

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

First Session

Unesco, Paris, 27 June - 1 July 1977

Final Report

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The first session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") was held in Paris from 27 June to 1 July 1977 and was attended by representatives of the fifteen States members of the Committee.
2. Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, the International Council of Monuments and Sites and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (hereinafter referred to as the "Rome Centre", "ICOMOS" and "IUCN" respectively) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The discussions were also followed by representatives of two other States Parties to the Convention, of the United Nations and of a non-governmental organization.
3. The full list of participants is to be found in Annex I to this report.

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. After welcoming the representatives of States members of the Committee, the Director-General underlined the importance of the meeting for the pursuit of one of the fundamental objectives of the Organization - the promotion of the preservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage of mankind. He stressed the innovative character of the World Heritage Convention under which the Committee was established: for the first time, an international convention was concerned with both the cultural and the natural elements of the environment of man and, again for the first time, the international community as a whole was called upon to assume responsibility for protecting the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value. He expressed the hope that action taken by the Committee would not induce States Parties to neglect that part of their heritage that would not be included in the World Heritage List. The Director-General also recalled the different tasks before the Committee, referring in particular to the establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger and to the provision of international co-operation under the World Heritage Fund. Before concluding,

he thanked the Rome Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN for their valuable assistance in preparing the documentation for the meeting and expressed his conviction that the same spirit of co-operation with these three organizations would continue to prevail.

III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

5. The Committee elected by acclamation Mr. Firouz Bagherzadeh (Iran) as its Chairman.
6. A member of the Committee proposed that Rule 12 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure should be amended to provide for the election of four Vice-Chairmen. This proposal was supported by two members and adopted by the Committee. The Committee then proceeded to elect by acclamation the representatives of the Arab Republic of Egypt, France, Nigeria and Poland, as Vice-Chairmen, and Mr. Peter H. Bennett (Canada) as Rapporteur.

IV. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. The Chairman invited the members of the Committee to examine the Provisional Agenda prepared by the Secretariat. The representative of the Director-General proposed that an item on "Other matters" be added to the Agenda; under this item would be considered the offer of collaboration from the International Organization for the Protection of Works of Art (document CC-77/CONF.001/5) and the proposed donation of Professor Badawy (document CC-77/CONF.001/7). He also suggested that the methods of work of the Committee should not be discussed separately but rather in conjunction with items 7 and 8 of the Provisional Agenda since these items were closely related.
8. With the above modifications and on the above understanding, the Agenda was adopted.

V. ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

9. In reply to a suggestion that the Rules of Procedure should be examined by a working group which would report back to the Committee at a later plenary meeting, the Legal Adviser stated that, in the absence of a text formally approved by the Committee, the Provisional Rules of Procedure would prevail and he therefore proposed that they be examined at an early plenary meeting; this would not prevent the Committee from amending the Rules of Procedure at a later stage, if necessary. He added that the Rules of Procedure would probably only assume their final form after two or three sessions of the Committee. After some discussion, the Committee decided to examine the Rules of Procedure one by one.
10. Several amendments were proposed to bring greater clarity to the text or to reflect more closely the terms of the Convention. The Rules relating to the election of officers and to the voting procedures gave rise to some comment.
11. With respect to the eligibility for re-election of members of the Bureau, participants considered that, although rotation in the membership of the Bureau was necessary, continuity in the work of the Committee was of paramount importance. Various proposals followed, some providing for re-election of all officers and others for re-election of the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur only. A further proposal which sought to limit the eligibility of all officers for immediate re-election to a second term of office was finally accepted.

12. An explanation was requested on the different weightings required for a majority vote under the terms of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Rule 28. The Legal Adviser referred members to paragraph 8 of Article 13 of the Convention which stipulated that "Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by a majority of two-thirds of its members present and voting". This provision was included in an Article of the Convention dealing with substantive questions and not with procedural matters. It was therefore considered that a two-thirds majority should be required on substantive questions. However, according to the terms of paragraph 4 of this Rule, it would be the Committee which would decide, by a simple majority, whether the question to be put to the vote would or would not require a two-thirds majority.

13. Participants requested that two points raised in connection with the Rules of Procedure be noted in the summary record. The first related to the meetings of the Committee which, in the opinion of one member, should be given wide publicity. The second concerned the suspension of the Rules of Procedure which, as confirmed by the Legal Adviser, could be initiated by any State member of the Committee.

