

Distribution limited

WHC-06/30.COM/7B

Paris, 09 June 2006

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirtieth Session

Vilnius, Lithuania
8-16 July 2006

**Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: Examination of the State of Conservation of
World Heritage properties**

7B. State of conservation reports of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

As per Decision 7 EXT.COM 4B.1, paragraph 9, this document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and is separated in three categories:

1. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring discussion by the Committee, and concerning properties considered for in-Danger listing;
2. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring discussion by the Committee;
3. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring no discussion by the Committee;

Decision required: The Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. In certain cases, the Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion. The Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.

The full reports of Reactive Monitoring missions requested by the Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language:

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	2
III.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	4
	NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	4
	<i>AFRICA</i>.....	4
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	4
	1. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)	4
	2. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39).....	4
	3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)	8
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	10
	4. Dja Faunal reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)	10
	5. Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev)	11
	6. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)	13
	7. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)	16
	8. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509)	17
	<i>ARAB STATES</i>	20
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	20
	9. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)	20
	10. Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)	23
	<i>ASIA-PACIFIC</i>.....	26
	FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	26
	11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083).....	26
	12. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)	26
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	30
	13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)	30
	14. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)	32
	15. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120).....	34
	16. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653).....	37
	17. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 bis)	40
	<i>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</i>.....	44
	FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	44
	18. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	44
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	44
	19. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)	44
	FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	44
	20. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)	44

21. Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada) (N 404 bis).....	47
22. Nahanni National Park (Canada) (N 24)	49
23. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908).....	51
24. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)	53
25. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis).....	55
26. Durmitor National Park (Serbia and Montenegro) (N 100).....	57
27. Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America) (N 259).....	60
28. Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)	61
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	65
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	65
29. Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis).....	65
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	72
30. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 260).....	72
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	75
31. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)	75
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	79
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	79
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	79
32. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis).....	79
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.....	82
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	82
33. Pyrénées - Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis).....	82
34. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454).....	84
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	88
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	88
35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274).....	88
CULTURAL PROPERTIES.....	93
AFRICA.....	93
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	93
36. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev).....	93
37. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956).....	96
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION.....	96
38. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev).....	96
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	98
39. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 12).....	98
40. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)	100
41. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	103
42. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599).....	106
43. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26).....	109
44. Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916).....	111

ARAB STATES	112
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	112
45. Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)	112
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	116
46. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)	116
47. Medina of Essaouira (formerly Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 rev)	116
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	119
48. M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)	119
49. Qal'at al-Bahrain Archaeological Site (Bahrain) (C 1192).....	122
50. Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89).....	124
51. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093).....	127
52. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)	130
53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	132
54. Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750).....	132
55. Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836).....	136
56. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)	138
ASIA AND PACIFIC.....	141
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	141
57. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)	141
58. Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)	142
59. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev).....	147
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	150
60. Prambanan Temple Compunds (Indonesia) (C642)	150
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	150
61. Angkor (Cambodge) (C 668).....	150
62. Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)	154
63. World Heritage properties in Beijing (China)	157
64. Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056 rev)	162
65. Borobudur Temple Compound (Indonesia) (C 592).....	165
66. Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range (Japan) (C 1142).....	169
67. Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870).....	171
68. Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143).....	174
69. Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138).....	175
70. Historic Centre of Shakhrysbz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)	178
71. Complex of Hué Monuments (Viet Nam) (C 678).....	179
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.....	184
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	184
72. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	184
73. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)	184
74. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)	189
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION	192
75. Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)	192

76. City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)	195
77. Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (C 1156)	197
78. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation) (C 540).....	199
79. Old Town of Ávila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 rev).....	203
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	205
80. Madriu – Perafita – Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160)	205
81. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786).....	206
82. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)	208
83. Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)	209
84. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)	212
85. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis).....	214
86. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541).....	217
87. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)	219
88. Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)	221
89. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723).....	222
90. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Serbia and Montenegro) (C 125)	225
91. Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain) (C 311 rev).....	227
92. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev).....	228
93. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)	231
<i>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</i>	<i>234</i>
FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION	234
94. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)	234
95. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120).....	236
96. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412).....	238
97. Archaeological Site of Chavín (Peru) (C 330).....	241
98. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016).....	243
99. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)	244

I. INTRODUCTION

This document deals with reactive monitoring as it is defined in paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*: "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 properties that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (paragraphs 177-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*) and for the eventual removal of properties from the World Heritage List (paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

By its Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.1**, the Committee had requested that the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, propose at its 29th session:

- a) Criteria to present State of Conservation reports before the Committee;
- b) Criteria orienting the inclusion of a property in the category "for adoption requiring discussion" and the category "for adoption requiring no discussion";

These criteria are proposed within this introductory section.

The properties to be reported on have been selected, among all those inscribed on the World Heritage List, in consultation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. In making the selection, the following have been considered:

- Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (Cf. Documents *WHC-06/30.COM/7A* and *WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add*);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the Committee.

II. STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3** requested "...that the reports are categorized as follows:

- a) Reports with recommended decisions which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, require discussion by the World Heritage Committee,
- b) Reports which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, can be noted without discussion,"

In line with this request, and taking also into account the increasing attention paid by the Committee to the review of state of conservation reports, and notably the provisions of Decision **29 COM 7C** concerning improved reporting standards, the World Heritage Centre proposes to introduce a new category for properties which are considered by the Committee (former Decisions) and/or the Advisory Bodies/World Heritage Centre to be put on List of World Heritage in-Danger. This category entitled "For consideration for in-Danger listing" is the first to be presented.

Therefore, the State of Conservation reports of specific properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and presented in this document are divided in three categories, as follows:

- a. For consideration for in-Danger listing;
- b. For adoption requiring discussion by the Committee;
- c. For adoption requiring no discussion by the Committee;

Reports in the last category will not be discussed unless a request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee in advance of the discussion of this agenda item.

The reports have been categorized according to the following criteria, established in consultation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies:

Properties are included in the category for discussion when, in the view of the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies:

- The threat is serious and urgent
- The possible solution to the conservation problem requires the involvement of more than one State Party;
- A decision from the Committee is likely to have an impact on the situation;
- A debate / discussion is required on the general issue raised by the report;
- The Committee has specifically asked information for decision.

All other properties will be in the last category.

To facilitate the work of the Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **29 COM 7C** as well as Decision **27 COM 7B 106.4**:

"Invites the World Heritage Centre to present all information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the following manner:

- a) the report on each property should start on a new page,
- b) the identification number of the property allocated at the time of its nomination should be used in the document,
- c) an index of all properties should also be included,
- d) the decisions should have a standard layout, draft recommendation, and should be concise and operational; ”

Therefore the standard format includes:

- a) Name of the property (State Party) (ID number);
- b) Year of inscription on the World Heritage List;
- c) Inscription criteria;
- d) Years of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger (if applicable);
- e) Previous Committee Decision(s);
- f) International Assistance (if applicable);
- g) UNESCO Extra budgetary Funds (if applicable)
- h) Previous monitoring mission(s) ; (if applicable)
- i) Main threat(s) identified in previous report(s) (if applicable);
- j) Current conservation issue(s);
- k) Draft Decision.

The information contained in this document was prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO Divisions and Field Offices.

In this document, the state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties will be presented in English alphabetical order by region, as follows: Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, and finally Latin America and the Caribbean. For practical reasons, as in previous years, each report will not start on a new page (99 reports are presented in this document). However, each region will start on a new page.

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

1. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add* .

2. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21(b).22

29 COM 7B.1

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: Technical co-operation for a scientific study of vehicle congestion in the Ngorongoro crater (2001: USD 10,000).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN mission 21-24 April 1986

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Increased human pastoral population;
- b) Immigration; Poaching;
- c) Spread of invasive species;
- d) Tourism pressure;

e) Encroachment and cultivation.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received on the 6 January 2006 a state of conservation report for the property from the State Party, through its site management authority, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA), as well as the report 'The effects of congestion of vehicles on the environment – an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in the Ngorongoro Crater, Results from the scoping process'.

The State Party report provides an update on the information reported to the Committee at its 29th session and covers the following issues:

Management and Planning

The general management plan is under its final stage of review and was due to be adopted in April 2006. The Authority has also put in place a corporate plan, a new scheme of service and organization structure, although these are not described further.

Visitor management

With the support of many partners an EIA on vehicle congestion in the Ngorongoro Crater is currently under preparation. The results of the scoping process for the EIA were submitted by the State Party (17 January 2006). At the same time NCAA reports taking several mitigation measures to reduce tourism impacts, including the regulation of vehicles, increased fees and provision of information. Walking safaris and cultural tourism, involving resident communities, and visits to other areas of the NCA are also being encouraged. The State Party is planning to introduce a booking system for the Crater if the above measures are not successful in reducing the impact, although no timeframe for this is provided.

Boundaries and encroachment

NCAA reports that it continues to stop immigrants from entering and illegally cultivating within the property, and notes areas under cultivation are declining, although no specific area figures are given. Following the boundary resurvey reported in 2005, the title deed has still not been issued by the Ministry of Lands. Boundaries have been demarcated and this has reportedly solved the problem of encroachment.

Resident pastoralist population

The State Party report notes that the World Heritage property does not have the capacity to sustain the current Maasai population of 60,000 people and 360,000 cattle. It has now successfully acquired 400ha of agricultural land outside the property for the voluntary relocation of immigrants. Development of infrastructure to meet basic human needs on this land is planned over the next two years so that up to 200 households can voluntarily relocate outside the NCA. The State Party recognizes the need to reduce the numbers and improve the quality of the livestock production and find alternative livelihoods, such as through tourism. The authority has purchased an estate of 430 ha just outside the main entrance gate of the NCA in the view of relocating NCAA and tourist lodge staff currently housed on the rim of the Crater. It is not clear from the report whether the land for the Maasai community and the land to be provided to the staff is the same.

Invasive Species

The State Party reports that a prescribed burning programme has been put in place to reduce the spread of invasive weeds, with 400 ha successfully burnt in September 2005. A

combination of manual removal, mowing and burning has also been applied to areas infested by the Mexican Poppy which is now reported to be eradicated from the Crater.

Overview

The State Party report is encouraging in relation to progress on a number of issues. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received a variety of other reports and comments on the report provided by the State Party claiming that management action on the ground is inadequate and raising concerns about the current state of conservation of the property. In particular, these reports to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note:

- a) Encroachment, forest destruction, erosion and cultivation within the property are ongoing and increasing, and boundary patrolling is inadequate. Action and resources to stop immigration are insufficient and plans to move people out and reduce livestock numbers are too slow in comparison to the ongoing increases. In addition, foreign NGOs have brought in additional livestock to improve the livelihoods of pastoral communities, while camels, an exotic species, have recently also been introduced.
- b) The high numbers of tourists coupled with inadequate infrastructure and poor management is resulting in serious ecological problems and environmental degradation.
- c) Insufficient involvement, capacity building and equitable sharing of income with the local Maasai community.
- d) Significant impacts on limited water resources, critical for the wildlife and habitat of the property and its inhabitants.
- e) A number of alien species, other than the Mexican Poppy, require attention to ensure that they are regularly controlled. Range management is currently receiving very little attention.
- f) Inadequate implementation of the previous general management plan (GMP).
- g) The State Party report fails to mention current plans to develop a new five star tourist lodge, "Ngorongoro Mountain Lodge", on the rim of the Crater within the World Heritage property and possibly another lodge on the crater rim at Empakai.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are in touch with the Institute of Resource Assessment of the University of Dar-es-Salaam, charged with carrying out the EIA currently underway on behalf of the 'Mountain Lodge' developers, and have requested that they be consulted to review the EIA's preliminary outcomes. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned that this development will only increase the pressure from tourism on the property and considers that a better option would be to develop the Wildlife Lodge already in place or to consider development outside the World Heritage property.

In its report, the State Party has not given the trends in data revealed by the bi-annual monitoring of fauna such as Wildebeest and other ungulates in the Conservation Area. The Committee upon the request of NCAA took note at its 26th session of the study published in 2002: Ngorongoro Crater Ungulate Study 1996-1999, Final Report. No mention is made in the State Party's reports of the implementation of recommendations of this study, such as the establishment of a multidisciplinary scientific committee and the commissioning of a hydrological survey of the whole NCA, as well as the outcomes of

the monitoring of these ungulate populations (see Decisions **26 COM 21(b).22** and **29 COM 7B.1**).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned by the reports they have received on the state of conservation of this property, conflicting with that of the State Party itself. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore considers that it is necessary to arrange a monitoring mission to the property to meet with the State Party and other stakeholders to get a clearer picture of the current situation and to bring forward clear recommendations to the 2007 World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.1**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Encourages the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) to act without delay on the measures planned to strictly regulate and control tourism in the Crater and move immigrants, NCAA and tourist lodge staff out of the property;*
4. *Notes with great concern that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received a number of reports highlighting serious concerns on the state of conservation of the property, notably in relation to poor management practices, the impacts of unplanned and uncontrolled tourism, lodge development, increasing resident pastoralist population, illegal cultivation and encroachment;*
5. *Urges the State Party to consult widely, including with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, on the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) relating to the new lodge development on the rim of the Crater and to carefully consider alternative options such as the development of an already existing lodge or the development of the lodge outside the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO-IUCN monitoring mission to visit the property so that they may provide a detailed report to the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session on the state of conservation of the property, with particular attention being given to overall management and resourcing, visitor management and infrastructure development, the resident pastoralist population, illegal cultivation and encroachment;*
7. *Invites the State Party to provide a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the outcomes of the EIAs relating to the lodge development and vehicle congestion; measures to mitigate the negative impacts of tourism and increase revenue for the management of the property and local communities; measures to control cultivation, encroachment, immigration, and numbers of livestock; and to move immigrants to agricultural land outside the property.*

3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1982

Criteria:

N (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Proposed cattle driving route;
- b) Poaching

Current conservation issues:

In February 2006, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were informed of the deterioration of the Selous Game Reserve since the end of the German Government (GTZ) assistance programme in 2003. This is in contrast to the considerable improvements in the management of the property during the GTZ funded Selous Conservation Programme (1987 to 2003).

The information received provides details on a number of recent problems/trends: the management plan developed with assistance from GTZ has not been formally approved and is not being implemented; the income retention scheme (allowing for 50% of commercial hunting income to be retained for reserve management) that had underpinned the rehabilitation of the property has been significantly reduced by the government since the end of the GTZ project; recent increases in elephant poaching allegedly involving government officials; prospecting licenses have been granted by the Government to explore for precious stones inside the property; lack of implementation of the recently approved Tanzanian Wildlife Policy designed to involve local communities in the conservation and utilization of wildlife resources in the property and its buffer zones; and plans for a large dam across the Ruvu River to supply the city of Dar-Es-Salaam with water, which would result in the flooding of parts of the property.

On 2 March 2006, the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party requesting information on these issues. At the time of writing this report no response had been received from the State Party. The World Heritage Centre also notes that no reply has been received from the State Party to an earlier letter dated 31 March 2004 requesting

information on reports received previously concerning allegedly granted licences for mineral exploration in the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with great concern the recent deterioration in the management of the property and the reduction in financial resources available to the management authority. The rapid reversal of the improved conservation status achieved during the long-term GTZ supported Selous Conservation Programme is alarming and the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it important for the State Party to enhance its political and financial support as to ensure the integrity of the World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that the financial resources available to manage the property have declined significantly in recent years and recommend the State Party to seek independent financial advice on the management of the income from commercial hunting activities in the World Heritage property.

Considering the lack of a State Party response to previous requests for information on the multiple threats allegedly affecting the Selous Game Reserve, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN believe that a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission is required to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the implementation of the management plan and EIAs as well as the impacts of poaching, prospecting and mining activities.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes with great concern that the State Party has not responded to the previous request for information about a number of threats to the property;*
3. *Regrets that financial resources available from the income retention scheme from commercial hunting have decreased significantly in recent years and recommends that the State Party seek independent financial advice on the management of this income retention scheme to support conservation and management of the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to commission fully independent EIAs of all proposed mineral mining and dam development activities that could potentially affect the integrity of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the implementation of the management plan and EIAs as well as the impacts of poaching, prospecting and mining activities;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report by 1 February 2007 on the state of conservation of the property, in particular the measures taken to address key threats to the property and the progress made with the management plan and the EIAs, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

4. Dja Faunal reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1987

Criteria:

N (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decision(s):

27 COM 7B.1

28 COM 15B.2

29 COM 7B.2

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 81,700 for technical assistance and training activities.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000 from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust to UNESCO. The Dja Faunal Reserve also benefits from part of the USD 193,275 allocated to the Southeastern Cameroon region by the Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI).

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO mission 23-26 March 1998.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of implementation and full approval of management plan;
- b) Industrial mining activities proposed adjacent to the property;
- c) Industrial farming proposed in the buffer zone;
- d) Threats from commercial hunting; deforestation around the property.

Current conservation issues:

On 19 April 2006 the World Heritage Centre received from the State Party a report on the state of conservation of the Dja Faunal Reserve. This report is currently being reviewed by the Centre and IUCN, and key findings of this review will be presented, together with the report and recommendations of the forthcoming monitoring mission to the property, to the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session. Regarding the monitoring mission requested by the Committee at its 29th session, an official letter of invitation has been received from the Government of Cameroon, and the mission is planned to take place in June 2006.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN understand that the American mining company GEOVIC with a concession in the Lomié sector near the property, as reported to the Committee last year, has completed its Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and

submitted it to the Government of Cameroon. The IUCN Regional Office for Central Africa plans to review this EIA once it is made available publicly, and look at options of how it can assist in mitigating negative social and environmental impacts and involving local communities in any future environmental mitigation activities. IUCN is also reviewing options for working in the Lomié sector to support local community initiatives for forest conservation and sustainable development.

The CAWHFI program improved collaboration between the management authorities of the Dja Faunal Reserve and surrounding protected areas (e.g. Boumba Bek & Nki, and Djoum). Coordinated anti-poaching patrols seized several rifles and considerable amounts of bushmeat. The CAWHFI program also directly supports field operation of guards from the Dja reserve that contributed to uncover an ivory trafficking network.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.2, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
3. *Requests the State Party to facilitate the organisation of the joint UNESCO-IUCN monitoring mission requested by the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee.*

5. Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2004

Criteria:

N (ii) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 14B.12

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

Since mid-2005, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have been receiving information from concerned organisations and individuals indicating that management of the eight

conservation areas of the serial World Heritage property suffers from a lack of financial resources, and that essential management activities such as the removal of invasive alien species and controlled burning cannot be carried out as required.

This has allegedly led to an increasingly uncontrolled spread of invasive alien species, including on some of the mountainous sites of the serial World Heritage property. Together with adverse weather conditions, this has in turn led to an increased intensity and frequency of fires in the summer of 2005-2006, claiming lives and livelihoods. In addition, critical water resources are adversely impacted by the spread of invasive alien species, and all this could have adverse impacts on the indigenous biodiversity, especially the Fynbos vegetation, and people in the region.

This information was sent to the State Party for comments on 13 February 2006. No official State Party response has been received at the time of writing this report, but the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that a response was in progress.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in January 2006, CapeNature, the Western Cape's statutory conservation authority, and the Conservation Unit of the Botanical Society of South Africa have sent a joint submission to the provincial treasury requesting an extra Rand 52 million (ca. USD 8 million) a year for essential fire management in the Cape Floristic Region. According to various sources, severe reductions in funding and staffing have depleted CapeNature's capacity to effectively manage invasive alien species and fire in some of the sites of the serial World Heritage property.

The Boland Mountain Complex, Boosmansbos Wilderness Area and De Hoop Nature Reserve in the Western Cape, and the Baviaanskloof Protected Area in the Eastern Cape are allegedly affected by severe infestations of invasive alien species. Recent fires in the Boland Mountain Complex were ecologically destructive because they burnt through 35,000 hectares of mostly young Fynbos vegetation that has not yet had a chance to set seed since being burnt just five years earlier. In the summer of 2005-2006, fires had again affected parts of Table Mountain National Park, which is managed by SANParks (South African National Parks). It is unclear if SANParks' management capacity to prevent and control such fires is also affected by a lack of financial resources.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN understand that considerable financial resources are necessary for the management of fire and invasive alien species and, in turn, the conservation of critical water resources and the biodiversity in the Cape Floristic Region, including the World Heritage property. The cost of effective management of invasive alien species and fire are, however, thought to be insignificant compared to the potential cost of uncontrolled fires impacting biodiversity, local people, industries and infrastructure. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN believe the extra financial resources necessary for the conservation of the World Heritage property cannot continue to come largely from tourism revenues or international donors.

Considering the potentially severe adverse impacts, both ecologically and economically, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN urge the national and provincial governments concerned to ensure that adequate financial resources are annually allocated to and mobilised for the essential management of invasive alien species and fire in and around the serial World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also urge the State Party to further invest in awareness raising, in particular in peak fire season, among

key target groups such as international and local visitors to the property and its surroundings. This would assist in preventing fires and fire-related costs.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Commends the State Party, SANParks, CapeNature, C.A.P.E. and the Working for Water and Working on Fire programmes for their continued conservation and development efforts in and around the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas;*
3. *Thanks the international donor community for its substantial support of the continued conservation and development efforts in and around the World Heritage property;*
4. *Notes with great concern that the important efforts to manage invasive alien species and fire are currently severely impeded by inadequate financial resources;*
5. *Urges the State Party to ensure that adequate financial resources are allocated and mobilised annually for proactive management of invasive alien species and fire in and around the sites of the serial World Heritage property as well as related awareness raising among visitors to the property and its surroundings;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report before **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

6. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994

Criteria:

N (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1999-2004

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.7

28 COM 15A.8

29COM 7B.4

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property USD 96,249 (USD 32,249 for technical support activities and USD 64,000 as emergency assistance). In 2005, USD 19,990 was approved as Technical Cooperation for the implementation of the Annual Operations Plan.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring Missions:

Joint UNESCO-IUCN mission 5-11 January 2003.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Mining activities inside the property;
- b) Staffing and budgetary deficiencies;
- c) Degradation of buffer zone;
- e) Impact of tourism and climbing expeditions.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party submitted a State of Conservation report and the approved General management plan (2004-2014) on 26 October 2005. A map was also received showing the precise surveyed and marked boundary of the World Heritage property. A request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the implementation of the Annual Operations Plan amounting to USD 19,990 was approved by the Chairperson in 2005 and is being implemented.

The State Party report provides an up-date on the activities of the management authority since the property was re-opened in 2001, following four years of closure due to insurgency and military intervention. The State Party report indicates significant progress towards strengthening of the conservation and natural resource management activities in and around the property. The priority for the next phase of the recovery programme included in the general management plan is to identify sustainable financing for the management of the property and its buffer zones.

The State Party report states that the general management plan is being implemented focusing on six main areas. There are community conservation; resource conservation and management; monitoring and research; park operations and maintenance; tourism development; and regional cooperation. The goal of the General management Plan is to ensure better conservation and protection of natural resources and to uplift the integrity of the park.

The World Bank's Protected Area Management and Sustainable Use Programme and WWF are currently providing limited support for park management and a community conservation programme. However, substantial additional funding is still required to implement the general management plan 2004-2014.

The State Party also reported on the work of the Community Protected Area Institutions (CPIs), local community committees which work with Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) to address issues that affect community/Park relations, established upon the recommendation of the 2003 UNESCO-IUCN mission. At present, CPIs have been established in 22 adjacent sub-counties of three districts as well as an Inter-District CPI. It manages relationships with the communities, involves communities in protected area management and facilitates the implementation of benefit sharing projects. The possibility of establishing a memorandum of understanding between communities and Rwenzori Mountains National Park to share resources that occur within three kilometres inside the park is being studied.

According to the State Party report the main threats to the property at this point in time are threefold. They are: illegal timber cutting for commercial purposes; poaching of wildlife for domestic consumption; and illegal harvesting of bamboo for construction. Issues that represent a future threat to the World Heritage values of the property include: unplanned tourism development, including mountaineering; possible mining activities in and around the property; and population pressure on the boundary leading to the unsustainable use of natural resources.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the progress made by the State Party and UWA since the property was re-opened in 2001 to be very positive. The recently approved management plan incorporates the recommendations of the joint 2003 UNESCO/IUCN mission and provides a sound basis for the management of the World Heritage property for the period 2004-2014. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the management authority follows an adaptive management approach in the implementation of the plan with a mid-term review in 2009.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.4**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
3. *Notes with thanks the general management plan and the map showing the precise surveyed and marked boundary of the World Heritage property submitted by the State Party;*
4. *Commends the Uganda Wildlife Authority for ongoing work to improve the management and conservation of the property, notably through the implementation of a 10 year management plan, as well as considerable efforts to support the sustainable development of appropriate tourism in the park;*
5. *Further commends the State Party for the progress made since 2001 towards re-establishing the integrity of the World Heritage property;*
6. *Encourages the international donor and conservation community to provide additional financial and/or technical assistance for the implementation of the general management plan 2004-2014;*
7. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property, including information on how the main threats identified by the State Party are being dealt with, and in particular on the progress made in the implementation of the general management plan, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

7. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1981

Criteria:

N (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21 (b).23

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property USD 42,000 in 1990 under technical cooperation for the purchase of a vehicle.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

No monitoring missions. Various missions under the “Enhancing Our Heritage” project have been undertaken, including one in September 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Potential impacts of a hydro-electric project in Kenya;
- b) Poaching.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are aware of plans to develop a new five-star, 120-room tourist lodge, “Bilila Lodge”, within the World Heritage property, at some 30 km from Seronera towards Lobo. This development is linked to a proposal for a similar lodge by the same developer within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. The World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party on 18 October 2005 regarding this issue, but at the time of writing this report no response had been received.

IUCN has received reports of concern from its network noting that the proposed tourist development is likely to have detrimental effects on the integrity of the property, notably by increasing tourism pressure, including on limited water resources, and interfering with the natural migration of animals. The lodge is apparently planned on a wildlife corridor of critical importance, particularly for wildebeest migration across the Mara Serengeti ecosystem. IUCN urges the State Party to ensure that any tourist development at the property is in line with the property’s management plan and does not have any adverse impacts on the integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are in touch with the Institute of Resource Assessment of the University of Dar es Salaam. The institute is charged with carrying out the EIA currently underway on behalf of the lodge developers. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre have requested in a letter to the State Party (16 February 2006) that they be fully consulted and allowed to review the preliminary outcomes of the EIA.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a revised general management plan (2005-2015) has been approved for the property. It has been well received by all stakeholders and may act as a model for other Parks in Tanzania. It is, however, important that it is fully implemented and used for all planning within the property. In addition, the UNESCO-IUCN-UNF *Enhancing Our Heritage* Project has assisted in developing an ecological monitoring programme for the Park as part of the general management planning process.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Commends the State Party for the recent approval of the general management plan (2005-2015) for the property and the development of the ecological monitoring programme for the property under the UNESCO-IUCN-UNF *Enhancing Our Heritage* project;*
3. *Urges the State Party to consult widely, including with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, on the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) relating to the proposed new lodge development at Bilila, and to carefully consider alternative options so that there are no adverse impacts on the integrity of the property;*
4. *Notes with concern the lack of response from the State Party to the World Heritage Centre's request for information on the lodge development;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by 1 February 2007 on this issue for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

8. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1989

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

24 COM VIII.27

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 78,000 in 2001 and 2002 for Bi-national Workshop for the Review of IUCN reports on the impact of tourist development around

Mosi-Oa-Tunya Victoria Falls. USD 16,500 in 2001 for Zambia and Zimbabwe for national training activities.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Unplanned tourism development;
- b) Uncontrolled urban development leading to significant human population increase and pollution (water, air and visual);
- c) Reduced water flows over the falls due to drought and/or upstream hydropower production.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received a number of reports noting that uncontrolled urban development, pollution and unplanned tourism development on the boundaries of the Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls World Heritage property in both Zimbabwe and Zambia continue to threaten the integrity of the property. These threats were earlier highlighted in the 1996 IUCN report “Strategic Environmental Assessment of Developments around Victoria Falls / Mosi-oa-Tunya”. Subsequently, both States Parties developed recommendations addressing these threats during a bi-lateral workshop facilitated by IUCN in Livingstone in 2002. Areas requiring immediate attention were identified as: coordinated approaches to contentious biophysical and socio-economic issues; establishment of a Joint Institutional Arrangement; and preparation and implementation of a joint management plan for the property. However, according to a number of sources, no progress has been made to date in implementing the recommendations of the 2002 bi-lateral workshop, and the situation of the property with regard to the threats has further deteriorated.

