC
Academica Sinica

COSTA RICA

S.E. Mme Vivienne SOLIS de RIVERA
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

Mme Iris LEIVA-BILLAULT
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

ECUADOR / EQUATEUR

Mr Miguel CARBO
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

GREECE / GRECE

Mme Androniki MILTIADOU
Ministère de la Culture Hellénique

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

M Béla KOVACSI
Conseiller du Ministère

INDIA / INDE

H.E. Ms Arundhati GHOSE
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr Pradeep SINGH
Second Secretary
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF / IRAN, REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D'

M Réza FEIZ
Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

OMAN (Sultanate of) / OMAN (Sultanat d')

Mr Musa Jaafar HASSAN
Permanent Delegate to Unesco

PERU / PEROU

Mlle Lissette NALVARTE S.
Troisième secrétaire
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

11.

TURKEY / TURQUIE

M A. Engin OBA
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

III. ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY /
ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT AVEC UN STATUT CONSULTATIFINTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS) /
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES

Mr Helmut STELZER
Secretary General

M Léon PRESSOUYRE
Professeur à l'Université de Paris I

Mr Colin KAISER
Acting Director of Secretariat

Mme Florence PORTELETTE
Documentaliste

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL
RESOURCES (IUCN) /
UNION INTERNATIONALE POUR LA CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE ET DE SES
RESSOURCES (UICN)

Mr James THORSELL
Executive Officer
Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas

Mr Jeffrey SAYER
Senior Advisor on Tropical Forests

Mr Michael GREEN
Senior Research Officer
Conservation Monitoring Centre

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND THE
RESTORATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY (ICCROM) /
CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION ET LA
RESTAURATION DES BIENS CULTURELS (ICCROM)

Mr Jukka JOKILEHTO
Architect

IV. SECRETARIAT

Mr Abdul Razzak KADDOURA
Assistant Director General
for Science

Mr. D. DE SAN
Chief, International Standards
Division

Mr Bernd VON DROSTE
Director, Division of Ecological
Sciences

Mrs Jane ROBERTSON
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN
Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms Mireille JARDIN
Division of Ecological Sciences

Mrs Anne RAIDL
Director
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr Yudhishtir Raj. ISAR
Chief, International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage

Ms Chantal LYARD
International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage

M Etienne CLEMENT
International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage

Ms. Paule-Claude BENEDICT
International Standards
Division of Cultural Heritage