14. A corrigendum setting out the modifications made by the Committee, as well as an amendment proposed by the representative of the Director-General to Rule 8.2, was examined at the last meeting of the Committee which then proceeded to adopt unanimously the revised text of its Rules of Procedure. (Annex II)

VI. CONSIDERATION OF MAIN WORKING DOCUMENT (CC-77/CONF.001/4)

15. The Chairman invited the members of the Committee to consider the main working document and gave the floor to the representative of the Director-General who introduced the document which had been prepared with the assistance of the Rome Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN.

16. Some discussion ensued on the method to be followed in examining the different points raised in the document and it was decided to establish two working groups with which the Rome Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN would be associated and which would review the proposed criteria for the inclusion of cultural and natural properties in the World Heritage List, and a drafting group which would formulate the decisions taken by the Committee on other matters. The Committee proceeded to debate the general principles involved in establishing the World Heritage List and to examine, one by one, the other questions raised in the document.

A. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

(a) General debate

17. It was the opinion of several members that the Committee should issue a statement on the whole philosophy underlying the Convention and, in particular, the need for a World Heritage List. Others felt that the discussion on the criteria for inclusion of properties in the List would necessarily raise the philosophical concepts involved.

18. Several members felt strongly that the World Heritage List should be exclusive and that, because of its impact, the List - in which balance would be sought geographically and between cultural and natural properties - should be drawn up with extreme care. Responsibility for ensuring the exclusive character

of the List would rest first of all, with the States nominating properties and secondly, with the Committee which would have the right to reject nominations; the adoption of criteria which would be used by the Committee to filter nominations therefore constituted a very important first step.

19. The feasibility of adopting criteria gave rise to some discussion, with members referring to the difficulty already experienced in establishing criteria at the national level, to the changing and subjective nature of evaluations of qualities, to the impact of Western thought and to the difference between perception from within a given culture and perception from outside. The representative of ICOMOS, in reply, recognized the difficulty of drafting criteria to be applied to cultural property throughout the world and of translating concepts into words that were meaningful on a universal scale; an attempt had been made but he realized that, in the light of experience as nominations were examined, the criteria would probably require some adjustment.

20. Hope was expressed that sufficient information would be provided to States to enable them to select properties that were truly eligible for inclusion in the List and that the criteria adopted would assist States in restricting their choice of properties nominated. In this connection, one proposal put forward sought to impose on States a limit in the number of properties that they might submit in the first instance but, on reflection this was not considered advisable. It was, however, decided that States would be advised to limit the number of nominations submitted at a given time, on the understanding that these nominations were not to be considered exhaustive.

21. Questions were raised with respect to the calendar for the submission of nominations to be examined at the second session of the Committee. Many members mentioned difficulties for their own national authorities in meeting the deadline of 1 April 1978, particularly in those countries where complete inventories had not yet been established. Several members strongly urged that technical co-operation should be financed under the Fund for the preparation of these inventories. The representative of the Director-General referred participants in this respect to the Convention which explicitly provides that requests for international assistance might also be concerned with identification of cultural or natural property "when preliminary investigations have shown that further inquiries would be justified" (Article 13 (2)). He added that it was not necessary to submit complete inventories by 1 April 1978 and that other nominations could be put forward to later sessions of the Committee.

22. Several members considered that an independent assessment by experts of the nominations submitted would be essential and it was proposed that the nominations should be transmitted, for comments and evaluation, to the Rome Centre, ICOMOS or IUCN, as appropriate.

23. One member considered that States not Parties to the Convention should be able to have properties nominated by a State Party for inclusion in the List. Other participants inquired about the possibility of nominating properties not situated in national territories, such as international sites, for instance the United Nations building in New York, or regions such as Antarctica. However, it was pointed out that the Convention was very explicit in this respect, Article II referring to the submission by each State Party of inventories of properties situated in its territory.

24. The Committee then proceeded to examine the working document paragraph by paragraph and to put forward their comments which would be taken into account by the drafting committee in formulating the decisions taken by the Committee.