The World Heritage Centre requested an update on the situation from the States Parties (9 February 2006) and, in its response (24 February 2006), the State Party of Zimbabwe has confirmed the concerns about the state of conservation of the property and proposes a joint meeting between Zimbabwean and Zambian authorities. The State Party has also constituted a taskforce to visit the Victoria Falls from 1-3 March 2006 and compile a full report addressing the threats for submission to the World Heritage Centre. No response had been received from the State Party of Zambia at the time of writing this report.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with great concern the reports of ongoing threats to the integrity of the property and the lack of follow-up on the 2002 workshop recommendations. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there is now an urgent need for an effective joint management framework to address these threats. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are prepared to assist the States Parties in this regard and believe that a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission is required to assess the state of conservation of the property and to assist both States Parties in the implementation of the 2002 workshop recommendations.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes with great concern that the recommendations of the 2002 bi-lateral workshop have not been implemented;*
3. *Regrets that the integrity of the World Heritage property remains threatened by uncontrolled urban development, pollution and unplanned tourism development;*
4. *Urges both States Parties to urgently follow-up on the recommendations of the 2002 bi-lateral workshop and in particular the preparation and implementation of an effective joint management framework to address the ongoing threats; and requests the States Parties to set a firm schedule for their follow-up;*
5. *Also requests both States Parties to invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 2002 bi-lateral workshop;*
6. *Further requests both States Parties to provide the World Heritage Centre before **1 February 2007** with reports on the state of conservation of the property and progress made in implementing an effective joint management framework and other recommendations of the 2002 bi-lateral workshop for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

ARAB STATES

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

9. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1989

Criteria:

N (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.7

28 COM 15B.7

29 COM 7B.5

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (until 2005): USD 35,000 for technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre consultative missions: September 2002 and June 2003; World Heritage Centre/World Bank mission, June 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Illegal fishing;
- b) Mechanical shellfish harvesting;
- c) Oil exploitation;
- d) Tourism and increased accessibility due to the new Nouadhibou-Nouakchott road;
- e) Lack of management capacity and resources.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party submitted (2 March 2006) a report on the property in the form of a periodic report, accompanied by a copy of the Institutional and Organisational Audit and an approved Summary of the Development and Management Plan (2005-2009). The State Party's reports, however, do not respond specifically to all of the requests of the Committee decision (**29 COM 7B.5**), notably in relation to oil extraction and ratifying

international agreements, and it is not clear if the full Development and Management Plan has been completed.

IUCN carried out an informal field trip to the property in July 2005 in collaboration with the Park authority, and has regular contact with the State Party through the IUCN Mauritania Liaison Office. IUCN notes that in the past five years important progress has been made by the State Party, working with key partners such as the Fondation Internationale du Banc d'Arguin (FIBA), to set up an effective management authority and work with the local Imraguen community to ensure the long term protection of the Park and its resources. However, a special law for Banc d'Arguin National Park (BANP) was passed in 2000 (2000/24) and two decrees for its implementation have not been approved, causing some difficulties for current management. This requires urgent attention and there are plans to have the decrees approved in 2006.

A major Regional Marine and Coastal Conservation Programme for West Africa (PRCM) currently linking 47 governmental and non-governmental organizations, includes the BANP as one of its core marine protected areas (www.prcmarine.org). The ambitious programme (2004-2008) led by IUCN, WWF, FIBA and Wetlands International, in partnership with the Subregional Fisheries Commission (CSRP), seeks to protect the coastal waters and resources of 7 West African countries. This programme highlights the importance of BANP as a critical habitat contributing to the protection of species like mullet and meagre in the region. Lessons learned in the World Heritage property will support sustainable coastal development in the region, while the Park is also set to benefit from exchanges with other marine protected areas, the pooling of resources and expertise, research, training, communication and advocacy action in general.

The first tanker of oil was exported from Woodside's Chinguetti project, a single hull floating production facility off the coast of Nouakchott, 200km south-west of the World Heritage property, in March 2006. The risk to the property is linked with the potential for spills from routine operations or shipping accidents and the lack of an emergency response plan. A spill from the Chinguetti project or other oil and gas developments and/or transportation in the area could also threaten the Senegal Delta Transboundary Biosphere Reserve (which includes the Djoudj and Diawling National Parks, the City of Saint-Louis) to the South-East. At the same time new explorations have begun to the north of the Banc d'Arguin National Park.

Members of the Woodside company met with various stakeholders, including IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, in January 2006, and noted that its Oil Spill Contingency Plan includes training and equipment stockpiles in a number of key locations such as the BANP, and that it is working with the Mauritanian and Senegalese governments to develop national oil spill contingency plans. The company has also committed to support the BANP in the event of a spill from any source. It appears, however, that these actions have not yet been fully implemented and a national system for response and decision-making is not yet in place. The State Party report makes no reference to activities in this regard.

It appears that no progress has been made in ratifying the 1992 Conventions¹ relating to compensation and civil liability, or in seeking designation of a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA), under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization, around BANP, as requested by the Committee, at its 29th session. There is an urgent need for the State Party to implement the Marine Environment Code (MEC) in order to implement MARPOL (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships) provisions, including an emergency response plan, and to ratify the 1992 Conventions on compensation and liability (CLC 92, FUND 92).

The Mauritanian Government has recently signed up to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and has created a Commission for its implementation. In addition, the President of Mauritania recently requested IUCN's assistance in ensuring that offshore oil exploitation at the Chinguetti project comply with the best international environmental protection standards (10 February 2006). IUCN is proposing to facilitate discussions between oil and gas companies and the Government and to convene an independent panel: i) to review the social and environmental aspects of their agreement with Woodside; ii) to evaluate whether the environmental and social assessments conducted by the company meet international standards; and iii) to assess whether appropriate measures are in place to implement the necessary social and environmental management plans. This process should also take into account the need for the Government to take all necessary precautions in case of oil spill.

The Banc d'Arguin National Park celebrates its 30th anniversary in 2006 and events and festivities are being organized throughout the year to raise awareness and support for the Park and the Imraguen people. The Management Authority also plans to launch a Trust Fund for the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.5, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party and its partners for their efforts to protect the Banc d'Arguin National Park, including through the implementation of the Regional Marine and Coastal Conservation Programme for West Africa (PRCM);*
4. *Congratulates the State Party for the 30th anniversary of the Banc d'Arguin National Park and the associated programme of events to raise awareness and support for the property and encourages international donors to support the Banc d'Arguin National Park Trust Fund;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to implement the Marine Environment Code (MEC) in order to implement MARPOL (International Convention for the Prevention of*

¹ The 1992 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the 1992 International Oil Pollution Compensation Fund.

Pollution from Ships) provisions, and to ratify the 1992 Conventions on compensation and civil liability (CLC 92, FUND 92) as soon as possible;

6. *Takes note of the proposal of IUCN to oil and gas companies and the Government of Mauritania to convene an independent panel to review the social and environmental aspects of the agreement between the Government and Woodside, and recommends that the above review process also take into account the need for the State Party to take all necessary precautions in case of an oil spill;*
7. *Requests the State Party to complete the Development and Management Plan (2005-2009) with all relevant stakeholders and submit a copy to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007**;*
8. *Urges the State Party to adopt the two decrees necessary for the implementation of the Special Law for Banc d'Arguin National Park (2000/24);*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a report on progress with the implementation of each of the above mentioned points, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

10. Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994

Criteria:

N (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

24 COM VIII.25

28 COM 15B.8

29 COM 7B.6

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 95,000 for preparatory and training assistance (1995-2003)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN mission in 2000

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Poaching ;
- b) Gas and oil exploration ;
- c) Overgrazing by domestic stock ;

d) Boundary marking, management planning and management regime.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party has provided a report on 10 February 2006 informing of the measures taken to address the main management threats to the property. The establishment of trained and equipped ranger units within the Sanctuary is particularly welcome.

Proposals to review the 2000 management plan and delineate boundaries are welcomed; however, there is a concern as regards the slowness of this process. The revision of the management plan will provide the opportunity to improve the management of the property in accordance with proposed boundary and management zones amendments. The State Party should be urged to accelerate this process so that a clear map showing the proposed revised boundary for the property may be submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007. This map should include management plan Zones 1 and 2 within the World Heritage Property but excludes the buffer zone (Zone 3).

In the process of revising the management plan, the State Party should take into consideration the detailed suggestions made in the State of Conservation report to the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Document *WHC-05/29.COM/7B.Rev*). In particular the revised management plan should include a work plan with clear timeframes for implementation. It is also reiterated that the provisions within the current management plan which conditionally permit mining activity (exploration and production of oil, gas and minerals) in the World Heritage Property are not supported and should be excluded from the management plan.

The State Party reports no known cases of Arabian Oryx poaching in 2005. However, there are discrepancies between the report from March 2005 and the most recent report on the numbers of Oryx estimated in the wild (120 in March 2005 and 90 in February 2006). The State Party should provide an accurate estimate to clarify the conservation status of the Oryx population and any trends. The State Party should also provide an update on the state of implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding prepared between the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates, related to illegal wildlife trade.

The State Party references plans to construct a 'tourism lodge in the Sanctuary'. It is presumed that any such development would be consistent with the provisions of the current management plan as it relates to tourism and environmental impact assessment procedures; further that any such infrastructure would be located in appropriate zones (Utility Zones under the current management plan).

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.10

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.6, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party on its continued efforts to improve management and conservation of the World Heritage property;*

4. *Notes with concern that progress on reviewing the 2000 management plan and delineating boundaries remains very slow and that the State Party is yet to submit a revised boundary for the World Heritage property;*
5. *Regrets that the provisions of the current management plan conditionally permit mining activity (exploration and production of oil, gas and minerals) in all zones of the World Heritage property and urges the State Party to exclude these provisions from the management plan;*
6. *Recommends that any tourism development within the property be consistent with the provisions of the current management plan as it relates to tourism and environmental impact assessment;*
7. *Requests the State Party to provide an accurate and consistent estimate of the status and trends of the Arabian Oryx population and an update on the state of implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding prepared between the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates,*

ASIA-PACIFIC

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

12. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2004

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 14B.5

29 COM 7B.9

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,600 in July 2005 for Emergency Assistance on rehabilitation of management facilities of the Gunung Leuser National Park, which is part of the property.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,800,000 for the 3-year UNF/UNFIP Project (2005-2007) - Partnership for the Conservation of Sumatra Natural Heritage.

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Agricultural encroachment;
- b) Illegal logging; poaching;
- c) Road construction and institutional and governance issues.

Current conservation issues:

At the time of inscription of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (TRHS) on the World Heritage List in July 2004, IUCN recommended that the property be simultaneously inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Committee, at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), noted the urgency of the ascertained

threats to the property but due to the strong objection of the State Party of Indonesia to the inclusion on the Danger List, the Committee requested the State Party to prepare an emergency action plan focusing in particular on illegal logging, agricultural encroachments, proposed road development, securing international assistance and protection of critical habitat. This action plan was not submitted by the State Party as requested.

On 21 December 2004, the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry submitted an international assistance request on the preparation of an integrated action plan for better protection and management of Sumatra Natural Heritage. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre commented on this request and the State Party was requested to reformulate the request for re-submission to the World Heritage Centre. Due to the Tsunami disaster of December 2004 that affected northern Sumatra, the State Party submitted another request for Emergency Assistance to support the rehabilitation of management facilities at the Gunung Leuser National Park. The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved an amount of USD 66,600 for this project in July 2005, which is currently being implemented by the Indonesian authorities in collaboration with the UNESCO Office in Jakarta.

The World Heritage Committee, at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), requested the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to carry out a monitoring mission and report to the 30th session on the state of conservation of the property, the impacts of the Tsunami and progress with the proposed emergency action plan.

The IUCN-UNESCO mission was successfully carried out from 25 February to 5 March 2006. It found that all three National Park components of the serial World Heritage property continue to face serious threats. Notwithstanding some welcome improvements and positive changes since inscription on the World Heritage List, all areas are subject to a mounting series of on-going and imminent threats linked to agricultural encroachments, illegal logging, road construction (legal and illegal), and poaching. Not only are all of the protected areas being substantially encroached upon and losing habitat, they are also losing their forested surrounds to agriculture and industrial coffee and oil palm plantations.

Most indicators point towards quickening loss of biodiversity, particularly the larger mammals such as the elephant, tiger and rhinoceros. The capacity of management to effectively respond to and resolve critical situations has failed to keep pace with the mounting threats due to a range of institutional constraints, including funding constraints; inadequate cooperation and support from local, provincial and central government agencies, including in some cases law enforcement agencies; confusion over the rights of local government within national parks; and bureaucratic procedural constraints and inefficiencies. In addition, local communities and local government remain largely uninformed about the importance of and threats to World Heritage property, and are therefore often antagonistic.

Of all the major threats to the values and integrity of the property, growing unchallenged encroachment has the greatest potential for destruction. Mapping by the Wildlife Conservation Society shows that the cumulative loss of forest to encroachments within the Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park is now in the order of 22.5% (86,000ha). The largest known encroachment in Gunung Leuser National Park is at least 16,000ha in an area previously recognized as critical elephant and prime tiger habitat.

The mission noted that notwithstanding a skilled and motivated leadership in the management regime of the property, the burden of effectively protecting and managing the World Heritage property in the face of overwhelming external threats is now beyond the current capacity of management. Failing an urgent and major management intervention by the State Party, the TRHS World Heritage property will remain critically endangered.

The most urgent intervention is required in Kerinci Seblat National Park, the largest and most critically threatened component of the property. This is illustrated by local government planning for construction of no less than 34 roads through the core zone of the park, recent illegal commencement of one such road and on-going illegal logging and encroachments. The rhinoceros, according to the Park authority, is on the verge of local extinction and the elephant population has been divided and 'boxed in' by topography and agriculture. Park management has in effect lost control of illegal encroachments by local farmers and does not presently have the capacity to respond to or press prosecutions, let alone establish other deterrents and conduct meaningful reforestation.

The major interventions necessary to remedy the deterioration in the state of conservation will require a combination of financial, institutional, government policy changes and on-ground initiatives. Failure on any one of these components will result in further deterioration of the value and integrity of each component area and hence the serial property as a whole.

If the outstanding universal values and integrity of the TRHS World Heritage property are to be maintained in the longer term, it is essential that a major intervention in protection and management is mounted as a matter of urgency.

Based on the findings of the IUCN-UNESCO monitoring mission, it is considered reasonable to expect within 3-4 years that there is evidence that:

- a) An Emergency Action Plan is completed, resourced and under implementation;
- b) Sustainable programmes are in place to effectively control encroachment, illegal logging and road development, and to reforest areas previously affected by these activities, and there is a clear reduction in the percentage of the property subject to these threats;
- c) The boundaries are amended to exclude major encroachments and include critical habitat; clearly marked, including signposting of World Heritage status; that park gazettal is completed; and park zoning plans are finalised, formally adopted and communicated to local government and stakeholders;
- d) Effective governance is in place to ensure mechanisms for institutional coordination across the serial property, and that collaboration and participatory management regimes are in place;
- e) Progress is made in establishing sustainable financing for the property and developing capacity for effective management; and
- f) Effective wildlife monitoring and anti-poaching programmes are in place for the whole property and the associated Leuser Ecosystem to arrest the decline in populations of all wildlife species, especially of the Sumatran endemic taxa.

These benchmarks need to be reviewed during preparation of the Emergency Action Plan, and endorsed by the State Party and World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 14B.5** and **29 COM 7B.9**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with great concern the findings and recommendations of the joint IUCN-UNESCO monitoring mission (25 February to 5 March 2006), in particular that the property continues to be increasingly threatened by extensive agricultural encroachment, illegal logging, poaching, road construction and institutional and governance issues, and that an Emergency Action Plan requested at the time of inscription has not yet been prepared;*
4. *Requests the State Party to amend the boundaries of the World Heritage property to exclude major cleared encroachments and to add critical habitats for the conservation of biodiversity, as identified in the mission report;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to submit an Emergency Action Plan by **1 February 2007**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007, to address the trend in loss of value and integrity of the property. In this regard the State Party should:*
 - a) *seek international assistance from the World Heritage Fund and the FFI-UNESCO-UNF World Heritage Rapid Response Facility, as well as technical support from IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, to urgently convene a workshop to scope the parameters of an Emergency Action Plan and identify partners, timeframe, responsibilities and sources of funding for its implementation, as well as benchmarks to assess progress over time;*
 - b) *ensure that the Emergency Action Plan is developed in collaboration with national and international partners and consider a number of key interventions proposed by the monitoring mission to arrest the alarming on-going decline of the World Heritage property;*
6. *Urges the State Party, with support from UNESCO, IUCN and members of World Heritage Committee, to call for significant international donor support to implement the Emergency Action Plan and to develop capacity for effective long-term management and governance of the property;*
7. *Decides to include the property of the **Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia)** on the **List of World Heritage in Danger** due to serious ongoing ascertained threats to the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property, notably from extensive agricultural encroachment, illegal logging, poaching, road construction and institutional and governance issues.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1985

Criteria:

N (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.8

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO site visit 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Inadequate water supply.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party submitted a report on 31 March 2006.

The State Party reports that in 2005 there was more than average rainfall in the catchment area of Ajan Band, the temporary reservoir from which water is supplied to the wetland areas of the park, and thus the park received 481 million cubic feet (mcft) water, which is sufficient to meet its requirement (optimum 540 mcft). In previous years, the park received less than a fourth of this requirement, with adverse impacts on the wetland ecosystem of the park. According to the report, the Rajasthan State Government is also exploring the supply of water from Chambal River as an alternative to the unstable water supply from Gambhir River.

During the previous drought years, the wetland area in the park has been invaded by *Prosopis juliflora* and other woodland species, which are still spreading despite all efforts to remove them, which is indicative of the pervasive dryness of the park. Invasive water hyacinth, which drifts into the park with the water released to the park, is however removed as required.

The IUCN/UNF/UNESCO Enhancing our Heritage (EoH) project, which includes Keoladeo National Park as a pilot site, implemented a water quality monitoring programme in the park in 2005. This included the development of protocols for data collection and analysis and initial collection and analysis of baseline data.

Considering that, according to the State Party report, agrochemicals used in surrounding villages threaten the wetland ecosystem of the park, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this important initiative and note that both water quantity and quality are now being monitored at the park.

In 2005, the EoH project has also 1) reviewed Keoladeo National Park's protection strategies and recommended measures to enhance their effectiveness; 2) developed a capacity building plan for the park; and 3) reviewed the opportunities and limitations for benefit sharing with local communities. In addition, a project was undertaken on enhancing communication, interpretation skills and capabilities for effective tourism management in Keoladeo National Park. This project provided a number of training sessions to park staff. The findings of all these activities will be used in phase 3 of the EoH project.

More than one hundred thousand tourists (60% domestic) visit Keoladeo National Park annually. These tourists are having an increasing impact on the park, for example through littering and disturbance of water birds. It is noted that every entry to Keoladeo National Park has an "eco-development surcharge" which is used for both further development of the park and surrounding villages. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this innovative initiative as a means of building broader support for the park.

The State Party indicates, however, that additional funding is necessary to ensure the effective management of pests as well as to implement long term solutions for the water problem of the park.

It is noted that the intense monsoon rains in 2005 temporarily improved the park's water situation. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN regret that the State Party report did not respond specifically to all the requests of Decision **29 COM 7B.8**. For example, it does not clarify what specific actions the State Party will take to ensure a sufficient water supply to the property even in years where the monsoon rains fail.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.8**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes that the 2005 monsoon rains have improved the water situation in Keoladeo National Park;*
4. *Urges the State Party to implement long term solutions for the water problem of the park to ensure a sufficient water supply to the property even in years where the monsoon rains fail, and effectively deal with the problem of invasive species;*
5. *Calls upon the international donor community to provide further financial and technical support to the State Party for the implementation of such long term solutions for the water problem of the park and for an invasive species management programme;*

6. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated, comprehensive report by 1 February 2007 on the state of conservation of the property, including information on any actions taken by the State Party to ensure sufficient water supply to the property as well as the information requested by the Committee in Decision 29 COM 7B.8, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

14. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1999

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.8

28 COM 15B.10

29 COM 7B.12

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 45,000 for preparatory assistance and technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN mission 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Mining;
- b) Security limitations;
- c) Development threats;
- d) Exploitation of marine resources;
- e) Absence of a co-ordinating agency;
- f) Absence of a finalized strategic management plan;
- g) Absence of physically designated Park boundaries;
- h) Inadequate financing.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party, in response to the request from the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee for a progress report on the implementation of recommendations from the 2004 IUCN mission to the property, submitted on 6 March 2006, a two-page report to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party notes that the Strategic Plan for the management of the World Heritage property is in the final stage. However, there is no schedule identified for its implementation as called for in Decision **28 COM 15B.10**. The State Party notes that the park management authority, Balai Taman Nasional Lorentz, has been agreed and is in the process of being established. Meanwhile, the park is under the management of the regional Conservation Agency. The 2006 national budget includes provisions for some management activities of the property. However, no information is included on actual amounts allocated.

The Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation, and WWF-Indonesia have carried out an assessment of the management of Lorentz National Park to measure the effectiveness of the Park's management. The assessment reviewed the threats arising from "pre-existing development rights" on the conservation of Lorentz National Park. However, based on the limited information available, it is not possible to determine the degree to which this has been adequately addressed.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about the length of time involved in the finalization/implementation of the Strategic Plan for the property and that the resources (human and financial) available to manage it are extremely limited for such a large national park that covers such a wide range of habitats, from high mountains to coastal marine.

The report received from the State Party does not provide a substantive response to the World Heritage Committee's request to commission an independent environmental audit of the proposed Habema Road (**28 COM 15B.10** paragraph 3).

In addition to the issues reported by the State Party, IUCN has received a number of press reports and information concerning pollution and land rights issues associated with the Freeport mine on the park boundary. The press reports provide details of on-going public protests in Indonesia over the activities of the mining company and IUCN is concerned that these issues may threaten the World Heritage property if they remain unresolved.

Of particular concern is the pollution of the marine and estuary areas of the World Heritage property resulting from the water discharged from the mine tailings into the estuary of the Ajkwa River, near the boundary of the property. This discharge could be carried by longshore drifting into the marine section of the World Heritage property.

IUCN is also concerned about the reported oil and gas exploration within the World Heritage property, which appears to be supported by licenses and permits that have been issued over the park. In addition a number of reports have been received on a large landslide reported to have occurred in and near the property. This landslide seems to be the result of a new underground mining technique applied in the Freeport mine.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.12, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*

3. *Notes that there are ongoing significant threats to the values and integrity of the World Heritage property that requires a concerted effort and adequate resources to address;*
4. *Notes with concern that the Strategic Plan has yet to be formally approved and implemented;*
5. *Urges the State Party to take urgent action for the establishment, staffing and funding of the park management authority, Balai Taman Nasional Lorentz;*
6. *Requests the State Party to formally approve and implement the Strategic Plan and to provide a detailed report as soon as possible, but not later than **31 October 2006**, on the human and financial resources required to implement the Strategic Plan and the actual resources currently available from the State Party and other sources;*
7. *Encourages the international donor community to place a high priority on funding the implementation of the Strategic Plan, once it has been formally approved by the State Party;*
8. *Urges the State Party to provide a substantive response to the World Heritage Committee's request (**28 COM 15B.10** paragraph 3) to commission an independent environmental audit of the proposed Habema Road;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property in relation to the different issues noted above, including the threats to the World Heritage property posed by the mining activities, in particular those associated to the discharge of water from the mine tailings into the estuary of the Ajkwa River, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

15. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

N (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.10

29 COM 7B.A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 71,995 Technical Co-operation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN Monitoring Mission, December 2002.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Pressure and degradation from increasing tourism and mountaineering;
- b) Airstrip development;
- c) Climate change.

Current conservation issues:

At the beginning of July 2005, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received informal reports about the development of a tourist resort, 'Kongde View Resort', within the Sagarmatha National Park.

Upon expression of concerns by the World Heritage Centre on 7 July 2005, the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation (DNPWC), IUCN-Nepal, and WWF-Nepal sent a fact-finding mission to the site at the end of the same month. IUCN received an unofficial translation of the mission report in September 2005, while the State Party submitted a summary of the findings and its official response to IUCN and the World Heritage Centre on 21 March 2006.

The report indicates that construction of the 20-roomed Kongde View Resort started in June 2005 at an altitude of 4200m overlooking Namche Bazaar, Tengboche and the Everest massif. The resort site is inside of the World Heritage property but was believed to be on privately owned land. Written permission for the construction of the resort was provided by the DNPWC following the approval of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) by the Ministry of Environment and Population and the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation.

Despite specific recommendations of the EIA to mitigate negative environmental impacts, the fact-finding mission observed a number of adverse environmental impacts including pollution and litter at the construction site, the collection of wood for cooking/heating and landscape modification due to unchecked laying of the foundation. The lodge had, however, been designed incorporating local architecture and natural colours.

The fact-finding mission also noted potential disturbance to musk deer and snow leopard populations, risk of increased poaching and the negative impact of the location of the resort on scenic views from many parts of the World Heritage property. It also found opposition to the resort among the local communities in the area, who were not adequately consulted and who believe the resort will impact negatively on seasonal grazing grounds, tourism trends and biodiversity.

The DNPWC notes that a letter has been issued withdrawing the permission to construct the resort but that the resort developer has filed a petition to repeal the stop order. A Supreme Court hearing on the case is reportedly scheduled for the end of May 2006. In addition, it has been requested that ownership of the land within the World Heritage property be revoked and this process is underway.

The process by which the resort development was permitted and is being executed effectively within the World Heritage property and the consequent negative impacts on the scenic values for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List is a matter of concern.

It may be recalled that in Decision **29 COM 7B.a** the Committee had taken note of the threat that the Sagarmatha National Park *inter alia* was facing climate change. The impacts of climate change on World Heritage are dealt with in detail in Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7.1*.

In the meanwhile, the State Party submitted, on 13 September 2005 to the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu, a draft management plan for the Sagarmatha National Park, prepared by the Tourism for Rural Poverty Alleviation Programme (TRPAP), which is a task force between the DNPWC, Nepal Tourism Board and the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Civil Aviation with financial cooperation of UNDP and the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Comments of IUCN-Nepal had been integrated in this draft and the World Heritage Centre provided further comments in January 2006 for improvement, in particular to stress in the document the identification and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes with concern the findings of the joint fact-finding mission of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation, IUCN-Nepal and WWF-Nepal in relation to the development of the Kongde View Resort within the World Heritage property, the potential negative impacts of this development on the integrity of the property and the lack of adequate consultation;*
3. *Urges the State Party to:*
 - a) *clarify the ownership of the site of the resort development;*
 - b) *carefully consider the social and environmental impacts of such development on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property; and to*
 - c) *carry out proper consultation with relevant stakeholders and an independent environmental impact assessment before any further construction takes place;*
4. *Further urges the State Party to review the situation with other private land holdings within the World Heritage property to avoid a repetition of this type of issue;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit as soon as possible, at the latest before **1 February 2007**, to the World Heritage Centre a report on the outcomes of the court case and the steps it plans to take in relation to the Kongde View Resort in the Sagarmatha National Park, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

16. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1993

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.11

28 COM 15B.18

29 COM 7B.13

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 for preparatory, training and technical assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Excess exploitation of marine resources;
- b) Illegal and destructive fishing.