(b) General principles relating to the establishment of the World Heritage List

25. Several participants felt that the fundamental notion of the Committee's complete independence in evaluating nominations of States Parties should be more emphatically underlined. Others foresaw that certain properties would be re-evaluated in the light of new discoveries which may lead to the deletion of properties from the List. The "loss of integrity" referred to as a reason for the deletion of property from the List did not appear pertinent in the case of cultural property; for example, monuments in ruins, obviously having lost their integrity, could be eligible for inscription.

26. An emphasis given to properties which combine cultural and natural features demonstrating the interaction between man and nature might, in the opinion of some participants, be confusing in that it might appear to diminish the value of properties outstanding only from the cultural or natural points of view.

27. Another participant suggested that it should be indicated at the site itself that that site is included on the World Heritage List. On this point, the representative of the Director-General informed members that a World Heritage emblem was under preparation and this could well be used inter alia at the sites. It was feared by another participant that sites not included in the List and not marked by the emblem might be neglected by States.

28. The definition of "universal" given in paragraph 17 of the working document was found to be incomplete, in that time also was a factor that modified the appreciation of values.

(c) Criteria for the inclusion of cultural properties in the World Heritage List

29. It was proposed by several participants that, in the final text of the criteria, no examples should be cited, in order not to prejudice the decisions of the Committee. There was general agreement on this point.

30. The interpretation given of authenticity was challenged by several members who did not consider that it necessarily entailed maintaining the original function of property which, to ensure its preservation, often had to be adapted to other functions. Another member specified that functions could change but when this different function entailed fundamental and irreversible changes to the original form, authenticity should be considered as lost. The same member went on to plead that due recognition be given to "progressive authenticity", for example, monuments and buildings that are constructed or modified throughout the centuries but which nevertheless retain some form of authenticity.

31. Taking into account the comments made in plenary, a working group under the chairmanship of Mr. Michel Parent (France) reformulated the criteria for cultural property. The Chairman of the working group presented to a later plenary meeting the revised text on which several comments were formulated.

32. On the first criterion, the use of the word "spirit" was questioned and was replaced by "genius". One member requested that the word "scientific" referring to development be reinserted in criterion (iv). Another member proposed that "significant" be added to criterion (v) before the words

"traditional style of architecture..". The same member queried the use of the word "site" in the introductory lines and asked that this should be interpreted as covering also groups of sites and large areas. This interpretation was accepted by the Committee. There was some discussion on the advisability of adding the word "immovable" to "monumental sculpture" in criterion (ii) but this was not accepted.

33. With the above modifications and some minor changes in form, the criteria were unanimously adopted by the Committee.

(d) Criteria for the inclusion of natural properties in the World Heritage List.

34. Some members questioned several changes made to the original draft text prepared by IUCN. For instance, there had been a change of emphasis from "representative" examples to "outstanding" examples in the different criteria, with which one member did not agree. The same participant found that too much emphasis had been laid on superlative examples (the highest, the largest etc.). Another member sought to reinsert manageability as a criterion; in reply, the IUCN representative considered that this should rather be taken into account at the stage of allocating funds. It was decided that, as for the text on cultural criteria, named examples would be excluded.

35. A working group under the chairmanship of Mr. David F. Hales (U.S.A.) then reviewed in detail the criteria and presented a revised text to a later meeting. With some minor changes in form proposed by the Chairman of the working group, the criteria were unanimously adopted by the Committee.

(e) Format and content of the nominations for inclusion in the World Heritage List

36. The proposal to prepare one printed form for nominations of cultural and natural properties that would provide brief explanations on the information to be given was endorsed by the Committee which decided that it would be used on a trial basis until changes became necessary. The list of information to be provided by States Parties, which had been modified by one of the working groups, was approved by the Committee.

37. On the question of model nomination files, there was some discussion on the organizations to be entrusted with this work, on the feasibility of associating the Bureau, and of the timing of their preparation. Whereas members of the Committee felt that model files would be extremely valuable to States Parties in preparing their nominations, they recognized that it was no easy task to prepare fictitious dossiers. It was finally decided that ICOMOS and IUCN would prepare model files which would be reviewed with the Secretariat before they were dispatched to States Parties. One participant hoped that these model files would be relatively simple and not too sophisticated.