Current conservation issues:

The State of Conservation report submitted by the State Party (23 March 2006) provides a detailed account of the progress made by the Tubbataha Protected Area Management Board (TPAMB) since the last report in 2004.

In response to problems associated to illegal fishing in the property the State Party has developed an integrated management strategy based on four management programmes:

Conservation Management Programme:

This programme is under implementation aiming to enhance law enforcement capability, expansion of partnerships in supporting management actions and the development of sustainable financing strategies. While noting that sustainable financing remains the major constraint faced by the management authority, the State Party has been able to secure an additional USD 118,000, which is to be used as seed funding for developing an Endowment Fund in support of the conservation of the property. In kind resources to enhance the work of rangers (fuel, patrol and field equipments, medicines and communications equipments) have been provided by a number of partners (Conservation International, and a number of national NGOs). In addition the capacity of rangers has been strengthened through a number of training activities in 2005 and a comprehensive training seminar implemented in March 2006.

The Park's boundaries are constantly monitored using a radar unit that allows for targeted patrols. However, this important equipment, which was provided to the property in 2000, is beginning to show signs of deterioration and may require additional investments.

Control of tourism and diving operations have been enhanced and all dive and tourism boats are now boarded by Park's staff to validate permits and ensure adherence to Park's regulations. This has been proved to be a good opportunity to interact with the private sector and serves to discuss recommendations from the industry on the conservation of the property. This cooperation is also supporting monitoring activities of the park as divers are providing valuable information on the sightings of megafauna and the state of coral reefs. These reports indicate an increase in the sightings of fishes, different species of sharks, marine turtles and cetaceans.

The State Party has also re-filed the Tubbataha Protected Areas Bill to the Philippine's Congress, which, once enacted, will considerably expand the Park's boundaries, authorize the establishment of a Trust Fund for the property and strengthen enforcement mechanisms.

Finally, under the Conservation Management Programme, the Park's authority, based on the IUCN/WCPA Best Practice Guideline *How is your MPA doing?*, has completed in 2005 the assessment of management effectiveness of the Park for a seven year management cycle (1998-2005). This is the first national park in the country completing such exercise, which has provided valuable recommendations for adaptive management.

Conservation Awareness Programme:

Over 2,000 brochures for visitors were produced in 2005, and a video on the property, its values and conservation needs was produced and distributed to all dive operators. A number of outreach and awareness raising activities have also been implemented with the diving community, local governments and local communities.

Ecosystem Research and Monitoring Programme:

The Park can now build on 10 years of continued monitoring and research, which started in 1997 using permanent transect sites and standard methods for assessing bottom cover and fish biomass. These activities have been supported by a number of partners (Conservation International, WWF-Philippines, Earthwatch, the Coastal Conservation and Education Foundation and the Coastal Resource Management Project of USAID). Results show healthy populations of the different bird species identified in the Park and new records for 9 migratory bird species. In addition, coral cover has continued to recover since the bleaching event of 1998, although it has not yet reached the same level as when it was first monitored in 1984. Total fish biomass has also increased and is at the highest level since 1997.

Sustainable Resource Use Programme:

A number of socio-economic studies have been conducted in the Municipality of Cagayancillo, to whose political jurisdiction the property belongs, and show a positive trend in livelihoods and living standards of local communities. However, these positive results raise the question of whether this trend can be sustained. It is important to note that, as a result of an active awareness programme, the number of fishery law violations by local communities decreased from 10 incidents in 2000 to only one in 2005.

In addition to these positive achievements, the State Party report notes several areas of concern related to the future management of the World Heritage property. These include: delayed prosecution and minimal fines for offenders apprehended by the dedicated park management staff and Philippine Navy/Coast Guard; outdated equipment; absence of a modern mooring buoy system; and a need to continue enhancing the conservation awareness programme.

Additional information received by IUCN from different sources indicates that the primary threats to the Tubbataha Reef Marine Park continue to be from various forms of illegal fishing, particularly from fishermen coming from the wider region as illegal activities by local fishermen have significantly decreased. Whilst the efforts of the State Party are reducing illegal fisheries within the property, information received by IUCN indicates that there has been a corresponding increase in illegal fishing from within the wider Sulu Sea region. This trend may in the long-term also affect the biological recruitment capacity of the property and the conservation of megafauna, particularly sharks that use large marine areas for their needs, potentially taking them out of the World Heritage property.

A revised International Assistance Request to hold a “*National Forum on the Conservation of the Tubbataha Reef Marine Park and the Greater Sulu Sea*” has been submitted by the State Party (March 2006). The Forum is due to take place in October 2006 and will bring together all sectors and stakeholders. The aims of the Forum are to generate action-oriented political support for and commitment to law enforcement; enhance cooperation among national and local governments; develop an action agenda to deal with the property’s major management issues; and formulate policy recommendations to strengthen MPA management and fishery laws.

However, given the recent trends in the Sulu Sea noted above, such events should be complemented by a regional forum addressing the issue of illegal fisheries in the wider Sulu Sea region. The State Party may consider calling upon the relevant regional or international organisations to provide assistance for developing this proposed regional forum. Support from the World Heritage Fund to implement such a regional initiative can also be considered as suggested in previous Committee decisions.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.13**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Notes the positive achievements in the conservation and management of the property and particularly in controlling the illegal fishing activities at local level;
4. Urges the State Party to provide sufficient basic funding for the management of the property in order to avoid annual fluctuations caused by dependence on tourism income and project funding;
5. Encourages the State Party to enact the Tubbataha Protected Areas Bill as soon as possible;

6. *Commends the international and national NGOs for their continued support provided to the conservation, management and monitoring of the property and encourages them to maintain and augment such support;*
7. *Calls upon the international donor and conservation community to respond positively to calls for support from the State Party to develop an Endowment Fund for the conservation and management of the property; and also calls upon the international community in collaboration with the Sulu Sea region States Parties to organise a regional forum on the conservation of marine resources in the wider Sulu Sea region to help find long-term solutions to illegal fishing;*
8. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a report by 1 **February 2007** on the results and recommendations of the “National Forum on the Conservation of the Tubbataha Reef Marine Park and the Greater Sulu Sea”, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

17. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994; extended in 2000

Criteria:

N (i) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.13

28 COM 15B.13

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2004): USD 87,207 for Management Planning support, Equipment and Training.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount recently provided to the property: USD 100,000 under the Youth Volunteers for Cultural Heritage Preservation project (2003-2006) ; USD 519,000 for Cua Van Floating Cultural Centre, a component of the Ha Long Ecomuseum (funded by the Government of Norway, for the period of 2003-2006).

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Population growth;
- b) Increased tourism pressure and development;
- c) Urban and industrial development;
- d) Lack of financial and technical resources;
- e) Absence of an integrated planning approach.

Current conservation issues:

In September 2005, the World Heritage Centre was informed by IUCN about a number of serious conservation issues allegedly threatening the World Heritage value of Ha Long Bay, including water pollution from coal mining wastes; live coral extraction and sale; destruction of mangrove forests; degradation of water bodies from construction of tourism and recreation facilities; and other impacts of inappropriate tourism infrastructure developments.

The World Heritage Centre sent this information to the State Party on 22 September 2005, and the State Party submitted a detailed response on 15 March 2006. The State Party notes that the reported threats occur only in the buffer zone or outside the property and have no impact on the property at present. The State Party provides the following information:

- a) Limited pollution from coal mining wastes occurs in the buffer zone. This is closely monitored, does not impact the water quality of the property, and is addressed through a range of activities initiated by Quang Ninh Province in cooperation with the coal industry, including the development of a master plan for the future of the coal industry.
- b) Destruction of mangrove forests continues to be a problem in the buffer zone and outside the property, where they are replaced by aquaculture dams, urban or industrial development. From 1998-2003, 2,509 ha of mangrove forests were destroyed, i.e. 11% of the total mangrove forests of Quang Ninh Province. However, the Province and the Ha Long Bay Management Authority have initiated a range of activities including raising awareness, planting or replanting mangrove forests (2,196 ha from 1998-2003) and limiting further destruction.
- c) The tourism and recreation facilities that were reported to degrade the property's water bodies, as well as other tourism infrastructure developments, are all located in the buffer zone of the property and are being constructed based on approved Environment Impact Assessment (EIAs) or after approval by local authorities.
- d) Thanks to a range of activities including strict enforcement and awareness-raising, the marketing of live corals has basically ended.

The State Party reports, however, that the property continues to be potentially threatened by economic development pressures, especially further urban, industrial and tourism infrastructure development.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the detailed response to the concerns raised over the state of conservation of the property and note that the reported threats occur at present only in the buffer zone or outside the property and are being addressed by the local authorities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern, however, that potential negative impacts on the property caused by these threats cannot be completely excluded, and that the property might continue to be potentially threatened, and therefore urge the Ha Long Bay Management Authority to continue its efforts to relieve or resolve the economic development pressures in close cooperation with other authorities concerned.

In November 2005, the Maritime Project Management Unit II, the executive body of the Cai Lan port construction, informed the World Heritage Centre of a possible extension project in the vicinity of the World Heritage property. This project was reported under

preparation based on an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) approved by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment in 1998.

Although the port is located outside the protected zones of the property, given the assumption that such an extension project may affect the outstanding universal value of the property, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party in January 2006 to send technical documents showing the possible impacts of the above-mentioned extension. In a letter dated 22 March 2006, the Maritime Project Management Unit II requests the support of the National Commission of Viet Nam for the extension project of the port (Stage 2 of Phase 1), as a continuation of Stage 1, which is currently under completion, based on the 1998 report and other reliable studies.

However, the World Heritage Centre considers this information insufficient to establish the appropriateness of the port extension project in terms of its potential impacts on the outstanding universal value of the property, given that the EIA was conducted eight years ago.

In April 2006, IUCN also received a report on a cement plant project, with potential negative impacts on the property. The Cam Pha cement plant is planned at Cam Thach ward, Cam Pha town, on the seashore of Ha Long Bay. Potential negative impacts on the property could allegedly come from a jetty which will be built 4km offshore into Ha Long Bay as well as air and water pollution resulting from the import and export of raw material such as clay, clinker, coal and cement.

The limited management capacity of the staff of the Ha Long Bay Management Authority is reported to impede further improvements in the conservation and management of the property. Considering the urgent need for capacity building, and the limited funds available, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore encourage the State Party to submit a request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for capacity building, with possible technical assistance from IUCN through its Viet Nam office, for the preparation and implementation of such an international assistance request.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 27 COM 7B.13 and 28 COM 15B.13, adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 28th (Suzhou, 2004) sessions respectively,*
3. *Commends the State Party and Ha Long Bay Management Authority for their continued efforts in addressing key issues in and around the property and for submitting a detailed response to the concerns raised over the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party and the Ha Long Bay Management Authority to continue their efforts to relieve or resolve the economic development pressures on the property and its buffer zone in close cooperation with other authorities concerned;*

5. *Encourages the State Party to submit a request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for capacity building of the staff of the Ha Long Bay Management Authority to strengthen their management capacity;*
6. *Calls upon the international donor community to provide further financial and technical support for the conservation and management of the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007** on the potential impacts of the Cam Pha cement plant and the proposed extension of the Cai Lan Port on the property as well as any other important changes in the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

18. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

19. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

20. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979; extension 1992

Criteria:

N (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.14

28 COM 15B.20

29 COM 7B.15

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO/IUCN mission 1999; UNESCO/IUCN mission 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

a) Illegal logging;

- b) Excess commercial logging;
- c) Bark beetle infestation of forest;
- d) Alterations of the hydrological regime;
- e) Border fence impeding mammal movements;
- f) Lack of transboundary cooperation.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Belarus submitted a short report on 1 February 2006. The report indicated that the Belarusian part of the World Heritage property covers 5,000 hectares and is part of a strict protection zone covering 30,000 ha in the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park, which covers 163,500 ha. The State Party report further stated that, apart from scientific research, no other human activities are allowed and/or underway in the strict protection zone including the World Heritage property. The 2000-2004 mass drying of middle-aged and old-aged Norway spruce forests in the national park and World Heritage property ceased due to favourable climate conditions in 2005. Aggravated by severe bark beetle infestation, the 2000-2004 mass drying destroyed a third of the Norway spruce population. A yet unexplained mass drying of ash trees, aggravated by a mushroom infestation, was observed in 2005. Sanitary felling, logging and limited artificial afforestation occur only outside the strict protection zone. The State Party reported that logging has increased more than twofold from 2001 to 2002, following the mass drying, and has remained fairly stable since then.

The State Party of Poland submitted a report on 28 February 2006, indicating the anticipated transboundary Coordination Council for both national parks had not been constituted yet, but common meetings of the Scientific Councils of both national parks are held at least twice a year. The State Party further reported on transboundary cooperation activities in the fields of conservation and environmental education such as the “Forest of Hope” project, and that participatory processes are in place. The State Party further stated that, apart from non-intrusive scientific research and education, no other human activities are allowed and/or underway in the Polish part of the World Heritage property, which is part of a strict protection zone in the Białowieża National Park. Sanitary felling occurs only outside the strict protection zone at a very low level (500-1500 m³ in 2004-2005). According to the State Party, the situation of cross-border tourist movement is gradually improving. In April 2005, the previously closed border pass for pedestrians and cyclists in Grudki-Piererow was reopened. There is no border fence on the Polish side, but a high border fence is still located on the Belarusian side. Within the framework of the “Forest of Hope” project, the creation of effective migration corridors is discussed, which would allow for cross-border movements of large mammals.

The State Party of Belarus has submitted an international assistance request to address the issue of large mammal movements by developing a project on the creation of effective migration corridors. This is a direct follow up on Decision **28 COM 15B.20**, and it is hoped that the proposed work will improve significantly the situation of the European bison population, other herbivores as well as carnivores. IUCN’s European Bison Action Plan strongly supports establishing migration corridors between the two currently separated subpopulations in the World Heritage property. In close cooperation with the “Forest of Hope” project, the proposed work should seek to identify priority areas for the creation of effective migration corridors.

Various sources stress that the implementation of the recommendations of the joint 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission is progressing only very slowly. Furthermore, several NGOs

report continued commercial logging and hunting and diverse infrastructure developments outside the strict protection zones on both the Belarusian and Polish sides, which could potentially impact on the property and its integrity, especially where they occur within the direct vicinity of the property or affect wildlife populations moving in and out the property. The very slow progress made in implementing the important recommendations of the joint 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission is of great concern, especially with regard to transboundary cooperation, and that a number of the reported activities do not relate specifically to the conservation and management of the World Heritage property. The delay in the preparation and implementation of a common management body and plan for the transboundary World Heritage property is especially alarming. So far, the implications of the World Heritage status are not given adequate consideration in any of the existing management plans. Thus, both States Parties should be urged to ensure that in future activities adequate consideration is given to the implications of the World Heritage status for conservation and management.

IUCN noted that the introduction of a system of paid licences for tourism services offered on the Polish side has further obstructed the opportunity of local people to benefit from tourism revenues generated by the park and urges the State Party of Poland to work in close cooperation with the local people in order to identify and implement improved ways of benefit sharing.

Finally, the still unclear delimitation of the World Heritage property on both the Belarusian and Polish side is of great concern. Both States Parties claim at present that only parts of the strict protection zones are part of the World Heritage property. However, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre are of the understanding that 87,607 ha of the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park are inscribed as part of the World Heritage property, not only 5,000 ha as mentioned in the State Party report. This requires urgent clarification. Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park was also extended to at least 152,200 ha by a presidential decree in 2004, and if the State Party wishes the Committee to consider extending the World Heritage property to coincide with the revised park boundaries, it is necessary to formally submit a nomination for such an extension.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.20** and **29 COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with great concern that little progress has been made on implementing the recommendations of the joint 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission;*
4. *Urges both States Parties to ensure that the management of the areas surrounding the World Heritage property does not adversely impact on the values and integrity of the property;*
5. *Further urges both States Parties to clarify in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN the exact extent of the transboundary World Heritage property including its buffer zones;*

6. *Encourages both States Parties to further explore the possibility of extending the transboundary World Heritage property;*
7. *Requests both States Parties to include in the management plans of both national parks jointly agreed sections dedicated specifically to the conservation and management of the transboundary World Heritage property;*
8. *Also requests the States Parties to provide the World Heritage Centre with updated reports by 1 February 2007 on the state of conservation of the property and further progress made in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

21. Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada) (N 404 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1984; extension 1990

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.16

23 BUR 5

22 COM 8 Rev

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Mountain pine beetle epidemic;
- b) Open-pit mining.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Canada submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2006. It states that the previously reported mountain pine beetle epidemic is continuing and is a concern related to forests both within and outside the World Heritage property. Within the serial property, the Mount Robson Provincial Park component is the most affected. Forest management activities under the Mount Robson Forest Health Strategy, a long-term plan developed in 2004, are inter alia expected to slow the further spread of mountain pine beetle. In 2005, mountain pine beetle population expansion was

sporadic due to the cool summer and the effectiveness of forest management activities such as controlled felling and burning, and tree removal (limited to specific areas). In 2006, fuel reduction and fireguard preparations in the Swift Current wildland/urban interface area and around the park headquarters will be implemented. All management activities are subject to the British Columbia Parks Impact Assessment and coordinated with the other components of the World Heritage property.

The State Party report also provides an update on the Cheviot mine 3 kilometres east of Jasper National Park. As previously reported, the first phase of the Cheviot mine is fully operational, as a satellite mine, with coal transported 22 kilometres to the existing Luscar processing plant. In this manner, the project differs from the original stand-alone mine proposal, and it involves a smaller footprint at Cheviot than initially proposed. However, the State Party reports that conditions imposed at the time of mine approval, aimed at mitigating potential impacts on grizzly bears, have not been fully implemented although, some progress has been made. Conservation NGOs were unsuccessful in their latest efforts to contest the Cheviot mine approvals through legal challenges, and continue to lobby the Cheviot mine and government agencies to ensure all approval conditions are fully met.

According to the State Party report, Parks Canada's priority interest is the maintenance of a sustainable population of grizzly bears in the Alberta Yellowhead Ecosystem, which includes federal lands in the World Heritage property and provincial lands in the Cheviot mine area. Therefore, Parks Canada continues to work with the Government of Alberta and industries in the area to advance strategies for carnivore conservation. According to a media release, the conservation NGOs, given that they were unsuccessful in their attempt to contest the Cheviot mine approvals (decision of Canada's Federal Court on 17 August 2005), shifted their focus from legal challenges to getting the governments and government agencies concerned to address a number of issues arising from the operation of the Cheviot mine. This includes identifying and protecting replacement habitat for grizzly bears in compensation for the habitat that is lost as a result of the Cheviot mine. This compensation has not occurred yet.

The State Party should be commended for its extensive efforts in controlling the mountain pine beetle epidemic. However, concerns remain about the actual and potential adverse impacts of the operation of the Cheviot mine on the integrity of the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.16**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Requests the State Party to ensure that adverse impacts of the operation of the Cheviot mine on the integrity of the property are minimized and mitigated;*
4. *Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed of any important changes in the state of conservation of the property.*

22. Nahanni National Park (Canada) (N 24)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1978

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21 (b)

27 COM 7B.16

28 COM 15B.24

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Mining and mineral exploration;
- b) Oil and gas exploration.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Canada submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2006. As requested by the Committee in Decision **28 COM 15B.24**, this report provides updated information on the mining development proposal by Canadian Zinc Corporation (CZN) at Prairie Creek, upstream from the World Heritage property, and in particular on a pending court decision related to a judicial review concerning the granting of a water licence for a proposed pilot plant and enlarged underground works. Canada's Federal Court heard the case on 30 August 2005 and ruled on 20 December 2005 that the water licence should be issued with certain modifications. The State Party report indicates that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) is likely to re-issue the permit soon. CZN plans to move ahead with the mining development project, which includes enlarging the underground workings and processing some ore on site in a pilot plan.

According to the State Party report, there are two other matters of concern with regard to the CZN mine at Prairie Creek. First, CZN applied to MVLWB to re-open an abandoned winter road into the mine. On 6 May 2005, the Northwest Territories' Supreme Court overruled a previous MVLWB ruling, stating that the road project does not have to follow the environmental assessment processes in place today. However, MVLWB will still have to hold consultations with First Nations and Parks Canada before issuing such a permit. Second, CZN applied for an amendment to their Land Use Permit to seek approval to expand the extent of the drilling programme on their property. Following an

environmental assessment of the project, a report issued on 23 December 2005 recommends approval of the project, with mitigation measures. This report is awaiting Government approval.

The State Party also reported that North American Tungsten has re-opened the CanTung mine on the Flat River, again upstream from the World Heritage property, and that other activities related to mining and mineral exploration take place in the South Nahanni watershed around the property. In Section II of the 2005 Periodic Report for the property, the State Party elaborated on the potential adverse impacts of both the CZN and CanTung mines on the property. The main concern is the water quality in the park because of the close upstream location of both mines on direct tributaries to the South Nahanni River. The mining developments may also have adverse impacts on transboundary wildlife such as grizzly bears and Dall's sheep. In addition, the re-opening of the abandoned winter road may degrade areas such as the North Nahanni Karst that has long been proposed for inclusion in the park. On 8 July 2005, a well-known expert on karst hydrogeology submitted a letter to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN explaining how the proposed CZN mine and road could contaminate the surface and groundwater in the South Nahanni watershed, including the World Heritage property. On 26 July 2005, CZN submitted a response, concluding that in the company's view the further development of the Prairie Creek mine and road will not in any way endanger the South Nahanni River or the World Heritage property. Despite this response, IUCN remains very concerned that, through downstream effects, the various mining, mineral, oil and gas exploration activities around the property, including the CZN mine and road, could have major adverse cumulative impacts especially on the water quality and, thus, integrity of the World Heritage property.

Concerning the previously reported proposed expansion of Nahanni National Park Reserve, the State Party reports that a feasibility study is expected to be completed by autumn of 2006, with an agreement on expanded park boundaries to follow within one year. This initiative is proceeding through the Deh Cho First Nations land claims process and the Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy. A significant portion of the South Nahanni watershed has been withdrawn from further industrial development pending the outcome of this process. As noted in Resolution #8 of the 8th World Wilderness Congress, held in Anchorage, Alaska from 30 September to 6 October 2005, both the Deh Cho First Nations and the Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy have called for the proposed expansion. The congress delegates expressed their support for expansion of Nahanni National Park Reserve to protect the entire South Nahanni watershed and the karstlands of the Ram Plateau and called on the Government of Canada to expand the park reserve. Considering the mounting pressures around the property and that there is no established buffer zone around the property, this initiative is welcomed and the Government of Canada is encouraged to proceed with the process leading to the approval of this expansion.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decisions **27 COM 7B.16** and **28 COM 15B.24**, adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 28th (Suzhou, 2004) sessions respectively,
3. Notes with concern that the various mining, mineral, oil and gas exploration activities around the property could have major adverse cumulative impacts on the integrity of the property;
4. Encourages the State Party of Canada to proceed with the expansion of Nahanni National Park to protect the entire South Nahanni watershed and the karstlands of the Ram Plateau;
5. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed of the mining developments around the property and any other important changes in the state of conservation of the property.

23. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2000

Criteria :

N (i)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21(b)13

27 COM 7B.18

28 COM 15B.26

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of overall management plan;
- b) Excessive tourism development;
- c) Pumice-pit mining.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Italy submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 9 March 2006 indicating that it had requested the two Sicilian authorities concerned for official statements regarding the mining activities on Lipari Island. Both authorities (*l'Assessorat à l'Industrie et l'Assessorat aux Biens Culturels et Environnementaux et de*

l'Instruction Publique de la Région Sicile) confirmed that any further extension or expansion of the pumice-pit mining is illegal and against the Landscape Territorial Plan in place. The State Party also reports that the latter has requested the communes of the Aeolian Islands to speed up the preparation of a general management plan. The authority had also informed the communes that, in case of their continued inactivity, it would take over the responsibility to prepare the general management plan.

The State Party did, however, not provide any information on the proposed hotel development on Lipari Island that sparked national and international media coverage and criticism in late 2004. In its Decision **28 COM 15B.26**, the Committee urged the State Party to seek long-term solutions towards a closure of the existing pumice quarries and to stop all mining activities in the World Heritage property. Whereas mining activities seem to have stopped on six of the seven islands, mining activities continue in the Lipari Island World Heritage property. On Lipari Island, the mining of pumice stone was authorized, as reported in 2004, by a regional law, originally until 31 May 2005. From 2004 to 2006, the Centre and IUCN received regular reports from concerned NGOs and individuals indicating that the mining activities continue and are proposed to continue on Lipari Island. Since the inscription of the Aeolian Islands on the World Heritage List in 2000, the extraction of pumice pit has allegedly been doubled. Moreover, a second pumice quarry reopened, and an old pier used to load pumice stone on big vessels was revamped. According to accompanying photographic and audiovisual material, the northeast side of the island is totally devastated by the continuing operation of the pumice pits. Finally, the crater of Mount Pelato has, allegedly, become unstable.

There is conflicting information regarding the authorization of these mining activities. Media reports indicated that the Sicilian authority in charge of mining concessions has twice declared to the public that all mining activities on Lipari Island will be stopped, at the latest by 30 June 2005. But following demonstrations in Messina, a further extension was granted to Pumex and Italpomice, the two companies operating on the island, until 31 December 2005. These companies have, backed up by the Mayor and council of the town of Lipari, requested the Sicilian Parliament to also grant an extension for at least another five years. Legambiente Sicilia, an environmental NGO, has in the meantime decided to take the Mayor of the town of Lipari to court for abuse of authority. At present, it is unclear whether or not the mining activities continue and for how long. Based on the available information, IUCN and the Centre are very concerned that the ongoing mining activities continue to have major adverse impacts on the integrity of the World Heritage property. Several studies indicated the possibility of immediate reemployment of all pumice workers, even following a complete stop of all mining activities in the World Heritage property.

IUCN has also received information on a proposal to develop an airport on Lipari Island. But no further information is available at present. There is also no further information available on the implementation of the Landscape Territorial Plan that should help to resolve planning and management issues. Considering the continued reports from concerned NGOs and individuals, and the available photographic and audiovisual material, a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission is required to assess the state of conservation of the property, and in particular progress made in seeking the above mentioned long-term solutions with regard to mining activities in the property. The State Party had previously offered to invite such a mission to the World Heritage property as indicated in its 2004 report.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 27 COM 7B.18 and 28 COM 15B.26, adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 28th (Suzhou, 2004) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with great concern that the mining activities continue to have major adverse impacts on the integrity of the property;*
4. *Regrets that little progress is made in relation to the requested stop of all mining activities in the World Heritage property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the impacts of the mining activities, proposed hotel development and the implementation of the Landscape Territorial Plan;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by 1 February 2007 on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

24. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1991

Criteria:

N (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

24 BUR I.44

24 COM I.21

29 COM 7B.18

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for a training seminar (1999).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Accidental cyanide pollution from mining;

- b) Deepwater navigation waterway through the Bystre mouth of the Danube River.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Romania submitted a report on its navigation systems in the Danube Delta on 3 February 2006. The State Party is responsible for maintaining the navigation conditions on the Sulina Canal. From 1991-1993, navigation on the Sulina Canal was interrupted following the stranding of a ship. The shipwreck was subsequently removed between 2003 and 2005 and the Canal was totally cleaned to allow navigation to be fully restored. Since then, regular dredging activities have taken place. Sulina Canal continues to be the most important international navigation way for the Eastern European countries as it is the only canal built as a deepwater navigation way for maritime ships in the Danube Delta. The State Party of Romania has no plans to build new navigation routes in the Danube Delta.