(f) Procedure and calendar for the submission of nominations

38. The very tight calendar proposed was discussed in some detail, with many participants referring once more to the difficulties their own governments would have to face in preparing in time their nominations. The question of limiting the number of nominations to be submitted by States was again raised, and whereas the decision previously taken in plenary not to impose any limit was maintained, it was decided that States would be requested to indicate an order of priority among the nominations submitted. States would, at the same time, be reminded that the process of submitting nominations was ongoing and that nominations not considered at the second session of the Committee would be examined at later sessions.

39. The exact role to be played by the Rome Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN gave rise to some discussion, one member proposing that all nominations should be transmitted automatically by the Secretariat for comments and evaluation to the competent organization. The representative of the Director-General agreed that the organizations had an extremely important role to play in reviewing the dossiers submitted by States Parties, and in particular in putting them into order but he feared that the addition of another step in the already tight calendar might entail delays. It was therefore decided that the organizations would have a dual role to play: firstly, they would review the dossiers with the Secretariat in order to complete them and put them into order and secondly - under their direct responsibility - they would send to members of the Committee their evaluations of nominations against the criteria adopted.

40. In order to present the Committee at its second session with a set of nominations that would be balanced by category and by geographical and cultural region, it was decided that the Bureau, meeting in June 1978, would review all the nominations received and decide which would be forwarded to the Committee. The following calendar would thus be followed:

November 1977: dispatch to States Parties of Director-General's letter, together with printed nomination form;

1 April 1978: receipt of nominations from States Parties;

April/May 1978: dossiers will be received and completed, if necessary, with the assistance of ICOMOS, IUCN and the Rome Centre; translation and reproduction of dossiers;

8 and 9 June 1978: meeting of the Bureau to decide on which nominations would go forward to the Committee at its second session;

July 1978: dispatch of dossiers to members of the Committee;

September/October 1978: consideration of dossiers at the second session of the Committee.

(g) Publication of the World Heritage List

41. The Committee decided to defer to a later session decisions relating to the form and periodicity of publication of the "World Heritage List".

B. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

(a) Format and content of requests for international assistance

42. Although one member found the list of information to be provided by States in making requests for assistance under the Fund to be rather too complicated and sophisticated, the Committee approved the content of requests for small-scale and large-scale projects.

(b) Procedure for the consideration of requests

43. The procedure proposed in the working document for the consideration of requests gave rise to few comments and was adopted by the Committee. Following the request by one member that assistance in documentation work should be added, the drafting group felt that there was no need to add a specific reference to documentation which appeared to be covered by the other activities mentioned in Article 22 of the Convention.

44. With respect to the granting of international assistance, it was suggested that, in view of the limited funds available, a fixed maximum sum should be made available for each project. This would be difficult, responded another participant, since each case would have to be considered separately in the light of resources available under the Fund and arrangements for complementary financing. Another proposed that such decisions should be taken on the basis of an annual budget submitted to the Committee at each session.

(c) Order of priorities for the granting of international assistance

45. General agreement was expressed on the factors proposed for consideration in determining an order of priorities but some comments were made on the concepts of "educational value" and "socio-economic benefits". The training of local personnel, essential for the continuity of almost all projects, was considered an important factor that had to be taken into account. One member expressed concern over the implications of the term "socio-economic benefits" which might be misinterpreted, particularly in relation to tourism; he stressed that if cultural property was used for touristic purposes it should be adequately protected and socio-economic benefits from tourism should not jeopardize the state of preservation of the property. While one member sought to delete all reference to socio-economic benefits, the representative of the Director-General suggested that the concept of socio-economic consequences could be retained especially in connection with the preservation of historic towns and quarters. In the opinion of another member, the socio-economic aspects of projects raised a whole host of problems that could not be covered at the present meeting. It was therefore proposed that this question be taken up in depth at a later session. In the meantime, the phrase "consequences from the social and economic points of view" was adopted.

(d) Standard agreement to be concluded with States receiving international assistance

46. It was agreed that a draft text of the standard agreement would be prepared by the Secretariat and sent to members of the Committee well in advance of the second session.