On 30 January 2006, the State Party of Ukraine submitted a report on the transboundary impacts of the reopening of navigation routes in the Ukrainian part of the Danube Delta. After dredging activities had been stopped in the early 1990s, navigation became impossible on both the Bystre and Prorva branches. The State Party of Ukraine reports that the decision to reopen these branches was made on the basis of a comparative study of more than 10 design options. The study concludes that there are no significant transboundary impacts on the river hydrology from phase 1 of the Project, and that any future increase in the scale and magnitude of such impacts is highly unlikely. Other impacts, for example on fish stocks, are expected to be alleviated by proposed mitigation measures.

A trilateral conference held under the aegis of UNESCO and the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) from 26 February to 1 March 2006 in Odessa generated a shared vision for the conservation and sustainable development of the Danube Delta. Participants from the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine agreed on a number of activities to be undertaken to achieve the shared vision. In order to monitor progress made so far, a follow up meeting will be held later in 2006.

Following a request by international conventions (including the Ramsar Convention) represented at the conference, the State Party of Ukraine agreed to hold a workshop later in 2006 to present the results of the EIA studies prior to starting phase 2 of the Project on the deepwater navigation waterway through the Bystre mouth. Dredging activities to reopen the Bystre mouth (and possibly also Prorva mouth) are, however, expected to be resumed in May 2006.

UNESCO and IUCN remain concerned about the increasing human pressures on the Danube Delta and the current approach to using the Danube River for navigation because it threatens the last intact river stretches including the integrity of National Parks, Natura 2000 sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, Ramsar sites and the World Heritage property.

The States Parties of Ukraine and Romania are to be commended for their reports noting that Ukraine's plans to reopen navigation routes are not expected to have significant transboundary impacts on the Danube Delta and that Romania does not plan any new navigation routes. IUCN noted with some concern that the Republic of Moldova is in the process of constructing a petrol terminal at Gjugjurlesti with potentially significant direct and indirect impacts on the Danube Delta ecosystem. Given the above, the three States

Parties are strongly encouraged to develop and implement a Master Plan for the whole of the Danube Delta with a set of shared environmental standards and regulations to ensure and enforce compliance. In this context, IUCN and UNESCO welcome the outcomes of the Odessa conference and encourage the three States Parties to follow up on implementing the agreed activities and to take common decisions on Danube navigation in the International Navigation Commission established under the Bucharest Convention.

With regard to the reopening of the Bystre route, IUCN and UNESCO strongly encourage the State Party of Ukraine to ensure, through an open consultative process, that adequate environmental mitigation measures are put in place.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 29th (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with concern the increasing human pressures on the Danube Delta and the resultant impacts on the World Heritage property;*
4. *Encourages the States Parties of the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine to follow up on the shared vision generated at the trilateral conference held in Odessa in 2006 and to implement the activities agreed upon;*
5. *Strongly encourages the three States Parties to develop and implement a Master Plan for the whole of the Danube Delta with a set of shared environmental standards and regulations to ensure and enforce compliance;*
6. *Requests the State Party of Ukraine to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed about the reopening of navigation routes, any actual or potential impacts on the Danube Delta World Heritage property, and the implementation of proposed mitigation measures;*
7. *Further requests the States Parties of the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed on any other important changes in the state of conservation of the property.*

25. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1996; extension 2001

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.20

28 COM 15 B.27

29 COM 7B.20

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN fact-finding mission 1997; UNESCO/IUCN mission 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Illegal salmon fishing;
- b) Gold mining;
- c) Gas pipeline;
- d) Development of a geothermal power station;
- e) Forest fires;
- f) Boundary changes;
- g) Construction of the Esso-Palana road.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party provided a report to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2006 which appears to repeat verbatim the report submitted on 27 January 2005.

Consequently, IUCN and the Centre reiterate the concerns and recommendations made to the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee and recommend that the Committee requests an update on the issues previously raised and on how they are being addressed.

The State Party urgently needs to address a number of other areas highlighted by the 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission. These include: improvements in staffing levels; tourism planning and development; overall access planning for the property including issues in relation to the Esso-Palana Road; management planning including the completion of management plans for the remaining two protected areas comprising the World Heritage Property (Klyuchevskoy in 2005 and South Kamchatka 2005/6); and improved interagency cooperation on timber and logging concessions in the property.

Further, it is recommended that the State Party respond to the specific recommendations of the 2004 UNESCO/IUCN mission on the growing and challenging problem of salmon poaching within the peninsula. Poaching occurs both within and outside of the property and impacts the ecological processes for salmon on the peninsula as a whole. IUCN has received reports of increased levels of poaching in all Kamchatka's rivers in 2005. The State Party should consider reviewing quota allocation systems to ensure that local communities receive adequate and equitable access to natural resources thereby reducing the need for them to turn to poaching to supplement livelihoods. The State Party should facilitate improved cooperation between the various regional and national authorities responsible for hunting concessions, World Heritage property management and the control of poaching.

Regarding mining, the State Party should elaborate on efforts taken to improve collaboration between the Aginskoye mine and the park authorities and ensure that the mine operates according to best mining practice and latest technology.

Given the potential of the gas pipeline development to significantly disrupt salmon spawning on rivers flowing from the property to the sea and to open up areas to increased poaching, an update on construction and measures taken to mitigate the environmental impacts of the project is requested. Furthermore, an update needs to be given that elaborates on the impact of forest fires on the property reiterating the call for research to better understand natural fire patterns in the property. Based on this research more detailed fire management planning should be undertaken to manage natural and human induced fire in the World Heritage property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.20, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with concern that the State Party report, received on 1 February 2006, repeats verbatim the report of 27 January 2005;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party has failed to report any update on the issues raised at the 29th session of the Committee or to respond to any of its decisions;*
5. *Requests the State Party to respond as soon as possible and provide a detailed report addressing all issues indicated by 1 February 2007 for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

26. Durmitor National Park (Serbia and Montenegro) (N 100)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1980

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

15 COM 8

20 COM p. 9-10

29 COM 7B.21

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 117,000 for equipment and technical expertise.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 40,000 by UNESCO Venice;

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO/IUCN mission 1996; UNESCO/IUCN mission 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Proposed dam development on the Tara River;
- b) Ski development in the Zabljak area;
- c) Boundary issues;
- d) Illegal logging and hunting.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Serbia and Montenegro submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2006. The report reiterated that the Buk Bijela dam project was stopped in 2005 and, following recommendations of both the joint 1996 and 2005 UNESCO/IUCN missions, minor boundary changes were adopted by the Committee in its Decision **29 COM 8B.15**, excluding the town of Zabljak from the property.

The report further stated that a number of relevant authorities are working on the implementation of the specific recommendations of the joint 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission. Ongoing activities include the full implementation of the Physical Plan for the Durmitor Area and the management plan for Durmitor National Park, as well as efforts to prevent illegal activities within the park boundaries such as building, logging and the development of skiing facilities.

Ongoing cooperation with the Municipality of Zabljak is further aimed at controlling future development of the urban area and improving environmental conditions and standards. The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Physical Planning of Montenegro is working on preparatory steps for the ratification of the Aarhus Convention, as encouraged by the Committee in its Decision **29 COM 7B.21**, and ratification is expected in 2007. In the future, this Ministry aims to establish stronger transboundary cooperation with relevant authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Ministry of Economy of Montenegro is at the same time working on a Strategy of Energy Development until 2025 to be adopted this year. The strategy will include the definition and discussion of alternative energy sources that will not adversely affect Durmitor National Park.

The conservation of the property is governed by the Physical Plan for the Durmitor Area and the management plan for Durmitor National Park for the years 2005-2020, which was adopted for the first five years in December 2004. These plans establish a zoning system and appropriate conservation and development measures. According to the current management plan, logging and hunting activities (with some exceptions) are completely forbidden in the core zones of the National Park. IUCN and UNESCO welcome the progress made in the implementation of recommendations of the 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission. IUCN noted that increasing demand may lead to the development of further ski facilities. Such ski facilities should only be developed outside the park boundaries and in

any case should seek to avoid any adverse impacts on the property. A draft Tourism Master Plan for the mountain regions of northern and central Montenegro, including the Durmitor National Park area, has drawn some criticism from UNDP and national and international NGOs such as the International Ecotourism Society. The draft Tourism Master Plan is currently being revised by the Government.

In the context of sustainable tourism development, the State Party is encouraged to take into consideration a recent report by the International Ecotourism Society, which strongly recommends that Montenegro not pursue ski tourism and instead concentrate on summer tourism, built around its national parks and mountain towns.

The State Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina submitted a report dated 3 May 2006 informing the World Heritage Centre that the Board for Tender for the tender concerning hydro plants (five representatives from the Republika Srpska and five from Montenegro) held a joint session on 27 February 2006 and announced the unsuccessful public announcement for granting a concession for the construction of the hydro power plants of Buk Bijela and Srbinje. The State Party underlined that this confirms the commitment made by the authorities to comply with international standards and their collaboration with the authorities of Montenegro in the preservation of World Heritage.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **9 COM**, **15 COM**, **20 COM** and **29 COM 7B.21**, adopted at its 9th (UNESCO, 1985), 15th (Cathage, 1991), 20th (Merida, 1996) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Welcomes the confirmation by the State Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina that no concession has been granted for the hydro power plants of Buk Bijela and Srbinje;*
4. *Notes that progress is being made in the implementation of the recommendations of the joint 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission;*
5. *Urges both States Parties to continue to fully implement all recommendations of the joint 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission;*
6. *Requests the State Party of Serbia and Montenegro to ensure that no further development of ski facilities is allowed within the property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party of Serbia and Montenegro to provide the World Heritage Centre with a copy of the Management Plan for Durmitor National Park;*
8. *Further requests both States Parties to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed on progress made in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission and of any important changes, particularly those related to tourism development, in the state of conservation of the property.*

27. Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America) (N 259)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1983

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

25 COM p.30

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Air pollution.

Current conservation issues:

In January 2006, IUCN was informed of the ongoing planning process for the North Shore Road project, which could have adverse impact on Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The information was subsequently shared with the World Heritage Centre and the State Party. On 27 February 2006, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received a State Party response indicating that the potential North Shore Road project is still very preliminary and quite far from the final decision stage.

According to the State Party response, the park is engaged in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to resolve a long standing issue with Swain County, North Carolina, arising from a 1943 Agreement that calls for building a new road through the park along the north shore of Fontana Lake. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was released on 4 January 2006. Five public hearings on the five alternatives included in the DEIS were scheduled to begin in February 2006. The five alternatives range from no action or monetary settlement to partial or full road construction. The DEIS did not specify a Preferred Alternative but stated that the Environmentally Preferred Alternative is to resolve the 1943 Agreement through a monetary settlement instead of any road construction. The DEIS further states that, although some of the alternatives involving road construction would be likely to have major adverse impacts on the natural and cultural resources of the park, none have been shown to cause impairment to the park based upon information obtained to date. Up-to-date information on the status of the EIS is available from the park's project website (www.northshoreroad.info).

IUCN noted that the agencies involved see the planning process as an opportunity to resolve a long standing issue and enhance working relationships between Great Smoky

Mountains National Park and the park's gateway neighbours in Bryson City and Swain County, North Carolina. At the same time, IUCN hopes that the planning process results in a decision that avoids major adverse impacts on the natural and cultural resources of the World Heritage property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Commends the State Party for its prompt clarification of the status of the North Shore Road project;*
3. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed of the process to resolve the 1943 Agreement that calls for building a new road through the park as well as any important changes in the state of conservation of the property.*

28. Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1978

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1995 – 2003.

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.12

28 COM 15B.122

29 COM 7B.22

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO/IUCN mission 1995.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Mining;
- b) Invasive alien species;
- c) Road construction.

Current conservation issues:

On 31 January 2006, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received from the State Party the third progress report for Yellowstone National Park following the property's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2003. Compared to the last report, progress was reported on the following key issues:

Mining activities:

In 2005, significant progress was made on the McLaren Mill and tailings and the Republic Smelter sites. Efforts are underway to determine whether a pre-selected site is indeed suitable as a depository for the McLaren tailings adjacent to the park. With the continued cleanup of toxic material, further improvement of water quality in the park is expected in the future.

Water quality:

The new Norris Village wastewater system will go on-line early in 2006. Construction of the Madison replacement system will begin in 2006, and smaller remaining wastewater treatment, distribution and collection facilities that are deteriorated or outdated will be replaced or updated in the future as funds are available.

Road impacts:

An annually funded programme for rebuilding existing roads in the park is expected to continue through 2017. This should correct the structural deficiencies noted in 1995. The park also obtained additional resources for the cyclical maintenance of roads including the newly rebuilt roads.

Key species:

The joint bison management plan has been implemented for the 5th year. In the last five years, the core Yellowstone bison population has been sustained between 3,000 and 5,000 animals, and efforts continue to reduce the risk of brucellosis transmission from bison to livestock. In the winter of 2005-2006, the State of Montana allowed bison hunting adjacent to the park and authorized 50 permits to be issued.

Considerable efforts continue in the park to conserve the endemic Yellowstone cutthroat trout by gillnetting non-native lake trout. Over 130,000 adult and juvenile lake trout were removed last year. Yellowstone cutthroat trout populations continue, however, to struggle with lake trout predation, trout whirling disease, and a series of years of drought-induced reproduction failures. In the autumn of 2005, monitoring efforts showed a strong year-class of juveniles that will start to reach reproductive age in 2006. However, according to an article by US National Park Service (NPS) scientists, Yellowstone cutthroat trout populations experienced a 60 percent decline in Yellowstone Lake, the fish's largest refuge, despite all conservation efforts. The State Party has also reviewed the currency and relevance of the 1973 Master Plan for Yellowstone National Park as requested by the Committee in its Decision **29 COM 7B.22**. It concludes that the Master Plan, which has been extensively amended and regularly reviewed since its initial adoption in 1973, continues to serve well as the overarching framework for park management and as the framework for the subplans which are in operation.

IUCN noted that the draft progress report was published for public comments in January 2006, but regrets that the public comment period was only 15 days. Furthermore it is noted that public comments were provided by several NGOs (annexed to the State Party report). They provided important additional information on the status and/or public

perception of the key issues in the property. The NGOs expressed concern over the continuing threats to Yellowstone National Park from the New World Mining District. They further indicated that a three-year temporary winter use plan approved by the National Parks Service allows 720 snowmobiles a day into the park, despite the fact that the less than 300 snowmobiles entering the park per day at present continue to have adverse impacts on the park, especially in terms of air and noise pollution (according to recent US NPS winter use monitoring reports). Referring to a 2005 status review of the joint bison management plan, the NGOs further indicated that little progress has been made in fact in bison conservation. But they acknowledged progress made in rebuilding existing roads and wastewater facilities. According to 2005 to 2006 press coverage, the Yellowstone grizzly bear population exceeds 600 animals, and all goals of the 1993 Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Plan are met. The Yellowstone bison population was estimated at 3,100 animals in late winter 2003, 4,200 in late summer 2004, 4,900 in late summer 2005, and 3,500 in late winter 2006. The recent reduction was attributed to normal winter mortality (typically at 9 percent of the population) and the fact that hundreds of bison were captured and sent to slaughter in the winter of 2005-2006. The new population estimate is still above the target population of 3,000 contained in the joint bison management plan. In March 2006, the grey wolf population in the Northern Rockies exceeded 1,000 animals, a decade after they were reintroduced in and around Yellowstone National Park. But recently grey wolf numbers fell sharply in the large Wyoming part of Yellowstone National Park mainly because many pups died. Officials suspect disease as the cause behind the deaths of many pups.

Considering all the available information, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre conclude that progress is being made in relation to most of the key issues in the property. However, it will still take time before the activities undertaken fully resolve them. It is therefore important that the State Party continues its activities and the monitoring of its activities, and that it ensures environmental impacts of activities such as rebuilding existing roads and wastewater facilities are minimized and mitigated. Furthermore, the State Party is encouraged to find a satisfactory long term solution for the winter use of the property. Having submitted three annual reports, which document the progress being made, the State Party, in its official report, questions the need for continuing to submit further annual reports, as previously requested by the Committee. Considering the overall positive progress documented in the three annual reports, a bi-annual reporting cycle for the property is suggested to the World Heritage Committee. The State Party should continue to seek public comments on its progress reports.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.122** and **29 COM 7B.22**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the State Party's efforts in addressing key issues in the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to continue its efforts in addressing key issues in the property including its winter use;*

5. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2008** on the status of key conservation and management issues in the property for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

29. Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1978; extension to include the Marine Reserve in 2001

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.25

28 COM 7B.31

29 COM 7B.29

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 466,250 for emergency, training and technical support

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 3,5 millions

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO/IUCN/Chairperson mission 1-11 June 1996; UNESCO mission June 2003; UNESCO informal visit 14-21 April 2005; UNESCO/IUCN mission 28 February – 10 March 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Delay in the full implementation of the Special Law and lack of enforcement;
- b) Inadequate quarantine measures;
- c) Illegal fishing;
- d) Instability of Park Director's Position.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Ecuador has submitted a report on 15 February 2006, noting progress achieved in the conservation and management of the islands. Key highlights are:

- a) The Minister of the Environment, with support from the UNDP and the InterAmerican Development Bank (IADB), developed a transparent process for the selection of the Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS) director. A new director was selected in April 2006.

- b) A new Galapagos National Park (GNP) management plan was adopted in April 2005. The plan promotes: “a shared vision for the archipelago and its management to maintain it as an ecological, socio-economic and environmentally sustainable system”.
- c) Implementation of the management plan for the Galapagos Marine Reserve (GMR) (approved in 1999 after a full participatory process) is well advanced. The Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS) is also assessing the effectiveness of its management, control and patrolling activities within the 133,000 km² GMR. Patrolling is to be reinforced as part of an agreement to be signed with the Navy.
- d) The government prohibited long-line fishing in the GMR in May 2005. It also banned the export of shark fins at the national level in an effort to stem the illegal shark fishery in Galapagos. In parallel to these measures, the government has committed national funds, along with those of IADB, Conservation International and other donors, to support alternative economic options for the area’s fishers, including the development of fish catch processing and storing, in an effort to add value to the resource and to influence the tourism market, which imports fish from the continent.
- e) Funding from IADB and GEF/UNDP has supported the establishment of the basic infrastructure for an Inspection and Quarantine System (SESA-SICGAL) for Galapagos in Quito and Guayaquil on the continent.
- f) Italian Cooperation is supporting a capacity building project for the Galapagos National Institute (INGALA), responsible for planning and controlling key development activities in the islands, including migratory controls.
- g) The Ministry of the Environment, with support of a Donors Roundtable, launched the Galapagos 2020 Initiative aiming to build a shared vision for Galapagos among key stakeholders involved in the conservation and management of the islands.

The State Party report, summarized above, provided background information for the UNESCO/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to Galapagos.

Through a series of 33 meetings, the mission team had discussions with all key stakeholders in the islands, representing national and local authorities and institutions, elected officials, NGOs, other representatives of civil society and the private sector. Though progress has been achieved on several issues raised by the World Heritage Committee it was also very clear that there is fundamental shift taking place in Galapagos. This shift, further discussed below, is having important and negative impacts on conservation concerns, in particular:

a) *Accelerated loss of ecological isolation.*

The unique ecosystems of Galapagos have developed over millions of years due to their biological isolation from continental landmasses. Humans have, purposefully or accidentally, introduced nearly 1,500 recorded terrestrial animals and plant species, mostly in the past 40 years, and despite recent efforts, this process is accelerating. Little is known about the marine introductions. 33 flights a week now ferry people and goods between the mainland and two airports in Galapagos. Old and unsanitary cargo ships from Guayaquil transport all goods, including fresh foods, from the continent to 3 main ports in the islands. Private aircraft and ships also arrive in the islands from other points in Latin America (100 arrivals in 2004-2005), each representing a new introduction risk. This increasing traffic is creating a conveyor belt on which new species are arriving and

dispersing within Galapagos. A panel of experts predicted the arrival of the West Nile Virus before 2010, unless full inspection and quarantine measures are strictly applied.

b) Unsustainable fishing effort

Despite extensive efforts by the GNPS and the Charles Darwin Foundation (CDF) at establishing a managed fishery, the sea cucumber fishery is now effectively exhausted due to unsustainable and illegal harvests. The fishing community is now seeking alternative means of sustaining that income, and finding solutions is proving to be elusive. As a result, there continues to be a great pressure to fish illegally, either out of season, or for illegal species (mostly shark). According to estimated figures obtained from different sources by the mission team, it is not unreasonable to assume that up to 300,000 – 400,000 sharks were fished from Galapagos waters in 2005.

c) Limited institutional capacity and weak governance

Staff interviewed in the key institutions involved with conservation and management of the islands, GNPS, INGALA and SESA-SICGAL were dedicated and highly professional. However, a chronic lack of capacity due to limited resources, and very short tenures of leadership posts prevent these institutions from effectively fulfilling their mandates.

At the time of writing this report, a director for the GNPS had just been selected, following a lengthy, rigorous and transparent process. This is a positive development and expectations are high that the appointee will continue in her position after the national elections in October. GNPS staff numbers are inadequate to deal with management demands (e.g. marine reserve patrolling alone is 40% understaffed). The GNPS has been accumulating responsibilities under the Special Law for Galapagos and its regulations, yet at the same time it has been losing resources.

Though INGALA (eight directors since 1998) is legally mandated to act as the regional planning agency in Galapagos, it has not been able to move beyond focusing on its own capacity building and on producing consensual planning documents that remain to be implemented. It appears to have little ability to ensure that its plans be respected, pointing to a possible legislative gap. Individual municipal governments are taking unilateral development decisions that are negative in terms of conservation and sustainable development, with no apparent objections from INGALA. Though INGALA has begun a comprehensive process to identify illegal immigrants, the mission team was not made aware of any actions being planned to reverse their continuing arrival. As a result, immigration continues with impunity. Though INGALA has a Specialized Committee for Institutional Coordination, with the mandate to ensure that all institutions in Galapagos are working towards a common vision, this Committee has never met.

SESA-SICGAL (6 directors since 2001, when it was formally created), is mandated to prevent arrivals of alien species and to identify/eradicate new arrivals before they are established. It is a professional agency staffed with qualified and dedicated technicians. However, existing infrastructure and available human and financial resources are very limited and cannot begin to address the increasing demands associated with the rapidly growing volumes of people and cargo, nor with the projected opening of new points of access to the islands, which in itself is a grave cause for concern. Furthermore, the infrastructure existing in Guayaquil is not fully operational, making it difficult to inspect and control all vessels loading cargo at this port. These same vessels are very poorly suited and are themselves an important risk in terms of introducing alien species to Galapagos. Marine alien species are not being considered, and hulls of ships (both cargo

and recreational vessels) are not being inspected. Though obliged to do so by law, aircraft do not fumigate passenger cabins nor cargo holds, the latter having been identified by scientists as the most likely entry route of West Nile Virus infected mosquitoes. There is no capacity to react to the discovery of newly introduced species before these have a chance to establish themselves and propagate.

Whilst all national institutions represented in the islands suffer from instability and lack of power, the local political structures governing the islands (municipal and provincial governments, local representatives to the national assembly) are stable and are taking the initiative in promoting new development projects which are often in flagrant contradiction to the Special Law for Galapagos. One municipality has declared itself as the “Sports Fishing Capital of the World”, sponsoring sports fishing events on a regular basis, despite the current illegality of this activity. One municipality is building a new airport terminal, despite the fact that no commercial flights currently have the authorization to land there.

d) High immigration rate:

Despite the fact that specific regulations to control human migration to the islands have been passed under the Special Law for Galapagos, these are not enforced. As a result migration contributes substantially to population growth rates, currently estimated at up to 6.9%. The current population of Galapagos is about 27,000 people (18,000 in 1998), of which up to 5,000 may be illegal.

The high level of migration increases the demands for imported products (food and non-food) to the islands, which in turn increases the risk of introduction of invasive alien species.

e) Delay in the full application of the special law for Galapagos:

The Special Law for Galapagos, approved in 1998, provides the legal framework against which productive activities in Galapagos are to be regulated. It is founded on the need to maintain the ecological isolation of the islands and relies heavily on the precautionary principle (article 2, paragraph 2). While a number of general and specific regulations under the law have been adopted there is a serious gap associated with those regulations relating to tourism. This absence, combined with the promotion of illegal activities such as sport fishing and the increasing visitation of large boats, contribute to growing frustrations on behalf of many sectors, in particular the fishing sector, as they observe outsiders positioning themselves to dominate future tourism opportunities which they have been led to believe would be reserved for them. Educational reform for Galapagos is called for under the law – it would result in a curriculum with a strong Galapagos component, including environmental and conservation issues. This reform is considered critical by many in the effort to develop a local island culture that will respond positively to long-term conservation matters. This reform remains to be implemented.

Those regulations that have been passed (e.g. immigration, fishing) are not effectively implemented, and will likely not be until the capacity issue is dealt with.

f) Tourism

Tourism is by far the main economic driver for Galapagos, and as a result, either directly or indirectly, through economic multiplier effects, is the main driver for illegal migration.

The traditional live aboard cruise ship model of tourism in Galapagos has had relatively little direct impact on the site’s state of conservation, though real threats exist, particularly

in regards to unintentional shifting of insect, plant and even bird species from island to island. However, the mission team received several reports that cruise ships were a significant driver of illegal migration, through short term hiring practices for cheap labour from the continent.

There is increasing emphasis on locally based tourism, whereby more benefits from the more than 120,000 tourists who visit the islands (2005) would be captured by local residents. Though attractive in principle, such initiatives threaten to open up new economic sectors that, if poorly circumscribed by weak immigration and regional planning laws will, as is the case for cruise ship tourism, further drive the demand for cheap labour from the continent, and result in unsound growth patterns with no end in sight.

g) Economic development model

Galapagos is fundamentally changing from being an ecologically isolated national park supporting a small human population not participating in the globalized economy, to becoming a centre of international commercial interest attracting capital and migrants at an accelerating rate. Some of the evidence includes:

- a) Population growth rate of up to 6.9% (half of which is driven by illegal immigration);
- b) Up to 20% of residents are illegal migrants;
- c) 500 passenger cruise ships now sailing in the islands (previous 90 passenger limit);
- d) Large international cruise ship companies now operating subsidiaries in Galapagos
- e) Construction boom in hotels ;
- f) Internet sales for building lots in Galapagos directed at international markets²;
- g) Galapagos illegally declared “International Sports Fishing Capital of the World”;
- h) Internet sports fishing packages overtly offered for Galapagos.³
- i) Tourist numbers growing by 12% per year;
- j) 33 commercial flights per week ;
- k) Construction of modern airport terminal in one town, even though no commercial flights currently authorized to fly there;
- l) Speculation driving coastal property prices up;
- m) Ease of access to global seafood markets resulting in the rapid commercial exhaustion of high value species, legal and illegal.

Galapagos is shifting into an economic development model that is fundamentally at odds with long term conservation and sustainable development interests. Various government subsidies encourage this model (cheap fuel, electricity, transport). As has been demonstrated in all island ecosystems, if human presence and activities cannot be successfully decoupled from the process of introduction of alien species, the end result is a massive loss of native and endemic biodiversity.

i) Vision for Galapagos

The World Heritage Committee, in its Decision **29 COM 7B.29**, requested that UNESCO work with the State Party to develop a practical, consensus based long term vision for Galapagos. The State Party has initiated such a process, entitled “Vision 2020”.

² www.santacruzgarden.com

³ www.fishgalapagos.com, www.galapagosfishing.com

Although commendable, it remains restricted in scope, as it is mostly rooted at senior ministry of environment levels, with some participation from the bi- and multilateral development community. Galapagos stakeholders have limited awareness of this important initiative and as a consequence, are not engaged with it. Until local stakeholders become fully engaged in the vision process, it will not enjoy support from Galapagos based stakeholders necessary to transform the vision into reality. There is also concern that, following projected national elections later in 2006, the momentum behind this initiative may be lost.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.29

The World Heritage Committee

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.29**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Regrets, however, that the documents have only been provided in Spanish, and not in one of the working languages of the Convention (English or French);*
4. *Commends the international donors and development agencies for their continued commitment and support for the State Party's efforts for conservation and management of the islands and in particular the recently launched initiative of establishing a Donors Roundtable to coordinate their activities and investments;*
5. *Also commends a number of partners and NGOs actively involved in the conservation and management of the islands for their continued support and in particular the Charles Darwin Foundation (CDF) for its successful scientific support to Galapagos National Park;*
6. *Notes with great concern the ascertained and potential threats that the property faces as noted in the report of the UNESCO/IUCN Mission;*
7. *Further notes that addressing effectively these threats requires the immediate implementation of a number of actions focusing on a variety of short, medium and long term results;*
8. ***Decides that, if the following short-term priority results are not achieved by its 31st session in 2007, the property be inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger:***
 - a) *A national level, binding commitment is adopted (e.g. law, decree) which restricts any further development of entry points into Galapagos beyond the two existing airports (Puerto Baquerizo Moreno and Baltra) and the five existing docking facilities (Baltra, Villamil, Puerto Baquerizo Moreno, Puerto Ayora, Floreana), and which identifies Guayaquil as the only airport from which non-stop flights can depart for Galapagos;*
 - b) *A national level, binding commitment is adopted (e.g. law, decree) ensuring adequate resources are allocated for the management of the property.*

- c) *The stability of leading senior posts for the Galapagos National Park System (GNPS), National Galapagos Institute (INGALA) and Cuarentena and Inspection System for Galapagos (SESA-SICGAL), is guaranteed, with consideration given to turning them into professional civil service posts;*
 - d) *At least 25% of identified illegal immigrants living in Galapagos have been repatriated;*
 - e) *No organized sports fishing takes place unless the activity, if considered compatible with conservation objectives, is formally assessed, regulated and resources are allocated to ensure its effective control;*
 - f) *A national level, binding commitment is adopted (e.g. law, decree) to impose a strict maximum number of tourist arrivals in Galapagos, based on the current registered cruise ship capacity;*
 - g) *No aircraft have been allowed to arrive in Galapagos without first having stopped in Guayaquil for a full inspection (passenger cabin and cargo holds) and fumigation;*
 - h) *All cruise and cargo ships and all private vessels sailing in Galapagos are applying measures developed in cooperation with the GNPS and the CDF to reduce the risk of transportation of species (both terrestrial and marine) between islands and commercial aircraft serving Galapagos are implementing systematic control protocols to reduce the risk of introduced species;*
 - i) *Appropriate levels of financial and human resources are available to GNPS to ensure full use is made of its Marine Reserve patrolling infrastructure and to ensure full implementation of its conservation mandate, as per the recently adopted management plan;*
 - j) *A national level, binding commitment is adopted to reduce the level of fishing, with a clearly defined timeframe and resources allocated for its implementation;*
 - k) *A framework for monitoring and assessing the state of conservation of the property is developed and adopted;*
9. *Further requests that the State Party submit, by **1 February 2007**, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee during its 31st session in 2007, a clear timetable and indicators for the achievement of the following medium and long term benchmarks:*
- a) *The movement of goods and people between the continent and Galapagos, and within the islands is rationalized to reduce the risk of introduction and dispersal of alien species by consolidating air and marine entry points on one island only. An efficient inter-island transportation service ensuring the needs of residents are fully met is in place;*
 - b) *All continental loading points and Galapagos entry points are staffed by a stable force of trained inspection and quarantine personnel with the necessary equipment and infrastructure to provide full inspection facilities for existing volumes of people and goods;*
 - c) *Cruise ships and private vessels are carrying out systematic measures to reduce the risk of transportation and dispersal of both terrestrial and*

marine species between islands. This should be developed with the support of the Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS) and the Charles Darwin Foundation (CDF);

- d) Measures to ensure the sustainable financing of the full SESA-SICGAL are in place so that it can effectively carry out its mandate, including: i) inspection; ii) quarantine; iii) monitoring; and iv) rapid response. Consideration should be given to revising the inspection levy charged on the transportation of goods to the islands;*
 - e) Commercial shipping to Galapagos is carried out exclusively by state of the art vessels, with concern over reducing the risk of transporting alien species;*
 - f) An economic analysis of existing subsidies is carried out, with a focus on identifying subsidies that are contributing to immigration and unsustainable development;*
 - g) A strategy for building the capacity of permanent Galapagos residents so that they may be better prepared for employment opportunities that have traditionally been filled by non-residents is developed and being implemented;*
 - h) The educational reform, as called for by the Special Law for Galapagos, is being implemented; and*
 - i) The vision process for Galapagos is broadened to include major stakeholder groups including conservation, tourism, fishing, agriculture and particularly youth. UNESCO and IUCN are committed to supporting the State Party in this regard;*
10. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN follow-up mission in the first quarter of 2007 to assess the state of conservation of the property and progress made in implementing the priority actions noted above;*
11. *Calls on donors and development agencies to re-orient their support towards attaining the above-noted benchmarks, as well as others noted in the monitoring report. There should be an urgent focus on rapidly capitalizing a permanent financing mechanism supporting the excellent applied research and management work carried out by the GNPS and the CDF, with emphasis on the Global Environment Facility-United Nations Development Programme (GEF-UNDP) endowment fund, to a level of at least USD 15 million.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

30. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 260)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1983

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:
1992-2005

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.13

27 COM 8B.12

28 COM 15A.12

29 COM 7A.11

29 COM 8C.3

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 58,500 (for equipment, community awareness building and staff training).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000.

Previous monitoring missions:

IUCN mission 1999 ; IUCN mission 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Poaching;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing;
- c) Encroachment along the Park's perimeter;
- d) Unplanned road construction.

Current conservation issues:

The IUCN/UNF/UNESCO Enhancing Our Heritage Project (EoH), which includes Sangay National Park as a pilot site, reported in 2005-2006 continued improvements in management including a revision of site's values and management objectives as well as the on-going implementation of monitoring programmes.

The State Party has submitted a report on 15 February 2006, noting that through the EoH project the management plan for the site has been updated to guide in a practical way the management of the site for the period 2005-2007. This plan has been designed to be as practical and operational as possible so as to address key conservation and management issues within available human and financial resources. The plan was prepared through a fully participatory process involving key stakeholders. It also includes provisions for addressing sustainable financing of the park.

Considerable progress has been achieved in extending and enhancing patrolling activities within the park and its buffer zone as well as in implementing focused training programmes for park's staff. This work has been supported by national funding from the Ministry of the Environment together with funds received from the National Environmental Fund. The provincial Government of Morona-Santiago and the Army Corps of Engineers are also supporting the construction of control points along the Guamote – Macas road.

The State Party has received additional support from the Moore Foundation for the period 2006-2008 which will allow the hiring of nine more rangers as well as the enhancement of

infrastructure required for control and field activities. In addition 21 local governments and municipalities are also providing support toward the park's management.

Management activities have been concentrated in the higher altitudes (páramos) of the park addressing the key threats to its integrity (agricultural and cattle raising practices in the buffer zone and unregulated tourism development). The work in addressing these threats has been supported by the development of co-management arrangements, the promotion of alternative economic options for local communities; and an active environmental education and awareness raising programme. Progress has also been achieved on clarifying the ownership and legal status of the land in a few zones of the park, however, this is an on-going process that requires further work.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7A.11**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
3. *Thanks the State Party of Ecuador for having submitted the requested report on progress in the implementation of the management strategy and measures taken to ensure adequate levels of funding and staff for the management of the property;*
4. *Commends the State Party for its continued efforts to improve the conservation and management of this World Heritage property;*
5. *Welcomes the support of the National Environmental Fund of Ecuador, Fundación Natura and the Moore Foundation in enhancing the conservation and management of this World Heritage property;*
6. *Notes the achievement, supported by the work of the EoH project, to prepare an updated management plan for 2005-2007, as well as the efforts to obtain additional financial resources for its effective implementation;*
7. *Requests the State Party to maintain their on-going efforts to achieve sustainable finance of the park including through the further expansion of ecotourism activities as an important revenue generation option;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the progress made in the implementation of the updated management plan and in particular on issues associated with resolving land ownership and the development of alternative economic options for local communities as a means to address conflicting activities occurring in the park's buffer zone, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

31. Iguaçú National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1986

Criteria:

N (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1999- 2001

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.23

28 COM 15B.32

29 COM 7B.28

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for training.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring mission(s):

UNESCO/IUCN mission March 1999; UNESCO/IUCN mission March 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Proposed development of hydropower dams;
- b) Pressure to re-open illegal road;
- c) Illegal logging and hunting;
- d) Uncoordinated developments;
- e) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- f) Lack of sustainable financing.

Current conservation issues:

On 3 March 2006, the State Party submitted a report using the format recommended for Periodic Reporting. The report outlines a number of on-going management challenges, including i) ongoing pressure to re-open the illegal Estrada do Colono road; ii) human population growth, urban development and associated pollution near park boundaries; iii) agricultural development and associated pesticide pollution; iv) invasive alien species; v) significant illegal extraction and hunting of flora/fauna; and vi) a proposed hydroelectric dam. The report points to inadequate staffing resources (41 forest policemen are currently working as wardens) as the main reason behind the inability to fully deal with several of these challenges.

Annex 1 of the State Party report provides further details on the proposed “Lower Iguaçú Hydroelectric Plant”, to be constructed upstream from the site. It states that infrastructure associated with the dam will be constructed within 150 metres of the park boundaries, and that significant earth works would take place to the very edge of the boundary, while a

drainage canal will actually be located within park boundaries. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is cited as claiming that “*drastic changes in the biological and geomorphic rain cycles*” would be one of the impacts downstream from the dam, and thus, in waters within park boundaries shared by Brazil and Argentina. It also claims that “*the building of the [dam] represents unpredicted pressure factors*” and “*when synergic and cumulative factors [are considered], the impacts take a greater dimension, since the [dam] is located next to Iguazu National Park*”. The State Party report questions the authority of a State Government (Paraná) in approving infrastructure works that would have impacts on the international boundary waters flowing between Iguazu National Park (Brazil) and Iguazu National Park (Argentina) World Heritage properties.

Studies have shown that dams have several effects downstream, including changes in water quality; effects on river temperature, nutrient load, turbidity, dissolved gases, concentration of heavy metals and minerals. The EIS for this dam notes that 62% of fish species located at the dam site are endemic to the Iguazu river, of which three are endangered.

The State Party report describes two further hydroelectric dam proposals, downstream from Iguazu falls. The Corpus dam in the Paraná river (Argentina) would elevate the Iguazu river waters by two meters at the base of the falls, eliminating downstream rapids and affecting river ecosystems. Another dam proposal would divert 20% of the Iguazu river waters at a point inside the park.

Information has been received indicating that political pressure to re-open the Estrada do Colono road is mounting as national elections approach in Brazil. As noted in previous State of Conservation reports, opening a road through the World Heritage property would seriously compromise its integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with great concern that apparently no progress has been made with ensuring sustainable financing of the property, especially relating to ongoing programmes with communities, as recommended in Decision **29 COM 7B.28** and by the 2005 UNESCO/IUCN mission.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.28**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Urges the State Party to ensure that the Estrada do Colono Road is not re-opened, ensuring that local concerns are addressed in alternative manners;*
4. *Further urges the State Party to provide full support to the park authorities in carrying out their mandate and to ensure sustainable financing of the property especially relating to ongoing programmes with communities;*
5. *Reiterates its concern about the Lower Iguazu Hydroelectric Plant project, and about other hydroelectric dam proposals, some in Argentina, near the property;*

6. *Requests the State Party to fully respect the World Heritage Convention, in particular Article 6.3, and not to take any action to threaten the values and integrity of a property located on the territory of another State Party to this Convention;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to deny authorization for the dams and in cooperation with Argentinian authorities, to provide a report to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN by **1 October 2006** containing the full details on the nature and extent of existing and proposed hydroelectric projects, along with their potential impacts on both Iguazu and Iguacu National Parks prior to taking any decision to proceed, so as to allow the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to assess whether a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to the property is necessary before the next Committee session;*
8. *Recommends that a framework of indicators of the state of conservation of Iguacu National Park, including indicators of those management issues raised in the State Party report, is developed to form the basis of ongoing monitoring of this property;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property including an update on the Estrada do Colono Road and the issue of sustainable financing, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

MIXED PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

32. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1982 / 1989

Criteria:

N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) C (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List World Heritage in Danger :

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

23 COM X.29

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring mission(s):

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Commercial logging in areas adjacent to the World Heritage property.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports in December 2005, from two Australian NGOs, the Wilderness Society and the Huon Valley Environment Centre, concerning current and planned commercial forestry operations immediately adjacent to the World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre transmitted the two reports to the State Party on 5 and 25 January 2006, respectively, asking for comments and clarifications, and the State Party response was received on 10 May 2006.

In particular, the NGO reports noted that clearfell logging operations; road construction and burning of logged areas directly threaten pristine, old-growth forests in areas outside the eastern and northern boundaries of the World Heritage property. The NGOs argued that critical areas of the Tasmanian Wilderness have not been included in the World

Heritage property due to pressure from resource-extractive industries. Further that, the loss of these areas due to commercial forestry activities will impact on the wilderness value and integrity of the property itself. These reports highlight the fact that forestry activities compromise options for future extension of the World Heritage property. NGO reports called for comprehensive and independent assessment of the threats and their direct and indirect impacts on the World Heritage property.

IUCN and the World Heritage Centre note that commercial forestry activities in areas adjacent to the boundary of the World Heritage property have been the focus of on-going debate between the State Party and the Australian conservation NGOs, over a number of years. This issue has been raised in numerous State of Conservation reports to the Committee, since the extension of the property in 1989. In the evaluation report of this property, IUCN noted that there is forested land outside the property which may have World Heritage values and which would contribute to the integrity of the property. In addition, a number of other reports have raised concerns over forestry operations, including the associated risks of increased fire frequency and have called for an extension of the World Heritage property.

The 1997 Regional Forest Agreement (RFA) between the Federal and State Governments was designed to balance conservation needs with sustainable forestry needs. This process identified a number of the forest areas adjacent to the World Heritage property for inclusion in protected areas, while others were identified as suitable for timber harvesting. The State Party informed the 23rd session of the Committee (1999) that boundary extensions to the existing World Heritage Property would not be actively considered. The Australian Government contends that the RFA adequately addressed World Heritage issues and the ecologically sustainable management of forests in Tasmania. At the 23rd sessions of the World Heritage Committee in 1999, IUCN commented that important steps had been made by the RFA towards a comprehensive, adequate and representative reserve system, but also urged the State Party not to foreclose any options related to future extension of the World Heritage property. In particular, IUCN recommended that areas of the dedicated RFA reserve system, which have been identified as having World Heritage value, should be managed in a manner consistent with potential World Heritage status and should ideally be added to the World Heritage property as originally recommended by IUCN.

The State Party response of 10 May 2006 notes that the eastern boundary of the property adjoins State Forest or Crown Land, and that state forests are managed for multiple use including wood production, conservation and recreation. The State Party noted that in 2005 a Supplementary Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement between Australian and Tasmanian Governments added 6,460 ha, including old growth tall wet eucalypt forest, to reserves along the eastern boundary of the property, notably in the Styx Valley, and as these areas will not be logged they provide greater buffer to the World Heritage property. The State Party also noted the Supplementary RFA will have a number of implications for Tasmanian production forests, including: an increase in protection of old growth forests, a new programme of incentives to protect forest on private land, an end date for clearing of native forest, and improved protection of rare, vulnerable and endangered vegetation communities.

The State Party's response does not respond specifically to the concerns of the NGOs in relation to logging in a number of specific areas near the boundary of the property, nor does it provide maps to illustrate improvements to the buffer zone of the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Commends the State Party for the implementation of a Supplementary Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement, and recent efforts to increase the protection of old growth forests adjacent to the World Heritage property, thus increasing the buffer zone in certain areas;*
3. *Notes the concerns expressed by NGOs in relation to the impacts of logging adjacent to the World Heritage property and the potential for this activity to compromise options for future extensions to the World Heritage property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit a revised map of the World Heritage property, showing the areas of extended buffer zone and identifying other use zones directly adjacent to the boundary;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to advise on specific management practices within the World Heritage property buffer zone which minimise potential negative impacts on the property ;*
6. *Urges the State Party and Tasmanian State Government to seriously consider the extension of the World Heritage property to include critical old-growth forests to the east and north of the property which have been identified as having potential World Heritage values;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007**, a report on the impact of commercial forestry activities on the integrity of the World Heritage property, and on the potential extension of the property to include critical areas identified as having potential World Heritage values, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

33. Pyrénées - Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1997; extension 1999

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv) (v) N (i) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.36

29 COM 7B.31

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Impacts of Festival de Gavarnie ;
- b) Lack of transboundary cooperation

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of France had been requested to report on the situation of the Festival de Gavarnie and transboundary cooperation by 1 February 2006. Following a reminder of the Chairperson of the Committee, the State Party submitted a letter on the situation of the Festival de Gavarnie. In its letter dated 23 March 2006, the Permanent Delegate of France reported that every effort had been made to ensure that the Committee's decision should be respected and implemented, so that the Gavarnie Festival would no longer be authorised at La Courade. Despite numerous discussions with the Ministry of Ecology and the regional authorities, the Delegation was unable to report that the Committee's decision would be respected, at least for the current year. For local political reasons it was decided to permit the Festival to take place at La Courade for one final year. The State Party report states that it has continued its efforts to relocate the festival from Courade as requested by previous Committee decisions. However, despite numerous communications, the Ministry

of Ecology and the local authorities were still planning to authorise the festival at Courade in 2006, supposedly for a last time.

The World Heritage Centre has received information, indicating that the authorities have indeed authorised the festival to take place in 2006. Until 2004, the Festival de Gavarnie has been taking place every summer in the Cirque de Gavarnie, a part of the core zone on the French side of this transboundary World Heritage property. IUCN noted in its evaluation of the nomination dossier in 1996 that the festival constitutes an “inconsistent” activity within the World Heritage property due to its adverse impact on an ecologically sensitive area. Since then the Committee has repeatedly reminded the State Party of France of its announcement to relocate the festival from Courade. The Festival did not take place in 2005.

Despite continued efforts little progress seems to be made in identifying and implementing an alternative solution for the Festival de Gavarnie. In addition, it is difficult to evaluate progress made in transboundary cooperation, since the State Party letter of 23 March 2006 does not address this issue at all. The State Party of France is in the process of adopting new national parks legislation. It is hoped that, under the new legislation, Pyrénées National Park will benefit from the improvement of management and zoning of French national parks, and the improved recognition of the national and international values of the cultural, natural and landscape heritage of French national parks. It seems that within five years after the adoption of the new legislation, new management plans are required for all French national parks. In the interim, transitory management plans will be in place, from about 2006-2010. It is hoped that the transitory management plan for the Pyrénées National Park will be the first step, within the spirit of the new national parks legislation, towards an improved integration of the property’s World Heritage values in the conservation objectives, policy and management of the Pyrénées National Park.

IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre regret that the State Party had been unable to accede to the Committee’s request for 2006.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.33

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document W3C-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.36** and **29 COM 7B.31**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the report provided by the State Party of France did not address the situation of transboundary cooperation;*
4. *Notes with concern that nine years after the inscription of the property, the issue of the relocation of the Festival de Gavarnie has still not been solved satisfactorily;*
5. *Requests the State Party of France to permanently relocate the Festival de Gavarnie as initially announced at the time of inscription of the property;*

6. *Encourages* the State Party of France to prepare and implement a management plan for the French side of this transboundary World Heritage property in line with the new national parks legislation;
7. *Urges* the States Parties of France and Spain to strengthen their transboundary cooperation in the conservation and management of this property;
8. *Also requests* both States Parties to keep the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN informed of progress made in transboundary cooperation and of any important changes in the state of conservation of the property;
9. *Further requests* the State Party of France to provide the World Heritage Centre with a specific progress report by **1 February 2007** on the situation of the Festival de Gavarnie and transboundary cooperation for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

34. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1988

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iv) (v) (vi) N (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.37

29 COM 7B.32

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

January – February 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of overall management plan;
- b) Fire damage to Chilandar Monastery;
- c) Excessive road construction;
- d) Timber extraction;

Current conservation issues:

While consolidation, cleaning and restoration efforts following the 4 March 2004 fire at the Chilandar Monastery move forwards and road development on the Mount Athos

peninsula has finished, the lack of an overall management plan, covering both the natural and cultural values of the property, remains a cause of concern.

The State Party submitted a brief report on 16 January 2006, describing the progress of consolidation, cleaning and restoration efforts at the Chilandar Monastery, especially its buildings and paintings. Furthermore, the State Party reports that the Ministry of Culture is realising a number of activities to reduce the risk to the property from natural disasters, including seismic activities.

According to the report, all road developments at the property are finished and no new road development is planned. The report further states that timber extraction at the property is guided by both the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Agricultural Affairs and follows traditional methods that respect the natural beauty of the area. According to the report, the ongoing timber extraction in the chestnut forest surrounding the monasteries helps to reduce the risk of forest fires. Finally, the Centre for the Preservation of the Holy Mount (Mount Athos) Heritage (KEDAK) is in the process of undertaking a special environmental study, in order to put in place measures to protect the forest ecosystem.

Considering that Mount Athos is also a Natura 2000 site, the responsible Ministry for Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works is encouraged to play a more active role in the future, especially in relation to developing the very much needed overall management plan for the property. Such a management plan would also help to address issues such as road development, timber extraction and risk preparedness.

The joint UNESCO/ICOMOS/IUCN monitoring mission took place from 30 January to 4 February 2006, after submission by the State Party's state of conservation report. Its primary objectives were to assess the impacts of ongoing restoration efforts on the World Heritage values of Mount Athos; to assess any threats including road development and timber extraction to the chestnut forest surrounding the monasteries; to assess the progress being made in the requested risk preparedness study; and to discuss the development of an overall management strategy for the World Heritage property.

The full report of the mission is available on-line at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>.

In conclusion, the mission noted that: the World Heritage values of the property were not at risk from the various operations reviewed and discussed, and that the long established monastic community and the national authorities deserved to be commended for their continuing efforts to bring the highest standards of conservation care to a living historic property of great religious importance and heritage value, in a management environment which has always accorded the 20 monastic establishments comprising the property considerable independence.

The mission also noted that the request of the Committee at its 29th session to the State Party to “undertake a risk preparedness study, including seismic preparedness, of all 20 monasteries on the Holy Mount, in order to systematically reduce the likelihood of fire elsewhere, and possibility of other threats, and to explore the development of an overall management strategy for the World Heritage property, which would address both natural and cultural values, and provide for a common framework for action among the 20 monasteries on the property” was not yet carried out.

In responding to this failure to meet the Committee's expectations, the mission report stressed that the development of strategies which would involve co-operation of all 20 monasteries needed to take into account the ways of working of the long established traditional protection system in place on the Holy Mount for over 1000 years, and that such initiatives needed to be developed through and with the co-operation of the Holy Community, the overall management and co-ordination instrument at Mount Athos.

The mission stressed that the highest priority for improvement of conservation of the World Heritage property is the preparation, approval and implementation of an integrated and multi-disciplinary management plan for the entire area of Mt. Athos, which should cover the following issues:

- Evaluation of the current situation, taking into account the co-existence of nature and spirituality / culture in Mt. Athos since the end of the first millennium, and the legitimate needs of the Monastic Brotherhoods;
- Circulation and transportation network of Mt. Athos;
- Integrated management of the natural environment;
- Sustainable management of the forests;
- Protection of the property within a cultural landscape perspective;
- Resolution of the problem of solid and liquid wastes;
- Improving management of risks, especially of fires and earthquakes, as well as eventual impacts from climate change;
- The importance of developing a consistent approach to conservation decision-making from monastery to monastery.

Due to the administrative autonomy of the Monasteries, it would be better if such a study would consider all these aspects initially at the level of the entire peninsula working with the Holy Community, but then treat in greater detail proposals for the specific area of each Monastery, and incorporate these within the overall management plan.

The study described above should also give consideration to treatment of Mount Athos as a cultural landscape in development of any future management plan/ strategy and a possible re-nomination of the property as cultural landscape. In addition, the mission noted that:

- The Ministry of the Environment, Planning and Public Works whose responsibilities for the property are mentioned in the Periodic Report, did not participate in the mission;
- Similarly the full participation of the Forest Service in improving management of the site needs to be assured;
- Concerning risk preparedness, the mission report recognized the important work undertaken by the Ministry of Culture to facilitate care of important archival material in a number of monasteries and to thus provide models of recommended care for all monasteries, the continuing vulnerability of many of the priceless collections in the monasteries and emphasized the priority importance of implementing a long term risk preparedness awareness building and training programme among those responsible in all monasteries, perhaps in co-operation with ICCROM.

A comparison with the contents of the Special Environmental Study – currently in its final phase – indicates that the Study might cover most of the points mentioned above, with the

exception perhaps of risk management, and of developing a consistent approach to conservation decision-making. An evaluation of the study should be undertaken to determine whether it would satisfy the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines* for a management plan. In any event, it appears that the Study at minimum will provide an excellent and comprehensive base for the preparation of a long term management plan for the World Heritage property.

In addition, the Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works should be encouraged to assign high priority to Mt. Athos (in accordance with Law 1650/1986 and Community Directive 92/43/WWC). This Ministry should play a key role in the assessment, approval and implementation of the Mt. Athos management plan.

A number of specific additional recommendations were also proposed to the Holy Community, to the State Party, and to the World Heritage Centre.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 28 COM 15B.37 and 29 COM 7B.32, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the exceptional quality of the efforts between national authorities responsible for heritage conservation and the leadership of the monastic community to collaborate fruitfully and effectively to ensure the long term conservation of the property;*
4. *Urges the World Heritage Centre, the State Party and competent authorities to fully implement all recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN mission;*
5. *Further urges the State Party and competent authorities to develop and implement an overall management plan for the property, covering both the natural and cultural values;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a report by 1 February 2008 on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2006 UNESCO/ICOMOS/IUCN mission for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1983

Criteria:

N (ii) (iii) C (i) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.38

29 COM 7B.33

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 103,825 for fire prevention equipment, Master Plan elaboration, consultancies, request for a stone specialist for the assessment of necessary restoration work on the stone sculpture Intihuatana, Machu Picchu, Architecture workshop.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Joint IUCN/ICOMOS mission October 1997; World Heritage Centre IUCN/ICOMOS mission October 1999; World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission 25 February-1 March 2002; World Heritage Centre visit 23 October 2003; World Heritage Centre mission 15-16 April 2005;

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Delays in revising the Master Plan, including detailed yearly operational plans, adequate budget provisions support;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, including geological studies and the development of a study on the impact of buses on landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies on the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Camino Inca;
- d) Delays in the development of a Public Use Plan;
- e) Delays in implementing the urban planning and control measures for Aguas Calientes;
- f) Lack of proper management of the site;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;

- h) Lack of adequate coordination of activities between institutions involved in site management.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party of Peru has submitted a detailed State of Conservation Report on the site and on the Master Plan for the property completed and officially approved by both INC and INRENA on 1 June 2005. However, in the last few months the World Heritage Centre has received a number of complaints, sent by the Local Government, on the lack of participatory processes in the preparation, approval and implementation of the Master Plan. Nevertheless, this Master Plan addresses some of the key concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee in its previous sessions including:

- a mechanism to ensure proper planning and control of urban development in villages located within the property;
- a monitoring programme to resolve conflicts on land ownership. Note that the State Party reports that these problems have been already addressed and solved;
- a revised structure for the Integrated Management Unit has been proposed to enhance cooperation between INC, INRENA and MINCETUR;
- options for solving issues associated with access to the property through implementation of a study on transportation system options. INRENA is already seeking expressions of interest from specialized companies to implement this study.