47. In the meantime, one member asked for clarification by the Legal Adviser on the possibility of awarding assistance at all under the Fund in the absence of a standard agreement. The representative of the Director-General transmitted the reply of the Legal Adviser who could not attend the meeting: in his opinion, Article 26 of the Convention related to the actual implementation of a programme or a project once the Committee had decided to grant assistance thereto - the terms and conditions of this assistance would be set out in the agreement; he considered that Article 26 did not relate to preparatory assistance (preparation of nominations to the World Heritage List or preparation of requests for assistance under the Fund). The representative of the Director-General added that such preparatory assistance would be provided in accordance with regulations and procedures prevailing in Unesco.

(e) Emergency assistance

48. A discussion took place on the procedure for dealing with requests for emergency assistance on which decisions might be required between sessions of the Committee, with participants referring to the prerequisite of inscription on the World Heritage List, to the possible role to be played by the Bureau and to the limited time available if immediate measures were to be taken.

49. It was decided that requests for emergency assistance would be receivable only from States Parties and only with respect to property included or nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List. If these two conditions were met, the Secretariat would submit the request to the Chairman for decision in consultation with the Director-General on the type and extent of assistance to be granted.

(f) Technical co-operation

50. On many occasions, members referred to the desirability of providing, under the World Heritage Fund, technical co-operation to States Parties in preparing (i) nominations for inclusion in the World Heritage List, and (ii) requests for international assistance.

51. The Committee decided that, at the request of States Parties, technical co-operation would be provided under the Fund for these two purposes, in accordance with the terms of Article 21(1) of the Convention and within the limits of the approved budget (see paragraph 57 below). Such assistance would be in the form of expert services or equipment. Authority would be delegated to the Chairman who would decide, in consultation with the Director-General, on the type and extent of preparatory assistance to be granted.

(g) Financial Regulations

52. The Committee had no comments on the text of the Financial Regulations prepared by the Secretariat, and already noted by the General Assembly, of States Parties and the Executive Board of Unesco.

(h) Other matters concerning the granting of international assistance

53. The Committee decided to defer until a later session its decisions on the establishment and publication of the List of World Heritage in Danger and of the List of properties for which international assistance is granted and also with respect to the share to be contributed by the recipient State in any given project.

C. INVITATIONS TO FUTURE SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

54. The Committee had before it the proposals of the Director-General on organizations that could be invited to send observers to future sessions of the Committee, as follows:

United Nations;
 United Nations Environmental Programme;
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;
 World Food Programme;
 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;
 Interamerican Development Bank;
 Arab Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization;
 Council of Europe;
 Organization of American States;
 South-East Asian Ministers of Education Organization.

These proposals were approved with the following additions:

United Nations Development Programme;
Afro-Malagasy and Mauritian Cultural Institute;
Organization of African Unity;
Organization for Museums, Monuments and Sites in Africa;
International Council of Museums;
International Federation of Landscape Architects;
International Organization for the Protection of Works of Art; and
International Union of Architects.

The Committee also decided that other international organizations with activities in the fields covered by the Convention could be invited to send observers, and, in addition, as proposed by the Director-General, the Chairman of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture.

55. The representative of the Director-General indicated that the Secretariat would closely re-examine the approved list of observers and should it appear that additional organizations ought to be included, the matter would be submitted to the meeting of the Bureau in June 1978.

D. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE

56. At the last meeting of the Committee, the Chairman of the Drafting Committee presented his report which, after a statement on the philosophy underlying the Convention, set out the decisions taken by the Committee on the various questions raised in the main working document. He drew the attention of participants to Section IV of the document in which several recommendations addressed to States Parties were formulated. With a certain number of modifications, which are referred to in the appropriate section of this record, the report under the title of "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention" was unanimously adopted.

VII. OTHER MATTERS

A. PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1977/1978

57. On the basis of resources available in the World Heritage Fund, the Secretariat proposed in document CC-77/CONF.001/6, a budget covering (i) the preparation of model nomination files, (ii) technical co-operation to States Parties in preparing their nominations and requests for assistance, and (iii) emergency assistance required before the next session of the Committee.

58. Members found the sums available to be very modest indeed and some felt that additional funds might be required. It was decided that the Bureau should have authority to increase the budget provisions, if necessary in the light of requests received and of funds available. With this proviso, the Committee unanimously adopted the proposed budget.

B. PROPOSAL BY THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF WORKS OF ART

59. The Scientific Director of the International Organization for the Protection of Works of Art presented the offer of collaboration of that Organization.