In addition, according to information from INRENA, it is reported that the project to construct a pilot village in the buffer zone of the property within the framework of the Vilcanota Project will not be implemented. INA and INRENA are also reported to be working with the World Bank to refocus the priorities of the Vilcanota project to promote sustainable tourism activities in this area.

However, the reports do not respond to all the questions raised by the Committee at its 29th Session. No progress has been made on the Public Use Plan, despite the disturbing speculations regarding the possible installation of a cable railway. No substantial progress has been made on the Risk Preparedness Plan, on the work schedule of the Management Unit, or on the Urban Development Plans for the Aguas Calientes Site.

IUCN believes that it is essential to prepare a comprehensive sustainable financing strategy for the management of the property to ensure the necessary financial resources for the implementation of the new Master Plan.

The State Party has shown interest in requesting the cooperation of the World Heritage Centre to organize a workshop to put forward a participatory methodology for the discussion of the Master Plan, which should in particular rely on the participation of the representatives of the organized civil society of the Sacred Valley, but has not submitted the official international assistance request for the World Heritage Fund.

The World Heritage Centre has urgently requested information on the building of a low impact approach way between the area of the Hydroelectric Power Station and the end of the Aguas Calientes railway line, which appears to have become a heavy traffic road crossing the area of maximum protection of the Sanctuary. In addition, IUCN has

received reports on a number of forest fires affecting the property and, it is noted that there is a lack of capacity to prevent and control these fires, which can potentially increase the risk of landslides.

The World Heritage Centre considers it essential to send a UNESCO/IUCN/ICOMOS mission to the Sanctuary to work with the State Party on a strategy for the cooperation of all the parties involved in the implementation of the Master Plan, in view of the disturbing lack of progress in implementing the activities scheduled in the Master Plan.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.33**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the completion and adoption of the new Master Plan for the property to address key issues of its conservation and management;*
4. *Also commends the State Party for its efforts to re-orient the priorities of the World Bank funded Vilcanota Valley Project to ensure its contribution to the development of a sustainable tourism programme for this area;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the Committee, through the World Heritage Centre, the plans for restoration and intervention at the major archaeological sites scheduled for 2006 before executing them, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines of the Convention;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to give priority to preparing a comprehensive sustainable financing strategy for the management of the property as to ensure the necessary resources for the implementation of the new Master Plan;*
7. *Takes note of the results of the International Workshop on Landslides at the Historical Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, in September 2005, which indicate reduced risk of landslides at the citadel, and requests that investigations continue and that training of local professionals be ensured in order to undertake systematic monitoring of the citadel as well as other vulnerable areas;*
8. *Urges the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a progress report on the preparation of the Risk Preparedness Plan by **30 October 2006**, given that fires and landslides take place every year, with disastrous consequences both in environmental and human terms;*
9. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN/ICOMOS mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and to work with the State Party on a strategy for the cooperation of all the parties involved in the implementation of the Master Plan;*
10. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007** a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress*

*made in the implementation of the Technical Plans embodied in the Master Plan,
for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

36. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1988

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1990-2005

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.16

28COM 15A.15

29COM 7A.14

29COM 8C.3

International Assistance:

Total amounts allocated to the property: 1989: USD 5,500, Preparatory Assistance ; 1991: USD 45,000, Technical Cooperation ; 1995: USD 15,500, Technical Cooperation ; 1996: USD 40,000, Technical Cooperation

UNESCO Extrabudgetary Funds:

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 85,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust with UNESCO)

Previous monitoring missions:

2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, World Heritage Centre missions

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) No management plan;
- b) Urban development pressure;
- c) Flooding risks and waste management problems

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the Committee, although having decided to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, also decided that if substantial progress was not made in drawing up a management and rehabilitation plan for the

preservation and sustainable development of the old city of Timbuktu, the property would be reinscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006).

In order to draft the management and rehabilitation plan, Mali obtained USD 15,000 in financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund, and technical assistance provided by Italy. At the invitation of the State Party, a World Heritage mission visited Timbuktu from 6 to 15 March 2006 to determine progress being made on drawing up the management and rehabilitation plan. The mission made the following observations at that time:

- a) A municipal order No. 002/CUT/2006 for the creation of a Committee for the Conservation and Management of the Old City of Timbuktu was officially signed by the Mayor of Timbuktu. This Committee, comprising community and administrative officials, as well as the Imams of the three mosques (Djingareyber, Sankoré, Sidi Yahia) is in charge of finalizing the management and conservation plan, and for its implementation for the period (2006-2010).
- b) The mission noted the full commitment of the national and municipal authorities of Timbuktu and the communities living in the old city to comply with the condition set out in Decision **29 COM7A.14**, by the deadline of 15 May 2006. The Imams and the inhabitants of the city had already provided to the coordinators drafting the management and rehabilitation plan all the information pertaining to the history and values of the property. The national authorities, through the intermediary of the Ministry of Culture, seconded a group of professionals to Timbuktu who were responsible for producing, by 15 May 2006, the document that should be submitted to the 30th session of the Committee.
- c) A definition of the objectives of short-, medium- and long-term conservation is currently being validated in public meetings with all concerned parties. Maps of the property are also being produced.

The Centre and ICOMOS were informed in December 2005, by letter from a civil servant, of a future construction project for the new Ahmed Baba Centre, which could be built on the land facing the Sankoré Mosque. This project, a joint initiative of the Presidents of South Africa and Mali, aims to safeguard the manuscripts, the oldest of which are thought to date from the 9th century, by providing the city of Timbuktu with an architectural complex which would house in one place a large library, as well as archive and research areas. The Centre's mission also analysed the impact that this future construction project might have on the Sankoré Mosque. From an analysis of the architectural documents, and the information gathered following the meetings with the authorities of the Ministries of National Education and Culture, the mission concluded that the present architectural project could affect the universal value of the World Heritage property. Indeed, the architectural project indicates that the construction would be carried out in the buffer zone. Its dimensions, typology, and the materials envisaged for its construction, do not provide a guarantee of the integrity and authenticity for which Timbuktu was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988. With regard to the operational aspect of this important project, the following recommendations, based on the *Vienna Memorandum* and the *Guidelines*, were formulated by this mission:

- a) It is essential to undertake a historical study of Sankoré Square, based on the objectives and activities defined in the management and conservation plan of Timbuktu. The purpose of this study will be to better understand the history of the

Square and its architecture, and to provide a framework for a spatial approach for a better integration of contemporary architecture in the future.

- b) The drafting of an urban development plan for Sankoré Square, including all measures to guarantee respect for the historic fabric, is a prerequisite to any architectural intervention. This framework, that could impact on the functionality of the Square, the typologies, materials, lighting, the urban furniture, the green spaces, would facilitate the coordination of the construction of all the contemporary buildings, in the respect of the universal value of the Sankoré Mosque.
- c) It is important for the authorities of Mali and South Africa to review the architectural concept of the project in order to ensure the compatibility of such a new construction next to the Sankoré Mosque, inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7A.14**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Thanks the State Party for having created a local steering committee for the conservation and management of the Old City of Timbuktu and for the actions undertaken for the elaboration of the management plan;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to pursue the development and to finalise the management and conservation plan for the property, and to initiate without further delay activities for its implementation;*
5. *Notes the importance of the construction of the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre to house the old manuscripts that will be used for training and research as well as the cooperation efforts between two States Parties, the Republic of Mali and South Africa;*
6. *Requests the States Parties to improve this architectural project for the cultural centre, taking into consideration the historic and aesthetic values of the site;*
7. *Also requests the State Party of Mali to provide the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the progress made in regard to the conditions set by the Committee to maintain the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2005, the progress made in the finalisation of the management and conservation plan and the activities initiated for its implementation, as well as for the improvement of the architectural project foreseen for the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

37. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)

See Document *WHC-06/340.COM/7B.Add*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

38. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1988

Criteria:

C (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.36

International Assistance:

Total amount allocated to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extrabudgetary Funds:

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 85,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust with UNESCO)

Previous monitoring missions:

2002; 2005; 2006, ICOMOS-ICCROM-World Heritage Centre mission

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) No management and conservation plan;
- b) Urban development pressure;
- c) Housing dilapidation;
- d) Waste management problem;
- e) Socio-cultural changes

Current conservation issues:

Following Decision **29 COM 7B.36**, an ICOMOS-ICCROM-World Heritage Centre mission visited the World Heritage site to assess the state of conservation of the property and propose solutions to ease urban development pressure and to make recommendations to the Committee at its 30th session. The mission, which was carried out from 13 to 17 March 2006, confirmed that the World Heritage property was effectively suffering from intense urban development pressure, for which urgent development and management measures needed to be taken to safeguard its integrity. This legitimate need for development must be accompanied by a set of measures that are in conformity with international standards in order to respond to the lack of guidance and resources concerning development. The inhabitants and the elected officials have the impression of living in a protected area where, in their view, “nothing is allowed”.

This development pressure is expressed in several ways:

- a) Non respect of the regulations in force (building permits, etc.);
- b) abandon of homes due to urban mobility requirements, the inappropriateness of the houses with regard to new needs for comfortable interior living areas and family composition;
- c) the will of the population to transform the spatial organisation of the houses using modern materials and techniques for restoration, which increasingly modifies the urban fabric;
- d) the inadequacy of the equipment for public services and other infrastructures, resulting in major changes in the urban morphology caused by inappropriate installation of electricity and street furniture, and the treatment of runoff water;
- e) the lack of technical and financial resources and competence within the Djenné Municipality to resolve the city's urban development and sanitation problems (waste water, household refuse, etc.);
- f) the implementation of the national development plan that does not take into consideration the requisite needs concerning the World Heritage status of Djenné;
- g) the increasing presence of administrative buildings around some of the archaeological sites that are part of the property, and the possible construction of different installations shown on the master plan for urban development being prepared;
- h) the degradation of the fixtures and furnishings of the archaeological areas caused by many years of inopportune trampling;

In order to ease this development pressure, the mission made the following recommendations:

- a) the preparation of an accurate map identifying the boundaries of all the components of the World Heritage property, especially the archaeological sites of Jenné-Jeno, Hambarkatelo, Kaniaana and Tonomba, the physical boundaries of which are not clearly defined at present;
- b) the establishment of urban and planning regulatory tools through a participative approach and in relation to the daily life of the populations;
- c) the urgent need to equip the municipal technical services and technical departments of the ministries concerned with references and regulations to guide their interventions with respect to the World Heritage status of the site, particularly with regard to the establishment of a system for the appropriate granting of building permits and the control of building sites;
- d) the creation of a buffer zone with a control mechanism for the application of urban and building regulations;
- e) the urgent preparation of a management and conservation plan for the Old Towns of Djenné, with two components: one for the ancient fabric of Djenné, and the other for the archaeological sites. This plan, based on participative action, must specify the way in which the Old Town, and the archaeological sites, should be conserved over a period of 5 to 10 years, and moreover, should provide guidance

for the preparation of urban or regional planning instruments such as the Master Plan for Urban Development and other mechanisms of control or urban planning.

The mission also encouraged the State Party to submit a request for financial assistance to the World Heritage Fund for the preparation of the necessary management plans and to establish an accurate map clearly defining the boundaries of all the components of the property.

Draft decision: 30 COM 7B.38

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.36**, adopted during its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Taking into account the pressure caused by development activities affecting the town of Djenné and the possible consequences to the property, as well as the lack of financial and technical resources, and competence within the Municipality of Djenné of a qualified local authority who could be alerted to threats to the property,*
4. *Requests the State Party to undertake all necessary measures to implement the recommendations of the March 2006 UNESCO-ICOMOS-ICCROM mission;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to submit a request for international assistance for the preparation of a management plan;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, before **1 February 2007**, with a state of conservation report of the property and progress achieved in the implementation of a management plan, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

39. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 12)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1980

Criteria:

C (i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

22 COM VII.31-41

29 COM 7B.34

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: The amount of USD 1,491,600 was provided for the “Aksum Archaeological Site Improvement Project: Preparatory studies for the re-erection of the Obelisk and capacity building for archaeological conservation” - Phase 1.

Previous monitoring missions:

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre conducted four missions to Aksum in October 2005, January, February and April 2006.

Main threats to the property identified in previous reports:

- a) Inexistence of the delimitation of this serial site;
- b) Lack of conservation and management plans;
- c) Lack of appropriate urban and architectural legislation;
- d) Lack of cartography, documentation and equipment.

Current conservation issues:

Following the return of the Aksum Obelisk, from Rome to Aksum, in April 2005, and in the framework of the Italian Funds in Trust, UNESCO has implemented the “Aksum Archaeological Site Improvement Project: “Preparatory studies for the re-erection of the Obelisk and capacity building for archaeological conservation – Phase 1”, started in October 2005. In close collaboration with the Ethiopian Authorities, UNESCO undertook Remote Sensing Investigations of the Aksum Stelae field in all the areas concerned by the re-erection works, an Impact Assessment Study for the planned re-erection of the Aksum Obelisk, a detailed Engineering Project for the re-erection of the Aksum Obelisk, as well as an outline Landscaping Project in the Stelae field.

The Remote Sensing Investigations allowed the identification of areas that need to be protected during the works, thus re-shaping the Engineering Project to preserve the site’s integrity and archaeological remains. In addition, and as a result of the risk assessment, the temporary consolidation of Stela 3 -the only remaining decorated *stela* erected *in situ*- was added to the initial activities to protect it from eventual negative effects during the re-erection works. The implementation of the re-erection works will start shortly, in the framework of the Italian Funds in Trust.

“The Ethiopian Cultural Heritage Project –Pilot Project” funded through a Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL) by the World Bank (USD 700,000), which has also benefited from a Japanese fund of USD 174,000 during the preparatory phase, is composed of a site museum and annexed services (including a cafeteria in a rehabilitated 19th century building), signage in all the areas of the serial site, training and capacity building in conservation techniques, tourism guiding and museum inventory, as well as infrastructure development in the old town of Aksum. This Project does not comprise a comprehensive management plan.

With reference to the World Heritage Committee request in 2005 (**29 COM 7B.34**) for the “World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM to undertake a mission to Aksum with view to evaluate its state of conservation and to submit a report to the Committee for consideration at its 30th session in 2006”, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in agreement with ICOMOS and ICCROM, considered that the present state of conservation

report could be prepared without a joint field mission to Aksum, for the following reasons:

- a) The World Heritage Centre is implementing a large scale project in Aksum; regular missions were thus conducted in 2005 and 2006, and technical reports, addressing management, training and institutional support, archaeological and environmental conservation, were undertaken by the World Heritage Centre Experts;
- b) The Training and Capacity building activities that are planned by the World Heritage Centre within the Aksum Obelisk re-erection project will address in 2006 and 2007 the main elements that concern the protection of the property: the management of the site, the definition of its boundaries and buffer zone, the legal framework, and the constitution of appropriate cartography and documentation.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.34, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to continue its support of the Ethiopian Government in abiding by the requirements of the World Heritage Convention in Aksum;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit an up-dated map of the property indicating clearly the boundaries of the World Heritage core and buffer zones;*
5. *Requests the State party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS-ICCROM mission to Aksum with a view to assessing its state of conservation and submit a report for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

40. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1978

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

21 COM VII.46 -1997

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: 1996 – USD 6,500 Restoration studies in Lalibela;
1980 – USD 57,386 Photogrammetric equipment

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Experts' missions to assess the European Union funded Project in Lalibela were conducted in April 1997, July 2004 and March 2005. The World Heritage Centre conducted a mission in October 2005.

Main threats to the property identified in previous reports:

- a) Rainfall, water infiltration and water run off;
- b) Lack of conservation and management plans.

Current conservation issues:

Since 1994, the European Union has been working on defining an action plan for the conservation of Lalibela. The European Union finally decided to fund a 9.1 million Euro project for the construction of large shelters over the churches in Lalibela to protect them from direct exposure to rain. The details of the project were evaluated by the World Heritage Centre in response to a request made by the Ethiopian Government in April 1997. In the World Heritage Bureau meeting (21st extraordinary session – Naples, 1997) the UNESCO experts described the construction works of shelters in Lalibela as ‘only a temporary answer’ and that only a recourse to the appropriate restoration techniques would lead to a solution that is ‘architecturally suitable’. The UNESCO experts recommended:

- “a) to use suitable techniques of restoration using local workforce and materials;
- b) to evaluate on site the need for technologically more advanced procedures and training for their use;
- c) to organise a long term management of the site which takes the territorial problems into account”.

In 1999, the European Union organised an international architectural competition for the construction of the shelters in Lalibela. A design was chosen by a jury, on which UNESCO was represented, following which the tender entitled “Temporary shelters for five rock hewn churches in Lalibela” was launched in 2002 and re-launched in 2005; the bids are currently under evaluation since their submission date was the 27th of April 2006.

To answer the request of the World Heritage Committee in 1997, the European Union included in the project complementary conservation initiatives in which the involvement of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre was solicited.

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre conducted two assessment missions to evaluate its participation to the European Union funded project, in July 2004 and March 2005. These missions provided new technical data that justified a reassessment of the shelters proposal. Tests conducted by the UNESCO experts showed that humidity was an important factor in the decay of the structures, due to the presence of *Montmorillonite* -a component that belongs to the mineral group of clays which expands several times its

original volume under humid atmospheric conditions- in the volcanic rock out of which the churches are hewn. Therefore, since these large shelters would not fully protect the churches from humidity and would prevent the rock from drying naturally, it was concluded that they were not an adequate answer to the current risks.

In addition, the UNESCO experts raised two important issues that are not addressed in the European Union funded shelters project: the environmental impact of the planned shelters and the feasibility of their dismantling.

In October 2005, the Director of the World Heritage Centre briefed the Ethiopian Authorities on the results of the recent studies conducted by the UNESCO Experts in Lalibela and expressed UNESCO's concern with regard to the implementation of the planned shelters and to their environmental impact. This concern was also shared with the European Commission Delegation in Addis Ababa.

However, the Ethiopian Ministry of Finance and Economic Development asked the European Commission Delegation, in a letter dated 5 April 2006 to proceed with the implementation of the planned shelters.

The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM consider that a detailed Impact Assessment Study of the proposed project should be undertaken and a restoration project formulated with a clear and feasible Action Plan, including a time-table for the dismantlement of the planned temporary shelters upon the completion of the restoration works.

The Impact Assessment Study should address:

- a) The impact of the construction works, equipment and machinery on the historic resources and the stone bedrock, and in particular the impact of the foundations;
- b) The channeling of rainwater from the shelters' roof surfaces;
- c) The risk presented by elements of the shelters dropping on the historic resources during/after the construction and during the dismantling of the shelters;
- d) The maintenance plan of the new roofing and its durability;
- e) The effects of the micro-climate created by the shelters on the historic resources;
- f) The potential impacts of the eventual dismantlement of the temporary shelters.

The Action Plan for the restoration work and subsequent dismantlement of the planned temporary shelters should include a detailed description of the activities and timetable for the restoration of the site, as well as a timeframe for the dismantling of the planned temporary shelters and the identification of the required financial resources.

The Action Plan and necessary amendments to the project that arise from the Impact Assessment Study need to be prepared before the start of any construction works on the site.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*

2. *Recalling Decision 21 COM VII.46, adopted at its 21st session (Naples, 1997),*
3. *Referring to the reports of the missions undertaken by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in July 2004 and March 2005, to evaluate its participation in the European Union funded project “Temporary shelters for five rock hewn churches in Lalibela”,*
4. *Taking note of the Ethiopian Government’s decision to implement the European Union funded Project,*
5. *Reiterates its request to the Ethiopian Government to prepare a conservation project that ensures an integrated approach;*
6. *Urges the Ethiopian Government to prepare, before any works are carried out on site, an Impact Assessment Study for the European Union funded Project in Lalibela, that addresses the integrity of the site during the construction and dismantlement works of the planned temporary shelters on the basis of the recommendations expressed by the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, as well as an Action Plan including a detailed description of the activities, the financial resources and timetable for the restoration of the site and the subsequent dismantling of the temporary shelters;*
7. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM mission to Lalibela, to review the Impact Assessment Study and Action Plan prepared by the Ethiopian Authorities, and report to the Committee at its 31st session in 2007;*
8. *Further requests the Ethiopian Authorities to take into account the recommendations of the above mission and make the amendments that might be considered necessary by the experts, and submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, on the status of the project for examination by the Committee in its 31st session in 2007.*

41. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2001

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.31

28 COM 15B.39

29 COM 7B.35

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: Technical cooperation for the rehabilitation of the Lamu Waterfront, 2004: USD 6,932

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

ICOMOS/UNESCO mission 22 to 27 March 2004

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of Management plan;
- b) Lack of risk preparedness, especially in the case of fire;
- c) Sewerage situation;
- d) Lack of resources

Current Conservation issues :

Following the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission to the property in March 2004, the State Party was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Decision **28 COM 15A.39**) to implement the recommendations of the mission and to submit a detailed report on its progress.

The State Party sent a report on the state of conservation of Lamu Old Town on 1 March 2005 to the World Heritage Centre, which was transmitted to ICOMOS for review.

On the basis of the report, prepared by the National Museum of Kenya, Lamu, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre concluded that, while the property was in a relatively good state of conservation, no restoration and upgrading of public areas had taken place since the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. Concern was also raised about the lack of progress on implementing the recommendations of the 2004 mission, especially concerning the establishment of a management plan to protect the character of the town.

It was also noted that a decline in tourism had occurred, due to water and sanitation problems. A UNESCO mission was undertaken to Lamu Island from 12 to 22 February 2005 to assess the situation on water distribution, solid and liquid waste, in relation to public health, as recommended by the Committee at its 28th session (**28 COM 15B.39**). This was carried out with the support of the Italian Government through the Italian Funds-in-Trust. The mission noted inappropriate provisions for water supply and an inadequate sanitation system. The mission also emphasized the need to protect the vital water catchment area in the sand dunes off Lamu Island, from uncontrolled and illegal development.

During its 29th session, the World Heritage Committee reiterated its request to the State Party to initiate and develop a management plan for Lamu Old Town, and to consider extending the core and buffer zones of the site, to include the Shella Sand Dunes and the mangrove area on Manda Island, to better ensure the integrity of the World Heritage Property.

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on the status of the World Heritage property at the end of January 2006. The report notes some significant steps forward in conservation, including a building condition audit carried out in September

2005; the creation of a World Heritage secretariat to help manage the property significantly increasing staff expertise available for conservation; the Gazetting of a new local Planning Commission - not yet functional; some physical improvement projects being initiated – waterfront, Harambee St.; and the planning for design and installation of interpretive signs. Despite these positive developments, however, the report illustrates that the principal recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th and 29th session are not being implemented. In particular:

- a) No progress has been made in the preparation of the management plan, urgently needed to identify ways to reconcile the different interests that may affect the heritage value of the property;
- b) No measures have been taken to improve water sanitation and waste disposal;
- c) The buffer zone has been extended to include the Shella water catchments (now gazetted) but not the two complementary areas OF Ras Kitau and Manda Island. The Shella water catchment area is marred by illegal sales of over 20 parcels of land to private investors.

Moreover, the risk-preparedness issues referred to previously by the Committee have yet to be addressed including the dangers linked to the uncontrolled stocking of petrol fuel in Makuti (grass) thatched houses, which have caused severe fires in the past.

The report also makes clear that the principal impediments to conservation and to implementation of the Committee's recommendations are the degree to which private interests are able to prevail over the public good. The National Museums of Kenya are required to intervene constantly to redress behaviours forbidden in law but which local authorities and leaders lack the will or capacity to confront. It is hoped that the newly created Local Planning Commission for Lamu, officially gazetted in 2005, but not yet operational, might assist in providing the necessary guidance and authority to overcome the problems cited.

ICOMOS noted that, despite the commitment of a small core of dedicated conservation professionals working in Lamu and with the national Museums of Kenya, the political will to protect Lamu World Heritage property seems to be lacking. ICOMOS believes that, if the State Party is unable in a year's time (i.e. by the 31st session of the Committee) to comply with the requests made by the Committee already at its 28th session at Suzhou, then the Committee should consider placing the site on the World Heritage List in Danger.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.41

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.35**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the successful efforts of those concerned with conservation locally to make some small improvements for conservation in the course of the last year, particularly the establishment of a well staffed World Heritage secretariat for Lamu;*

4. *Notes with great concern* that the principal recommendations of the Committee at its 28th and 29th sessions (management plan, buffer zone extension, improvement to sanitation, water supply, and waste management) have not been implemented;
5. *Requests* the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee at its 28th and 29th sessions, for review by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007, **in order to determine whether the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

42. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1991

Criteria :

C (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

2000, 24th Session

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 150,000 for preparatory assistance, emergency assistance and technical cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds :

Total amount provided to the property: Japan Funds in trust: USD 1,108,078 for the rehabilitation of San Sebastian Fortress ; UCCLA: USD 526,015 for the rehabilitation of San Sebastian Fortress.

Previous monitoring missions:

2000, ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

2006, World Heritage Centre missions

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of management and conservation plan;
- b) Buildings threatened with collapse; sanitation problems,

Current conservation problems:

In 2003, UNESCO and the Government of Mozambique signed an agreement for the rehabilitation of the San Sebastian Fortress, one of the most important monuments in the Island of Mozambique. The project will focus on three key activities: (i) Prevention from further deterioration of the Fortress; (ii) Restoration and limited re-use of the Fortress for new functions; (iii) Development of a Management and maintenance program for the Fortress. The Project execution involves a multidisciplinary team of professionals comprising conservators, architects, historians, archivists and archaeologists, artisans, etc.

It will also involve a construction company specialized in restoration of architectural heritage.

Having noted delay in the starting-up of the rehabilitation project, UNESCO organized, in July 2005, an Expert meeting in Island of Mozambique to define a new strategy, aiming at commencing rehabilitation works of the San Sebastian Fortress. The meeting defined a strategy based on the following:

- a) To contract an architectural firm to produce all the technical documents (execution drawings, technical specifications, bill of quantities, etc.) necessary for the publication of the tender for the rehabilitation work;
- b) To hire a UNESCO Chief Technical Advisor, to be based in Island of Mozambique, who should coordinate the project on a daily basis and provide regular progress reports to UNESCO;
- c) To consider on-site technical supervision to ensure quality work and respect for technical specifications;
- d) To give priority to the prevention from further deterioration of the Fortress;
- e) To reduce the duration of the project from 3 to 2 years.

In view of developing a comprehensive and realistic integrated work plan for the implementation of the project, including the definition of an effective implementation strategy and a monitoring and evaluation plan, the UNESCO Office in Maputo requested the World Heritage Centre to ensure the backstopping of the whole process. Accordingly, the World Heritage Centre organized, from September to November 2005, a series of activities aiming at briefing to the Governments of Japan and Portugal and discussing with them the possibilities of readjustment of the initial budgets. On 31 January 2006, the Permanent Delegation of Portugal sent a letter to inform UNESCO of its decision to contribute with an amount of USD 102,900 to the post of UNESCO Chief Technical Advisor and submitted the CV of a Portuguese Expert who is specialized in the field of architectural conservation for consideration by UNESCO. The revised budgets were submitted to the Government of Japan and to UCCLA in March 2006 and the bidding process for the architectural firm will be launched as soon as the adjusted budgets are approved.