60. While some members encouraged the Committee to accept the proposed offer which had no financial implications, others were uncertain as to whether the objectives of that Organization were the same as those of the Convention, particularly since the work of the Organization in question appeared to relate to movable cultural objects. This led to an exchange of views on the difficulty of distinguishing clearly between movable and immovable cultural property.

61. It was subsequently decided that the International Organization for the Protection of the Works of Art would be invited to attend future sessions of the Committee, in an observer capacity. However, a member of the Committee asked that it be noted that this decision was in no way to be interpreted as recognizing a special status for that Organization within the framework of the World Heritage Convention and that there was no commitment on the part of the Committee to grant a special status in the future.

C. DONATION OF PROFESSOR BADAWY

62. The representative of the Director-General introduced document CC-77/CONF.001/7 which, at this stage, was submitted to the Committee for information only. He explained that the offer included a house in Cairo and a capital fund of \$240,000 from which the interest could be used to finance a number of fellowships in Egyptian archaeology; he pointed out that the administrative and practical problems involved in the upkeep of the house would make it difficult to accept that part of the donation.

63. The representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt supplemented the information provided, giving further details on Professor Badawy's offer.

64. The Committee expressed sincere thanks to Professor Badawy for his offer and authorized the Secretariat to study further the exact conditions of the offer and to report to it at its second session.

D. DATE AND PLACE OF SECOND SESSION

65. The representative of the United States of America, on behalf of the Secretary of State, invited the Committee to hold its next session in Washington. The Committee expressed its gratitude to the United States for this generous offer, which was accepted by acclamation.

66. It was decided that the exact dates of the next session, which would take place between 15 September and 31 October 1978, would be fixed by the Chairman, in consultation with the Government of the United States of America and the Director-General.

E. MEETING OF THE BUREAU

67. It was further decided that the Bureau would meet in Paris on 8 and 9 June 1978. The Rome Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN would be invited to attend.

F. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

68. At the last plenary meeting the Rapporteur presented an oral report in which he highlighted the main conclusions and decisions of the Committee. In concluding his report, he referred to one issue that had not been discussed

during the session, namely Secretariat assistance to the Committee: in view of the volume and complexity of the administrative work involved both in the preparation of documentation for the sessions of the Committee and in implementing its decisions, which would be particularly heavy as from 1979, he suggested that Unesco should carefully examine the situation and provide the additional staff support necessary for the work related to the World Heritage Convention.

69. The Rapporteur's oral report has been incorporated into the present summary record, of which it forms a substantial part.

ANNEX I/ANNEXE I.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

I. Representatives of States Members of the World Heritage Committee/
Représentants des états membres du comité du patrimoine mondial

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Professor Derek John Mulvaney
Commissioner, Australian Heritage Commission

Mrs. Barbara Barry de Longchamp
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to Unesco

CANADA

Mr. Peter H. Bennett
Director of Liaison and Consultation
Parks Canada
Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Mr. Thomas E. Lee
Director
Provincial Parks
British Columbia Department
of Recreation and Conservation

Mr. Richard Apted
Director
Heritage Administration
Ministry of Culture and Recreation, Ontario

Mr. Bernard Ouimet
Directeur de la direction des arrondissements historiques et naturels
Direction générale du patrimoine
Ministère des affaires culturelles du Québec

Mrs. Maria Raletich-Rajicic (Observer)
Permanent Delegation of Canada to Unesco

ECUADOR/EQUATEUR

Mr. Rodrigo Pallares
Director
Patrimonio cultural del Ecuador

ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT/REPUBLIQUE ARABE D'EGYPTE

Dr. Shehata Adam
Director-General of the Centre of
Documentation and Study on Ancient Egypt

FRANCE

Mr. Jean Salusse
Directeur de la caisse nationale des
monuments historiques et des sites

Mr. Michel Parent
Inspecteur général des monuments
historiques et des sites

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY/REPUBLIQUE FEDERALE D'ALLEMAGNE

Dr. Georg Moersch
Conservateur en chef du Land Rhénanie

Mr. Hermann Gründel
Délégué permanent adjoint
de la République fédérale d'Allemagne auprès de l'Unesco

GHANA

Mr. Richard Nunoo
Director of Monuments and Museums Board

Mr. Boniface Atepor
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Ghana to Unesco