A World Heritage Centre mission was undertaken from 16 January to 23 January 2006 in order to participate in the selection of the Architectural firms that UNESCO will invite to bid for the preparation of the Fortress's technical documents. Out of the 12 international architectural firms that expressed their interest, four firms were retained and will be invited to propose strategies for the rehabilitation work.

The mission also assessed the state of conservation of the World Heritage site and was able to determine that the Island of Mozambique is seriously threatened by a number of dangers that can be summarized as follows:

- a) In the "Museum" zone, numerous buildings risk collapsing because of their advanced state of degradation. This is mainly due to their abandonment by private owners, and to significant water leakage in most of the roofs which affects the floors and the walls;

- b) There is a lack of information on the conditions of the architectural heritage (deteriorating, in ruins, poor, good, etc.). A detailed survey of the state of conservation of this heritage would enable the definition of an overall conservation and development approach for the World Heritage property;
- c) The authenticity of the historic fabric is today seriously questionable. Indeed, the number of ruins seems important, new structures are being built and important historic buildings are being altered in ways that are incompatible with their original materials and design. Furthermore the Municipality continues to deliver building permits without a proper procedure to assess what is being designed or restored or to even control what is being done on the ground. There is no established conservation agency which could even assist the Municipality to deal with this lack of expertise;
- d) The World Heritage property does not have a proper sewer drainage system for the people living in the Museum area or in the Macuti area. As a result, the majority of the residents use the beaches as an open air toilet;
- e) The management plan, whose preparation had been launched in 2003, has not yet been finalized. A site manager has not yet been appointed by the National Directorate for Culture to be based in the island.

Finally, a UNESCO-Africa Development Bank (AfDB) mission was carried out between 6 and 14 March 2006. This mission was aimed at paving the way for the development of a programme for the Island of Mozambique integrating heritage and sustainable development. The Mission discussed with the national authorities the possible terms of reference for such a programme, or Action Plan, as well as the steps required for its implementation, including the setting up of a responsible Unit within the Municipality.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.42

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Noting with great concern that Island of Mozambique continues to be threatened by the serious degradation of its historical monuments, the lack of a detailed architectural survey, the lack of conservation, management and planning mechanism, capacity and sanitation problems,*
3. *Further noting the results of the joint UNESCO-AfDB mission for developing a sustainable development programme for the World Heritage property,*
4. *Strongly encourages the State Party to appoint a site manager, to complete the conservation and management plan and to identify appropriate governance processes and structures;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, on the progress made in the rehabilitation of the San Sebastian Fortress, the development of the UNESCO-AfDB Programme, and the finalization of the conservation and management plan, for the consideration by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007;*

6. *Further requests the State Party to invite a ICOMOS mission to the property in 2007 with the view to evaluate the state of conservation of property and to make recommendations to the Committee for consideration at its 31st session in 2007.*

43. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List :

1978

Criteria :

C (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger :

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions :

27 COM 7B.33

28 COM 15B.42

29 COM 7B.37

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property : USD 33,071, in 1981 - Emergency assistance to consolidate the threatened western fortification USD 19,529, in 1981 – training of technicians charged with the rehabilitation of the island.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property : N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

2004, ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre joint mission

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of management structure for the property on the island
- b) Building threatened to collapse;
- c) Maritime erosion;
- d) Construction of the replica of the Goree Memorial

Current conservation issues:

During its 29th Session (Durban, 2005), the Committee expressed its concern over information concerning the grave threats that continue to endanger the buildings in the northern zone of the Island and urged the State Party to undertake urgent work in order to prevent their collapse and halt maritime erosion. In a report received in April 2006, the State Party informed the Centre that the following activities were being undertaken in order to improve the state of conservation of the property:

a) *Restoration and rehabilitation works*

Significant restoration and rehabilitation works had been undertaken for the following historic buildings: the City Hall, the Mosque, the Church, and the Henriette Bathily Museum for Women. Within the framework of the cooperation with the Walloon Region (Belgium), lime mortars and plasters were re-introduced through on-site-training activities

and important conservation works had been carried out on buildings in a very serious state of deterioration. According to the State Party, 200 millions FCFA (i.e. Franc de la Communauté Financière Africaine) were invested in total in restoration works for the Island. 250 millions FCFA were also invested for the rehabilitation of two historic buildings, housing respectively a Clinic and a Cultural Centre.

b) Replica of Goree Memorial

The State Party informed the World Heritage Centre of its intention to implement appropriate corrective measures for limiting the negative impact of the replica of the Goree Memorial on the property. However, the State Party mentioned its concern about the possible negative consequences of the physical destruction of the replica which, if not properly carried out, might damage the structure of the Castel monument on which it is built. It has therefore requested support for an Expert mission to advice on the appropriate ways to implement these corrective measures.

c) Appointment of a site manager

The Ministry of Culture is in the process of appointing a site manager for the day-to-day management of the World heritage property. The Senegalese professional who has been identified is currently based full-time in the Island. With support from the Africa 2009 Programme, he is undertaking several training programmes in cultural heritage conservation and management.

ICOMOS and the WHC note that further work has been undertaken in view of the demolition of the Gorée Memorial Replica and do not consider that any expert mission is needed before destrucion is undertaken.

On 30 September 2005, UNESCO received a letter dated 28 September 2005 addressed to the Director General of UNESCO from his Excellency the President of Senegal, Mr Abdoulaye Wade. In his letter, the President informed the Director General of the severe coastal erosion problems facing Gorée Island as well as of the discussions he had had with H.E. the Emir of Qatar on the issue of Gorée during his visits to New York. The Director General was informed of the interest of Qatar to finance the coastal rehabilitation of Gorée with funds from the Qatar Foundation, under the patronage of Her Royal Highness the Queen of Qatar. In his response to the President, dated 4 October 2005, the Director General expressed the readiness of UNESCO to assist in the project in view of the interest accorded by the Organization to the historical significance of Gorée World Heritage Site, and further informed that UNESCO would undertake a mission to Qatar in order to concretize the modalities for the execution of the project.

On 8 November 2005, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Senegal confirming the interest of UNESCO to collaborate with both Member States in the framework of the project. Furthermore, on 30 March 2006, the Director General of UNESCO addressed a letter to Her Royal Highness the Queen of Qatar, whose Foundation will most likely sponsor the project, to inform her that he had designated a UNESCO official who would accompany to Qatar the Director of the Office of Architecture at the Presidential Palace of Senegal, to discuss the modalities of funding and implementation of the project.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.43

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/03.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.37** adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005)*
3. *Notes with concern the potential negative impact of coastal and marine erosion on the Island of Gorée;*
4. *Expresses its full support to the proposed project for the coastal rehabilitation of the Island of Gorée, with possible funding from the Qatar Foundation, and strongly encourages the State Party and the World Heritage Centre to take all the necessary actions towards its finalization and actual implementation;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the Committee at the 31st session in 2007.*

44. Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

ARAB STATES

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

45. Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1987

Criteria:

C (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.41

28 COM 15B.46

29 COM 7B.43

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Reactive Monitoring mission in September 2003; World Heritage Centre mission in November 2003; UNESCO-Rabat mission in March 2005; Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission in April 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Near total abandonment of the property;
- b) Gully erosion;
- c) Rock falls due to erosion;
- d) Increased offences in the old *ksar* and its degradation;
- e) Delays in the establishment of a technical and administrative structure responsible for the site;
- f) Lack of a Conservation management plan for the property;
- g) Uncontrolled tourism and visitor pressure.

Current conservation issues:

As requested by the Committee, the State Party submitted a report, dated 25 January 2006, in which it provided information about the progress made regarding conservation and management of the property. The multi-sectoral committee, presided by the Governor

of Ouarzazate and composed of CERKAS (*Centre de Conservation et de Réhabilitation du Patrimoine Architectural des Zones Atlasiques et Subatlasiques*), a delegation of the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Housing, division of Urbanism and local authorities, continued their work on site to prevent and control violations against planning and building regulations. The Ministry of Culture and CERKAS, assisted by CRATerre (*Centre International de la Construction en Terre*) and in coordination with UNESCO Rabat and UNDP, had started the drafting of a site management plan following the decentralization of the USD 20,000 international assistance from the World Heritage Fund. Issues of conservation and the physical deterioration of the site were being addressed with a strategy for action, involving a wide range of stakeholders and under supervision of the Prime Minister. Furthermore, the report included details of the request for human and financial resources made to the Prime Minister and to be allocated to CERKAS to strengthen local management on site.

UNESCO's World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS undertook a reactive monitoring mission to assess whether the site met the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission took place from 21 to 25 April 2006. It reviewed the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, evaluated the overall state of conservation of the site, assessed if it met the criteria for danger listing and elaborated a programme of priorities to strengthen conservation and management.

The mission noted that conditions on site were not as alarming as previous reports had suggested and that rehabilitation work had been recently carried out on many structures, with due respect for authenticity, including the ramming of earth into shuttering. Nevertheless, inappropriate development did take place, especially in some recently constructed small shops, and a carpet workshop for women now under construction in the Ksar that had a concrete post and beam structure. The recommendation to establish a management structure has partly been implemented, as two committees had been established, at the local and the inter-ministerial level, while a request for reinforcement of CERKAS had been submitted to the Prime Minister.

The mission concluded that the State Party was engaged at several levels, from the local to the national, in setting up structures, plans and guidelines, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, through consultation and coordination processes. While full implementation had not yet taken place, the first results and impact of the work of the committees and CERKAS on the state of conservation of the site were noticeable and positive. There was a professional and technically competent conservation manual, prepared by CRATerre, that had just been published, with support from UNESCO, with the majority of interventions being implemented accordingly; this manual is going to be used to sensitize and educate the property owners and the general public in the Ksar; a management plan is under preparation based on an integrated approach with long-term vision, including visitor control; as well as an emergency action plan with priorities that the mission adapted for benchmarking.

Furthermore, the mission assessed the validity of the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and concluded that at the moment the Outstanding Universal Value of Ksar Aït-Ben-Haddou had not been compromised. Only the issue of *Lack of conservation policy* might have possibly justified consideration for danger listing, but the on-going process to set up an adequate conservation framework appeared to have gained sufficient momentum and the necessary elements were being put in place. The mission was of the opinion that this policy could be established soon and proposes to allow the

process of conservation management more time to develop satisfactorily. To facilitate this, the mission established benchmarks for the future assessment of the effectiveness of measures taken by the State Party.

These benchmarks, to be effectively implemented by 1 February 2008 included:

- a) Establishment of an effective and transparent management structure, with legal powers, adequate financing and technical staffing. The mission noted that CERKAS should be given this role and be strengthened, technically, professionally and financially, to establish a permanent presence on site.
- b) Establishment of a mechanism for collection of revenues (from the film industry, visitors, marketing, etc.) and re-distribution to benefit conservation management of the site. The mission further noted that until such mechanism has been established, a financial injection by the Government of Morocco is needed to reinforce CERKAS and its conservation activities.
- c) Establishment of a Special Decree or by-laws to mandate interventions regarding ownership issues in relation to planning activities, particularly for structures in a critical state.
- d) Finalization of the Draft and formal adoption of the management plan.
- e) Continuation of preventive conservation measures with increased programming in respect of the buildings requiring urgent intervention to prevent further decay and deterioration, to be developed simultaneously with setting up the management plan.

Failure to respond to the benchmarks, and the absence of guardianship and continuous conservation and monitoring through a permanent management structure on site, might lead the Committee to reconsider Danger listing in the future.

The State Party should be commended for the efforts made to address the many conservation challenges on this site. The recent World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission made a clear distinction between perceived and real threats to the outstanding universal value of the site. However, it is to be noted that the completion of an effective integrated site management plan requires the full participation of the management authority who will have the responsibility to implement the plan; at this stage, while two overview Committees identified in the report (a local committee that comprised representatives of local and national stakeholders, and an inter-ministerial Committee, focused on improving cooperation at the highest level) have been created, it should be understood that these Committees can not substitute for a much needed local management authority, not yet in place. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS strongly support the recommendation of the mission report that a separate management entity “would be needed that has a permanent presence on site, with the authority to work on the day-to-day management, and capable of reporting to all parties.”

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.45

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*

2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.4** and **29 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Takes note of the report of the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission which took place from 21-25 April 2006;*
4. *Commends the State Party for having committed itself at the highest level to address the issues of concern expressed through the decisions of the Committee, particularly through the creation of local and inter-ministerial committees that guide action and notes with satisfaction the initiation of a site management plan based on an integrated approach;*
5. *Notes that, although the property's Outstanding Universal Value has not been compromised at this moment in time, without strengthened management supported by an integrated site management plan, the situation remains critical;*
6. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations issued by the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission of 2006 and endorses the following benchmarks to be effectively implemented by **1 February 2008** for the future assessment of the effectiveness of measures to be taken by the State Party:*
 - a) *Adoption and implementation of an effective Management Structure;*
 - b) *Establishment of a mechanism for collection of revenues on site and re-distribution to benefit conservation management of the site;*
 - c) *Establishment of a Special Decree or by-laws to mandate interventions regarding ownership issues in relation to planning activities, particularly for structures in a critical state;*
 - d) *Finalization, formal adoption and implementation of the management plan;*
 - e) *Continuation of preventive conservation measures with increased programming in respect of the buildings requiring urgent intervention to prevent further decay and deterioration.*
7. *Requests the State Party to finalise the draft of the management plan and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**;*
8. *Recommends that the State Party invite a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission before the next session of the Committee in 2007 to monitor progress and support the Moroccan Government in its activities to achieve the benchmarks by **1 February 2008**;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the state of conservation of the property, and on the progress achieved in meeting each of the above-mentioned benchmarks, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

46. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

47. Medina of Essaouira (formerly Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2001

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.45

29 COM 7B.47

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 52,500 for preparatory and emergency assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Reactive Monitoring mission in September 2003; UNESCO-Rabat mission in February 2005; Joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission in April 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Progressive deterioration of the built framework;
- b) Absence of a rehabilitation policy for the Mellah Quarter (open air garbage dump, sewage runoff on the outer walls of houses, continuous collapse of the buildings);
- c) Advanced deterioration of the maritime part of the fortified wall of the Medina;
- d) Construction of two commercial complexes in the “buffer zone”.

Current conservation issues:

As requested by the Committee, the State Party submitted a report, dated 25 January 2006, providing information about progress made in improving conservation and management of the property. The authorities of the Municipality, the Province and the external services of the Ministerial Departments represented in Essaouira have been engaged, under supervision of the Prime Minister, in the sensitization and relocation of approximately two-thirds of the inhabitants of the Mellah, one of the historic quarters of the Medina of Essaouira, to new residences outside the historic city. These authorities have initiated a comprehensive study of the rehabilitation and restoration of the Mellah

and its Atlantic wall (under implementation by the Ministry of Housing), as well as multiple clean-up actions, a partial restoration of the wall (the interior façade at Bab Doukkala) and pavement and lighting of the Rue Mellah. Terms of Reference have been established for a comprehensive study for the protection of the Atlantic wall of the Medina against the action of the sea.

The report also described two new construction projects, the first next to Bab Sbâa and the second opposite Bab Doukkala, in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, already initiated prior to inscription. The projects, both in their final phase were primarily intended to enhance public spaces that had been in a state of abandonment for several years. The Ministry of Culture had guided discussions to ensure a proper integration of the two projects into their cultural-historic environment.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS undertook a reactive monitoring mission to review implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and to evaluate the state of conservation of the property, as well as the new projects in the buffer zone of the protected property. The mission took place from 26 to 29 April 2006.

The mission noted that the overall state of conservation of the Medina of Essaouira was fairly good and had improved in recent years, in particular due to the recent clean-up and demolition of ruinous structures in the Mellah, which had constituted health and safety hazards. The mission was able to draw comparisons with an earlier visit (1998) where formerly a totally ruined and slum-type of neighbourhood existed against the Atlantic wall, the area was now clean and full of tourists following the trail through the historic quarters of Essaouira. Artisanal workshops, new hotels and restaurants were bringing investment, trade and activity to this part of town. Other areas in this district were earmarked for demolition, although the mission was re-assured that only those structures beyond repair would be involved and that the best and most valuable structures together with the traditional street-plan of the Mellah would be maintained. The mission stressed the need for a proper balance regarding investment in new hotels and restaurants and the traditional residential function, as well as for documentation of those structures and parts of the Mellah earmarked for demolition.

The mission was of the opinion that the municipality had entered into a very challenging process that would require vigilance and constant monitoring. The section of the city now demolished requires careful planning to introduce high-quality, contemporary architectural design interventions, which at the same time preserve memory and spirit of place. There is a need for a delicate balance between old and new to ensure designs both sensitive to the cultural-historic character of the place, as well as a creative and imaginative continuation of Moroccan architectural culture.

As regards the two new construction projects, both located in the designated buffer zone, the mission noted two points. Firstly, although land purchase and permission for the projects were obtained prior to World Heritage inscription, the mission regretted that these projects were not brought to the attention of the World Heritage Centre for information and advice, in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*. Secondly the projects enhanced, to a great extent, the public spaces in respect of their revitalization, amenity and accessibility to local residents and visitors.

The project located next to Bab Sbaa to the south of the Great Mosque Ben Youssef is of modern design, one story in height and of appropriate proportion, reflecting the

surrounding cultural-historic features. Part of the project had involved the design of a large paved area in front of the Mosque and city wall, with green spaces and good access for full use by local residents. The mission felt that, despite its location in the buffer zone so close to the city wall, this solution represented a substantial improvement over the previous situation.

The project located outside Bab Doukkala was still under construction and the mission noted two concerns, both shared by local professionals: height and proportion did not follow the historic fabric, while the design was of questionable quality. There were however, collateral improvements connected to this project: the public space and adjoining city wall are to be improved considerably, while economic revitalisation would greatly benefit this part of town. From a town planning point of view, the location of the project (constituting 80 residential and 62 commercial units) is ideal, in creating a pole opposite the existing economic and touristic centre located around Bab El Menzeh – thus establishing an economic and cultural axis through the Medina of Essaouira.

Despite these relatively positive impacts, the mission stressed the necessity of respecting the buffer zone and ensuring that no future incompatible construction projects are carried out in this area.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.45** and **29 COM 7B.47**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Takes note of the report of the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission which took place from 26 to 29 April 2006;*
4. *Commends the State Party for having taken encouraging steps to address the concerns expressed by the Committee, particularly the clean-up and rehabilitation of the Mellah Quarter and partial restoration of the Atlantic wall;*
5. *Notes that, although the actions taken have already had visible impact on investments, economic activities, visitor access and safety, the task lying ahead will be long and complex, and that continued vigilance and monitoring will be critical to maintain the values of the property, including its Outstanding Universal Value;*
6. *Urges the State Party to incorporate these measures as a priority into an integrated site management plan, which should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for information and consultation;*
7. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report, by **1 February 2008**, on the state of conservation of the property and progress in the restoration, rehabilitation and redesign of the Mellah Quarter with its Atlantic wall, based on an integrated approach within a site management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

48. M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1982

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 25.2.2

28 COM 15 B.44

International Assistance:

Total amounts granted to the property: USD 60,000 for Preparatory Assistance and Technical Cooperation (up to 2004).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount granted to the property: USD 25,000 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention during 2003-2004.

Previous monitoring missions:

September 2001: World Heritage Centre mission; December 2003, World Heritage Centre mission and expertise in the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Development linked to socio-economic changes and population growth, causing strong urban pressure;
- b) Deterioration of the environment, uncontrolled urban growth in the palm groves and the bed of the *wadi*, visual impact impaired by new construction on the hills;
- c) Lack of a legal protection framework and safeguarding plan;
- d) Loss of craftsmanship and knowledge of traditional materials for the rehabilitation of the vernacular architecture;
- e) Loss of the traditional system for the management and distribution of water;
- f) Risk of flooding and pollution of the ground water.

Current conservation issues:

In previous reports, emphasis was placed on the need to ensure the legal protection of the property, with regard to urban development pressure. The nomination dossier of the M'Zab Valley as a Safeguarded Sector had been prepared by the Office for the Protection and Promotion of the M'Zab Valley (OPVM) in 2003, in conformity with Law 98-04 relating to heritage protection. It should enable the Algerian authorities to preserve the landscape value of the property and the contrast between the built and non-built areas. The executive decree concerning the creation of the Safeguarded Sector was finally adopted in 2005.

Independent of this procedure, the Algerian authorities implemented a very dynamic restoration policy concerning the most important monuments and the rehabilitation of vernacular architecture of the *ksour*. This work, which was carried out by OPVM in cooperation with the population and the different State services, led notably to the creation of new quarters inspired by the ancient *ksour*. Furthermore, OPVM has compiled and disposes of very extensive documentation that enables it to carry out ongoing awareness raising and training activities.

Reestablishment of the management of the dilapidated hydraulic network was also part of the priorities to ensure the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of this property. Following a request to the World Heritage Fund, OPVM implemented between 2003 and 2005, the project entitled *Rehabilitation of the traditional hydraulic system in the M'Zab Valley*, concerning the following activities:

- a) Preparation of basic documentation;
- b) Surveys of the area (general plan, sections, façades);
- c) Documentation concerning hydraulic data;
- d) Typology of local construction materials;
- e) Description of the hydraulic system;
- f) Preparation of the documentation required for repair work of the system;
- g) Emergency work and rehabilitation.

On 11 April 2006, the State Party sent a concise report on the implementation of the decision taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session in 2004, providing the Committee with new information, as follows:

1) The listing of the M'Zab Valley as a Safeguarded Sector:

The delimitation and the creation of the protected area of the M'Zab Valley by Executive Decree No 05-209, published in the Official Journal on 5 June 2005.

2) The Permanent Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan:

- a) The prescription for the preparation of the Permanent Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan was undertaken by the Ministry for Culture and the Wilaya de Ghardaïa;
- b) Funds have been allocated for the period 2006-2007 for the preparation of the permanent plan for the safeguarding and enhancement of the M'Zab Valley;
- c) A meeting of the Mixed Committee, comprising representatives of the Ministry for Culture and the Wilaya de Ghardaïa should be held shortly to decide upon an emergency plan, foreseen in the first phase of the execution of the permanent plan for the safeguarding and enhancement of the Safeguarded Sector.

3) The hydraulic network:

- a) To improve the presentation of the water separation system, the following actions have already been undertaken:
 - Site surveys above the Ghardaïa palm grove;
 - Consolidation and restoration work of the hydraulic works.
- b) A project is underway for the implementation of the water separation system in the Ghardaïa palm grove:
 - Construction of an access road;
 - Construction of an orientation and information centre;

- Restoration of the building for the Management Commission of the water separation system ;
- Enhancement of the site by the installation of a lighting system.

4) Definition of the non aedificandi areas:

These areas will be indicated by the Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Enhancement of the M'Zab Valley. Development, restoration and urbanism projects are submitted for examination by the Mixed Committee, which can delay proceedings until the approval of the Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Enhancement.

It should therefore be noted that, despite numerous actions undertaken by the State Party for the protection and the conservation of the property, the Development and Safeguarding Plan for the M'Zab Valley, considered as a priority since the 2001 mission, still remains at the preparatory phase.

Draft decision : 30 COM 7B.48

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.44**, adopted during its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the creation and the delimitation of the Safeguarded Sector of the M'Zab Valley by Executive Decree N° 05-209 dated 5 June 2005 and requests the State Party to transmit to the World Heritage Centre a copy of the Decree and the corresponding topographical maps or cadastral survey indicating the listed perimeter and its eventual buffer zone;*
4. *Congratulates the State Party for the numerous actions carried out, notably the rehabilitation of the traditional hydraulic network, in a sustainable development perspective;*
5. *Regrets that the Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Enhancement of the M'Zab Valley, already initiated in 2001, was still in draft form and urges the State Party to accelerate its elaboration during the 2006-2007 exercise, as a budget has been allocated for this purpose, as well as that of the definition of the non aedificandi areas;*
6. *Recommends to the State Party to submit a request for international assistance to obtain the support of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in this respect;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Committee, before **1 February 2008**, a report on progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

49. Qal'at al-Bahrain Archaeological Site (Bahrain) (C 1192)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2005

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 8B.26

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre mission in 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

When inscribing this property on the World Heritage List at its 29th Session in 2005, the Committee requested the State Party to submit complete management and conservation plans for the property for consideration at its 30th Session in 2006 (decision **29 COM 8B.26**). The State Party was requested to refrain from approving any land reclamation or construction in the sea anywhere in front of the site and to check the new construction on existing reclaimed land in order to protect the visual integrity of the site and to maintain the principal views within the area nominated. The conservation and consolidation of the fortress and of the excavated area were expected to be firmly integrated into both the management and the conservation plans.

The State Party submitted an Action Plan and a Progress Report on actions carried out to produce a management plan for the site. This is an impressive piece of work, covering the points raised by the Committee at its 29th Session. It explains that the management and conservation plans were not yet complete, since the Directorate of Culture and National Heritage had to concentrate its efforts on stopping the planned development projects referred to in the Committee's decision. Steady progress has been made, but it has not been possible to begin detailed work on the plans until all the problems are resolved.

One of the annexes to this document was the report on the mission carried out from 27 January to 2 February 2006 by an expert from the World Heritage Centre. The mission report notes that important development projects have been planned in the northern part of the country, where Qal'at al-Bahrain Archaeological Site is located. Notably, an important artificial island (North Star project) and a causeway are foreseen in the immediate vicinity

of the site. It is important to note that the mission benefited from the full assistance of the Government officials in charge of these projects.

This mission report made a number of recommendations, among which the following are the most significant:

- a) To ensure that the decisions taken at the highest level of the State Party, as regards the abandonment or relocation of the North Star project and the proposed zoning of the area surrounding the Archaeological Site of Qal'at al-Bahrain be officially reported to the World heritage Centre as soon as possible ;
- b) To collaborate with the World Heritage Centre on the identification of the most appropriate solution for the construction of the causeway, in order to respond to the concern relating to the traffic congestion of the northern coast while preserving the visual integrity in the sea in front of the site ;
- c) To define the legislative framework for the protection of the World Heritage Site, which is currently being discussed ;
- d) To postpone any archaeological excavation in the protected areas within the core zone, concentrating on archaeological survey in the most threatened areas (notably in the buffer zone and the bay in front of the site) ;
- e) To create a National Committee for World Heritage, based on close collaboration between national authorities, the civil society, and the private sector ;
- f) To include the local community in the management process, notably the inhabitants of the village located on the southern border of the archaeological hill, who complain about their life conditions and have expressed their will to move elsewhere.

Moreover, in order to better reflect the outstanding universal value of the site as ancient capital of the Dilmun civilization, the State Party requested the World Heritage Committee to consider the change of the name of the property from "Qal'at al-Bahrain Archaeological Site" to "Qal'at al-Bahrain – the ancient harbour and capital of Dilmun" (*Document WHC-06/30.COM/8B*).