IRAN

Mr. Firouz Bagherzadeh
Director General, Iranian Centre for Archaeological Research

Mr. Cyrus Eilian
Head, Bureau of Parks and Reserves, Department of the Environment

Mr. Féreydoun Ardalan
Secretary-General, Iranian National Commission for Unesco

Mr. Mohsene Foroughi
Architect and Technical Adviser,
National Organization for the Protection of Historical Monuments

Mr. Tschanguiz Pahlavan
Director-General, Ministry of Culture and Arts
Secretary-General, Asian Cultural Documentation Centre for Unesco

IRAQ/IRAK

Mr. Fuad Safar
Inspector General of Excavations
Directorate General of Antiquities
Ministry of Information.

Dr. T. Adil Naji
Director, Regional Centre for Conservation of Cultural Property
in the Arab States
Ministry of Information

NIGERIA

Dr. Ekpo O. Eyo
Director
Department of Antiquities

Mr. F.O. Iheme
Counsellor, Nigerian Permanent Delegation to Unesco

POLAND/POLOGNE

Professor Krzysztof Pawlowski
Conservateur général adjoint des monuments historiques de Pologne
Ministère de la culture et des arts

SENEGAL

Professor Amadou Lamine Sy
Directeur du patrimoine national
Ministère de la culture

Mr. Doudou Diene
Premier Conseiller
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Délégation permanente du Sénégal auprès de l'Unesco

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Mr. Abdelaziz Daoulatli
Conservateur du patrimoine de Tunis
Institut national d'art et d'archéologie
Ministère des affaires culturelles

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr. David F. Hales
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish,
Wildlife and Parks
Department of the Interior

Mr. Robert R. Garvey Jr.
Executive Director
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Mr. Robert C. Milne
Chief
International Park Affairs Division
National Park Service
Department of the Interior

Mr. Constantine Warvariv
Deputy United States Permanent Representative to
Unesco

YUGOSLAVIA/YOUGOSLAVIE

Professor Milan Prelog
Professeur à l'université de Zagreb
Expert pour la préservation des monuments
l'environnement humain et la planification urbaine

II. Organizations attending in an advisory capacity/
Organisations représentées à titre consultatif

International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration
of Cultural Property/Centre international d'études pour la conservation et
la restauration des biens culturels

Mr. Giorgio Torraca
Deputy Director

Mr. Louis-Jacques Rollet-Andriane
Consultant

International Council for Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)/Conseil
international des monuments et des sites

Professor Raymond M. Lemaire
President

Dr. Ernest Allen Connally
Secretary-General

Mrs. Ann Webster-Smith
Deputy to the Secretary-General

International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)/
Union internationale pour la conservation de la nature et de ses ressources
(UICN)

Dr. Duncan Poore
Scientific Director

III. Observers from other States Parties to the Convention/
Observateurs d'autres Etats parties à la Convention

Professor Driss Amor
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Morocco to Unesco

Mr. John Bjørnebye
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Norway to Unesco

IV. United Nations/Nations Unies

Mrs. Aminata Doukoure
Assistant Information Officer
United Nations Information Centre in Paris

V. Non-Governmental Organization/Organisation non gouvernementale

Mr. Adolphe Mocquot, Scientific Director
International Organization for the Protection of Works of Art

VI. Secretariat of Unesco/Secrétariat de l'Unesco

Mr. Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow
Director-General

Mr. Claude Lussier
Director, Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs

Mr. Gérard Bolla
Deputy Assistant Director-General (Operations)
Culture and Communication Sector
Representative of the Director-General

Mr. Michel Batisse
Deputy Assistant Director-General for
Science (Environment and Natural Resources)

Mr. Francesco di Castri
Director, Division of Ecological Sciences

Mr. Michel Prévost
External Relations Division

Mr. Hiroshi Daifuku
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mrs. Anne Raidl
International Standards Section
Division of Cultural Heritage
Secretary of the Committee

Mr. Bernd von Droste Zü Hulshoff
Division of Ecological Sciences
Secretary of the Committee

Mr. Harihara Iyer
Accounts Division (Special Accounts Section)
Bureau of the Comptroller

Mrs. Margaret van Vliet
International Standards Section
Division of Cultural Heritage