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.49

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 8B.26, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party on its commitment for the protection and conservation of the World Heritage property;*
4. *Notes that priority has been given to the resolution of the main threats which are likely to affect the property (the North Star and causeway projects);*
5. *Requests the State Party to send an official letter to the World Heritage Centre confirming the decision to abandon or relocate the North Star project and requesting the assistance of the World Heritage Centre in view of the delimitation of*

a “visual corridor” in which any land reclamation in the bay in front of the property would be prohibited in order to preserve the visual integrity of the latter;

6. *Encourages the State Party to collaborate with the World Heritage Centre on the identification of the most appropriate solution, concerning the construction of the causeway off the property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, a progress report on the recommendations made in points 5 and 6 above, as well as on the elaboration of the management and conservation plans, the definition of the legislative framework for the protection of the World Heritage Site, the archaeological survey in the most threatened areas surrounding the core zone and the response to the issues relating to the future re-housing of part of the local community, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

50. Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

C (i) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.36

28 COM 15B.47

29 COM 7B.42

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 503,849 (approved)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions in August 2002 and March 2005

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Rise of the underground water level;
- b) Dilapidated infrastructure;
- c) Neglect and lack of maintenance;
- d) Overcrowded areas and buildings;
- e) Uncontrolled development;
- f) Absence of a defined protection perimeter for the property and of a comprehensive Urban Conservation Plan;

- g) Absence of an integrated socio-economic revitalization plan linking the urban and the socio-cultural fabric of the city core.

Current conservation issues:

An International Symposium on the Conservation and Restoration of Islamic Cairo, which took place in 2002, and follow up discussions within the Committee at its 27th and 28th sessions, identified a number of key recommendations to improve conservation of old Cairo. These included:

- a) Designating Islamic Cairo as a Special Planning District, with buffer zones, in accordance with the provision of the *Operational Guidelines*;
- b) Preparing a comprehensive Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City, whereby the conservation of historic buildings would be accompanied by appropriate development regulations to encourage the rehabilitation of the urban fabric so as to ensure its compatibility with the historic character of Islamic Cairo;
- c) Organizing regular meetings among Egyptian and international experts to review and discuss current conservation issues and projects.

An ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 9 to 16 March 2005. Its report provided many positive indications concerning the quality of restoration work. However, it also drew attention to a number of important shortcomings in work underway including over-emphasis on tourism oriented functions, lack of concern for context, and lack of involvement of the general public. Finally, the report reiterated the need of designating “Historic Cairo within clearly defined borders including an appropriate buffer zone as one planning district”.

The Committee, at its 29th session, had commended the State Party “for the actions taken to rehabilitate the property by implementing conservation works on the historic buildings”, but regretted the lack of progress made on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2002 International Symposium. The Committee therefore urged the State Party to take immediate steps “to elaborate the requested Plan and all related actions, otherwise facing the loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property” and requested that the State Party identify “the exact boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone on a detailed topographic map at the appropriate scale”. The Committee also urged the State Party to submit this map and a report on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations by 1 February 2006, for the consideration of the Committee at its 30th session in 2006.

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2006, entitled “Report of Egyptian Government on Historic Cairo and its Development Project”. While the report provides an eloquent overview of the complexity of the historic city, and demonstrates the many improvements recently achieved in approaches and methodologies for monument restoration, as well as recent actions taken to address problems associated with excessive traffic and decaying infrastructure in the city, it also suggests that the Government has given priority to addressing the physical dilapidation of the city noted in the 2002 report, prior to launching the comprehensive planning measures called for in the same document. The report suggests that it is the intention of the Government to initiate such planning measures in the second half of 2006. The report is not accompanied by the detailed topographic map called for by the Committee at its 29th session, but by colour copies of the 1948 map of Cairo showing Islamic monuments (scale 1:5,000) which had

already been submitted with the original nomination, as well as a simplified A4 generic black and white map showing parts of 5 zones, without description or identification of same.

The importance of giving the highest priority to the planning process and outcomes called for in the 2002 report and emphasized as essential in all subsequent sessions of the Committee is hereby reiterated. This process should include efforts to identify and describe the character zones of the historic city, their associated significance (expressed within character zone significance statements), to ensure that planning integrates concern for housing, and socio-economic needs within conservation strategies examined. The 2002 report and supporting Committee recommendations call specifically for “designating Historic Cairo as a Special Planning District, with buffer zones, in accordance with the provision of the *Operational Guidelines*”. This critical point is not addressed in the recent report by the State Party.

ICOMOS believes that in spite of the many actions undertaken by the Egyptian authorities in recent years to improve physical conservation of the Old City, because of the time that has elapsed since the 2002 report and the failure in that period of the State Party to implement the principal priority recommendations in that report, the State Party should be asked urgently to consult with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Such consultations shall define a work programme to ensure beginning in 2006 for the implementation of all recommendations coming from the 2002 Report and subsequently endorsed by the Committee at its 27th, 28th and 29th sessions.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.50

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.42, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Also recalling Decision 28 COM 15B.47 adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), and particularly its request to:*
 - a) *designate Islamic Cairo as a Special Planning District, with buffer zones, in accordance with the provision of the Operational Guidelines, and*
 - b) *prepare a comprehensive Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City, whereby the conservation of historic buildings would be accompanied by appropriate development regulations,*
4. *Commends the State Party for the efforts made to improve conservation of Historic Cairo in the last years;*
5. *Notes with great concern that the principal recommendations of the 2002 Report, subsequently endorsed by the World Heritage Committee in 2003, 2004 and 2005 have not yet been implemented, and that the requested detailed topographic map, at the appropriate scale, identifying the exact boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone has not been supplied;*

6. *Recommends that the State Party invite the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies urgently to assist in drafting terms of reference for planning and administrative activities that would ensure beginning implementation of the 2002 Report recommendations;*
7. *Further recommends that the State Party consider whether the present name of the property, "Islamic Cairo", reflects the real character of the area or whether it should envisage to propose to modify the name to "Historic Cairo";*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, a report on the implementation of the principal recommendations contained within the 2002 Report and subsequently endorsed by the World Heritage Committee, and the detailed topographic map requested, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

51. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:
2004

Criteria:
C (i) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:
28 COM 14B.22
29 COM 7B.41

International Assistance:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:
ICOMOS mission in 2005

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Absence of management structures and protective measures;
- b) Lack of management and conservation plans;
- c) Lack of security and risk of collapse due to open trenches and unstable structures;
- d) Important tourism development project with new constructions.

Current conservation issues:
Upon inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee, at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), formulated the following requests to the State Party:

- a) to submit its annual work plan for the first year following the inscription, as well as the complete conservation and management plans;
- b) to review the progress of the implementation of these plans through two monitoring missions.

The first monitoring mission carried out by ICOMOS took place from 30 March to 3 April 2005. As the report had not been made available at the previous session of the Committee, a short summary is provided hereunder. Among the main issues raised by the report are:

- a) the site is not protected against exterior potential threats;
- b) the general state of conservation of the site is not good;
- c) most of the restoration works already conducted at the site were not adequate, notably due to the absence of a homogenous restoration approach and methodology;
- d) the site does not receive visitors in appropriate conditions both in terms of security and for the protection of the archaeological remains.

Furthermore, the mission reported some details concerning a European Commission Project which aims at providing the Jordanian authorities with assistance in view of the tourism promotion of the sites of Um er-Rasas and Lehun, through a preservation programme.

The State Party submitted, on 31 May 2005, a document presenting a series of guidelines for the establishment of the future management plan. This document mentioned the objectives of the authorities and the themes to be addressed, including conservation, documentation and management. This document was not a management plan.

In a letter dated 1 February 2006, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre about certain difficulties regarding the implementation of the European Commission Project, which led to delays in the submission of the documents presenting the foreseen visitors centre, shelters and parking. The elaboration of the management plan had been delayed. Therefore, the State Party suggested to postpone the second monitoring mission until the first draft of the management plan is available, possibly by May 2006. In the meantime, the above-mentioned designs and documents were sent to the World Heritage Centre and are being examined.

In the light of the information provided concerning the site since its inscription on the World Heritage List, it appears that there are some priority measures to be undertaken as regards its conservation and management, prior to any development project. These priority measures, which should constitute the first elements of the management plan to be elaborated at the same time, should be:

- a) to clearly identify the boundaries of the area(s) to be protected and fenced if necessary, even temporarily;
- b) to address the security issues, notably by prohibiting access of visitors to potential dangerous areas and carrying out the necessary works to cover the trenches and archaeological soundings;
- c) to isolate and preserve the most endangered and damaged archaeological and architectural components by establishing a temporary restricted plan of visit paths;

- d) to preserve the mosaics with adequate temporary and protective materials (special geo-textile layers and draining sand layers);
- e) to consolidate the most endangered architectural elements using temporary but secure structures;
- f) to stop restoration works and reconstruction of collapsed elements;
- g) to resolve, when possible, using simple and temporary solutions, the humidity problems, notably for the mosaic floor of the sheltered St. Stephen Church;
- h) to define the future management structure and financial system which will be adopted in the management plan for the site.

The State Party should define, in consultation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, how to implement these priority measures and review the current design, schedule and work-plan of the European Commission funded programme accordingly.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.51

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.41, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party on its commitment for the protection and conservation of the World Heritage Property;*
4. *Notes that several unforeseen constraints led to delays in the elaboration and finalization of the management and conservation plans for the property;*
5. *Recommends that the State Party concentrate its efforts on the implementation of priority measures, in close consultation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. These priority measures include:*
 - a) *to clearly identify the boundaries of the area(s) to be protected and fenced if necessary, even temporarily;*
 - b) *to address the security issues, notably by prohibiting access of visitors to potential dangerous areas and carrying out the necessary works to cover the trenches and archaeological soundings;*
 - c) *to isolate and preserve the most endangered and damaged archaeological and architectural components by establishing a temporary restricted plan of visit paths;*
 - d) *to preserve the mosaics with adequate temporary and protective materials (special geo-textile layers and draining sand layers);*
 - e) *to consolidate the most endangered architectural elements using temporary but secure structures;*
 - f) *to stop restoration works and reconstruction of collapsed elements;*
 - g) *to resolve, when possible, using simple and temporary solutions, the humidity problems, notably for the mosaic floor of the sheltered St. Stephen Church;*

- h) *to define the future management structure and financial system, which will be adopted in the management plan for the site.*
6. *Requests the State Party to engage, possibly with the support of the World Heritage Centre, discussions in order to make sure that the European Commission funded project be redesigned so as to integrate the above-mentioned priority measures and adapt its work-plan and schedule accordingly;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to organize the second monitoring mission, to be carried out by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, by 30 November 2006;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2007, a progress report on the recommendations made in points 5 and 6 above as well as on the elaboration of the draft of the management and conservation plans, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

52. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1984

Criteria:

C (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.48

29 COM 7B.102

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 in 2001 for technical assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,173 from 1997 to 2001 for the International Safeguarding Campaign.

Previous monitoring missions:

2004: assessment mission by UNESCO Beirut office; 2006: for security reasons, the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission was delayed.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Important and often uncontrolled urban development;
- b) Public works, tourism developments;
- c) Absence of a management and conservation plan;
- d) Insufficient maintenance.

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session in 2005, the World Heritage Committee noted the information received by the World Heritage Centre concerning alleged threats to the archaeological remains of

Tyre. Accordingly, it requested ICOMOS, in close consultation with the State Party and the World Heritage Centre, to undertake a reactive monitoring mission to the property in order to assess the impact of foreseen or on-going projects, to determine the overall state of conservation of the property, and to submit a report for examination by the Committee at its 30th session in 2006. For reasons of security, the mission could not take place.

The Committee further requested the State Party to provide, for examination at the same session, a report on the follow-up of the implementation of Decisions **28 COM 15B.48** and **29 COM 7B.102**, notably regarding the impact of the proposed highway in the vicinity of Tyre, the establishment of the archaeological map, and the transformation of the commercial port.

A report prepared by the General Directorate of Antiquities of the Ministry of Culture was transmitted to the World Heritage Centre on 24 April 2006. This reported, *inter alia*, that the decree for the creation of a marine archaeological reserve, proposed in 2003, is still being studied by the Transport Ministry. The archaeological map of Tyre, considered as an emergency measure since many years, is finally being prepared as part of the World Bank project and should be completed in the course of 2006. It consists in the establishment of a DTM (Digital Terrain Model) and of a GIS (Geographic Information System) as well as geophysical prospecting. The General Directorate of Antiquities, is carrying out survey work in all State-owned land thanks notably to geophysical survey material provided by the Japanese Government and the support of UNESCO, in order to integrate archaeological data into the map. The impact study for the new highway would be based upon cross-checking with the archaeological survey project that is in progress. Indeed, the issue of the highway has been discussed a number of times between UNESCO and the Lebanese authorities, including in the framework of the Scientific Committee for the International Safeguarding Campaign for Tyre. UNESCO had in the past recommended that attention be paid, in choosing the route of the highway, to avoid any negative impact on the archaeological remains of the property. As a result, the initial project had been revised, the interchange was displaced and the route of the highway moved further west. The General Directorate of Antiquities confirmed that soundings carried out along the current projected route of the highway have not revealed any significant archaeological structure. Nevertheless, additional survey work is being undertaken on the whole alignment of the road in order to identify possible archaeological remains and reduce the impact of the highway.

In terms of site management, the State Party announced the assignment of three new staff to work on the property: one site manager, who will be in charge of establishing the management plan for the property, one archaeologist and one person responsible for the foreseen Underwater Archaeology Centre.

In July 2003, the Scientific Committee for the International Safeguarding Campaign of Tyre made a number of recommendations concerning the importance of developing specific detailed Urban Conservation Plans for the entire historic centre and a series of other specific issues regarding single buildings or areas within Tyre. According to the report provided by the State Party, the new building code in the historic sectors of the city is in its final promulgation stage, leading hopefully to a comprehensive Urban Conservation Plan.

Feasibility studies and impact assessment on the transformation of the commercial port into a tourist marina have been completed and would take the form of a definitive plan for

the transformation of the port, in conjunction with the second phase of the World Bank project.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29COM 7B.102**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Commends the State Party for the progress made in the establishment of the archaeological map of the property, the preparation of the decree for the new building code in the historic sectors of the city, the completion of the feasibility studies and impact assessment on the transformation of the commercial port into a tourist marina to be integrated within the second phase of the World Bank project;
4. Regrets however that the decree for the creation of an archaeological marine protection zone has not yet been approved by the Ministry of Transport;
5. Strongly recommends to the State Party to extend the ending three-year period of construction freezing in the areas of potential archaeological interest until the survey and the map are completed, as well as the construction of the highway;
6. Reiterates its request for a joint ICOMOS/World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission, in order to assess the impact of foreseen or on-going projects and to determine the overall state of conservation of the site;
7. Further requests the State Party to provide a detailed topographic map indicating the boundaries of the property possibly also defining a buffer zone for the protected area, and to submit a progress report on the above recommendations, and particularly on the archaeological map and possible further land use decisions, by **1 February 2007** for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

54. Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1996

Criteria:

C (iii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions :

26 COM 21 (b).59

27 COM 7B.40

29 COM 7B.103

International Assistance:

Total amount granted to the property: USD 117,069 for Preparatory Assistance, Emergency Assistance, Technical Cooperation and Promotion

UNESCO Extrabudgetary Funds:

Total amount granted to the property: USD 39,000 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention; USD 40,860 for the supervision of The World Bank-Mauritanian Government-UNESCO tripartite project (USD 1,245,000).

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre mission in April 2001; six World Heritage Centre missions between 2002 and 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports :

- a) Socio-economic and climatic changes;
- b) Gradual abandon of the towns;
- c) Transformations made to houses affecting their authenticity;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) No technical conservation capacities;
- f) No management mechanism (including legal);
- g) Lack of human and financial resources;
- h) Weak institutional coordination.

Current conservation issues :

At its 29th session, the World Heritage Committee requested (decision **29 COM 7B.103**) a report on the state of conservation of the sites inscribed on the World Monuments Watch 2006 List of 100 Most Endangered Sites. As the Chinguetti Mosque is one of those listed sites, the State Party was requested to transmit a report on this site.

It is important to underline that the procedure to inscribe a site on the World Monuments Watch List is linked specifically to a conservation or restoration project requested by the local authorities, non-governmental organizations or even private individuals. There is not necessarily a link with potential or ascertained threats to the World Heritage values of a property. In the case where concrete threats risk affecting the authenticity or integrity of a World Heritage property, the State Party is obliged to make a report to the Committee, according to the provisions in paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Both the Chinguetti Mosque and the Oualata Mosque have already been restored from a Saudi Arabia Funds-in-Trust.

It is appropriate to briefly mention the activities carried out in the framework of the pilot project «Safeguarding and Development of Four World Heritage Cities in Mauritania» coordinated by the World Heritage Centre in 2003-2004, and implemented through a World Bank loan to the Mauritanian Government in the framework of a much bigger

programme entitled « Safeguarding and Enhancement of Mauritanian Cultural Heritage » (document *WHC-03/27.COM/7B*). This project, which was completed during the Mauritanian World Heritage Days, held at UNESCO Headquarters in April 2005, mainly consisted of:

- a) The inventory and complete survey of all the houses and buildings included within the protected perimetres, together with typology analyses, aerial photos, satellite images digital maps;
- b) Monographs of each of the towns, including socio-economic studies of the towns and the hinterland;
- c) Urban development plans, including safeguarding plans and the requisite regulations;
- d) Analysis of potential tourism and its possible impact on cultural heritage;
- e) Technical and institutional studies;
- f) Identification and strengthening of local capacities necessary for the implementation of the rehabilitation programmes, in particular a municipal technician for each town who would follow up on the work;
- g) Identification and training of specialised craftsmen who master the ancient techniques and knowledge;
- h) Preparation of technical manuals for rehabilitation adapted to each city;
- i) Implementation of a programme of pilot actions to test the procedures;
- j) Proposal for the creation of a Heritage Rehabilitation Fund.

The State Party sent to the World Heritage Centre, on 14 March 2006, a concise report established by the National Foundation for the Safeguarding of the Ancient Cities (FNSVA), responsible for the conservation of the property. The document does not actually describe the state of conservation of the property, but is more a summary of the inventory carried out during the implementation of the safeguarding project financed by The World Bank and observations made at that time on the state of conservation of the buildings. The FNSVA report confirms previous observations, such as:

- a) The non-constructed lots, in ruin or in a bad state, are in the majority;
- b) The *ksour* are gradually being abandoned and a large number of their population is leaving;
- c) Some houses are adapted according to “new comfort standards”. There is a risk therein of seeing the authenticity of the *ksour* degraded; this problem applies more particularly to Chinguetti;
- d) Only the old town of Tichitt appears to be in a good state of conservation. It has not succumbed to massive abandon, as have the other three towns.

This information sheds no further light. No mention is made of any follow-up of the pilot project, nor of the ongoing conservation or rehabilitation activities, nor the administrative or management measures. There is no mention made of institutional and management capacity-building necessary for a sustainable approach to the conservation of this property in the report, nor the follow-up to the main recommendations of the pilot project:

- a) Promulgation by the Parliament of the Law for heritage protection;
- b) Adoption of the urban development plans and safeguarding plans and the application of urban regulations;
- c) Creation and financing of a Heritage Rehabilitation Fund;
- d) Establishment of a management and technical assistance mechanism.

The observations made by the State Party are a cause for concern, as it appears that the property is in an accelerated state of dilapidation and abandon. On the basis of these observations and in comparison with other properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, ICOMOS considers that the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List are under threat.

Another problem was recently raised concerning the installation, by Mauritel, a Mauritanian telephone company, of a 40 m. high pylon adjacent to the Ouadane Mosque. Already in December 2005, the Ministry for Culture had alerted the Ministry of the Interior, Post and Telecommunications of the need to avoid any action that could modify the urban landscape of the inscribed towns. It appears that the pylon was, nonetheless, erected and, following a letter from the World Heritage Centre, the Ministry for Culture requested that it be relocated outside of the protected area.

Draft Decision : 30 COM 7B.54

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.103, adopted during its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the determination of the Ministry for Culture to continue with the actions proposed in the framework of the pilot project “Safeguarding and Development of Four World Heritage Cities in Mauritania” for heritage conservation and sustainable development of the ancient cities and encourages the State Party to integrate these actions with all the ongoing reforms in support of the transformation of Mauritanian society, whilst devoting particular attention to the safeguarding of the values of authenticity of the caravan cities;*
4. *Urges the State Party to complete and adopt the master plans and safeguarding and management plans for the four cities and to pursue the establishment of legal instruments and regulations;*
5. *Requests the State Party to reinforce the management capacities and the human and financial resources of the responsible body (FNSVA) as well as the local communities;*
6. *Recommends that the State Party requests a joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the recommendations made during the pilot project;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit, before 1 February 2007, a progress report on the activities undertaken for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

55. Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1997

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.100

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7,500 for technical co-operation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 3,700 for an expert mission.

Previous monitoring missions :

2003: World Heritage Centre mission ; 2005: Expert mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Risks due to development pressures;
- b) Implementation of an important construction project at the entrance of the property;
- c) Absence of a management plan.

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session in 2005, the World Heritage Committee expressed its concern over the major building projects undertaken on the site of Volubilis and the scope and volume of the new buildings, as well as the visual impact of these developments on the surrounding landscape. It therefore urged the State Party to consider the modification of the project in accordance with the recommendations of the expert mission and to submit a revised version to the World Heritage Centre and to ICOMOS for study, accompanied by a management programme for the new installations in accordance with the management plan for the entire property. The State Party was requested to define a buffer zone to ensure the protection of the area around the archaeological site and to take into account the surrounding landscape in its entirety, in particular the agricultural plain to the west of the property, which is inseparable from its historical origins. A report on progress made with the project was requested for examination by the Committee at its 30th session.

The State Party addressed a letter to the World Heritage Centre in January 2006, altogether with a presentation brochure on the project consisting of plans and sketches, very similar to the previous one. It is announced that the Minister of Culture has set up an expert committee to be responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decision, which was instructed to undertake the following changes to the original project:

- a) The area for presentation has been reduced from 500m² to 420m², to be used as the site for a museum or interpretation centre;
- b) Most of the existing entrance will be retained;
- c) The height of the administrative buildings will be reduced so as not to affect the picturesque view of the site;
- d) The residential buildings for researchers will be retained because of their significance in the understanding of the site;
- e) The design of the stage for the Volubilis Festival and other presentations will not seek to evoke classical models;
- f) Tree plantings will reproduce those already in existence on the site (olive trees, cypress, palm trees, mulberry trees, and eucalyptus).

It is reported that the work will be carried out in seven stages starting with the demolition of old structures and terracing, which is nearly completed; the building of the reception area; the ticket office, toilets, cloakroom, cafeteria; then the administration premises, the laboratory and archaeological storerooms. At a later stage, the housing for researchers and conservator as well as exterior works is foreseen.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS do not consider that reducing the surface of the museum/interpretation room from 500m² to 420 would make much difference to its visual impact. The issues raised by the expert mission of 2005 are still not addressed: “The construction of the right wing of the proposed building poses major problems concerning the physical and visual impact on the property. The space foreseen for the exhibition room appears both too small for a proper site museum, and too large for a simple room for the introduction of archaeological remains that do not appear to warrant a building of such importance. The very concept of a site museum should be reconsidered in the light of a detailed analysis of the objects intended for display.”

As regards the theatre, although it has been displaced further to the north, it remains semi-circular and it does not appear on the drawings that “it will not seek to evoke classical models”. The recommendation of the expert mission of 2005, stating that “The construction of a theatre or a fixed stage within the premises must be strictly avoided, all the more so as such a structure would only be used one week per year during the festival. In the event of a simple treatment of the area with temporary tiered seating, a semicircular form that would evoke an ancient theatre in a place where it did not exist and in a site where no structure of this kind has been identified should be avoided” has not been taken into consideration.

The graphic documents provided do not allow full comprehension of some parts of the project, in particular the area located between the museum and the administrative buildings, where a coffee-shop and large terrace are foreseen. Additional cross-sections should have been submitted as well as other perspective views from various angles. Some of the information that appears on the site plan is not reflected in the level-plans. It is therefore difficult to have a precise view of the actual project compared to the original one.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.55

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.100** adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the steps taken to retain the visual integrity of this important site;*
4. *Regrets, however, that the recommendations of the expert mission of 2005 are not fully taken into account and requests that a detailed project description, including plans and information on materials to be used, be provided to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for study;*
5. *Urges the State Party to present an up-dated management plan for the property, including the management programme for the new installations;*
6. *Further urges the State Party, as requested in Decision **29 COM 7B.100**, paragraph 5, to define a buffer zone to ensure the protection of the archaeological site limits, taking into consideration the surrounding landscape in its entirety, in particular the agricultural plain to the west of the property, which is inseparable from its historical origins;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

56. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1987

Criterion:

C (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1988-2004

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.19

28 COM 15A.19

29 COM 7B.46

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2000): USD 66,772 for technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 (private funding).

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre expert missions in 2001, 2002 and 2003.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Deterioration of the earthen structures of the Fort;
- b) Lack of appropriate conservation techniques;
- c) Urban pressure essentially due to the project for a new market near the Fort, including proposals for the urban development of the area;
- d) Lack of management mechanisms, including legislation.

Current conservation issues:

At its 28th session, in 2004, the World Heritage Committee, noting with satisfaction the commitment of the State Party towards the implementation of conservation measures and the preparation of a management plan for the Bahla Fort (inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1988), decided to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **28 COM 15A.19**). However, the Committee requested the State Party to “pursue its efforts towards the finalisation and adoption of the management plan, taking into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS”.

In May 2005, a new version of the management plan, dated 2005 but similar to the plan of 2003, was transmitted to the World Heritage Centre, without mention of its finalization or adoption. In its Decision **29 COM 7B.46**, the World Heritage Committee reiterated its request to the State Party to “report on the finalisation and adoption of the management plan, taking fully into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS”.

In February 2006, the Omani authorities transmitted an abbreviated report, listing three completed restoration activities, one foreseen restoration, a museum project and the preparation of a presentation booklet.

A short section of the report describes activities being planned to support future implementation of the Management plan, notably the constitution of a team for the “verification and perusal” of the Management plan, discussions in view of its implementation, the establishment of a legal framework for its implementation, the establishment of a “bureau” for its execution and the organisation of a number of seminars concerning the plan. However, the report does not actually specify whether the plan is complete, or the status of the implementation effort.

The status of work on the Souq Bahla is also described very briefly, informing that the design has been attributed to an expert (Mr Larsen), that meetings took place, notably with the Mayor of Bahla, and that the shop owners have been “reassured concerning the resumption of their activities after the restoration works of the souq”. The revised design – if complete – is not attached, nor described, and its impact on the values of the World Heritage site not mentioned. It is not possible either to estimate if the revised project takes into consideration the criteria suggested by the World Heritage Centre and CRATerre (Decision **28 COM 15A.19**).

In conclusion, it is impossible, on the basis of the information provided, to evaluate whether the State Party has responded or not to the World Heritage Committee's Decisions **27 COM 7A.19**, **28 COM 15B.19** and **29 COM 7B.46**. Since the property was only recently removed from the World Heritage List in Danger, this lack of information is of great concern as it does not allow assessing the implementation, by the State Party, of the commitments taken at the time of the removal from the World Heritage List in Danger in 2004.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30 COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.46**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Regrets that the briefness of the information provided by the State Party does not allow it to assess the progress achieved with respect to the previous decisions and recommendations of the Committee;*
4. *Further regrets that no mention is made of the finalization of the Management plan taking into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, nor of its official adoption;*
5. *Urges the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, as early as possible, the documents mentioned in its report, notably :*
 - a) *a comprehensive report on the restoration works carried out at Bahla Fort, including graphic documentation and pictures;*
 - b) *the final adopted version of the Management plan;*
 - c) *the legal framework being established for the implementation of the Management plan;*
 - d) *the administrative structure established for the execution of the Management plan;*
 - e) *a summary of the seminars which took place concerning the Management plan and their outcomes;*
 - f) *the detailed design executed by the expert selected by the State Party for the Souq Bahla and a progress report on the work already undertaken.*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007**, a thorough progress report including all the documents indicated in point 5 above, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

ASIA AND PACIFIC

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

57. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

C (i) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.48

28 COM 15B.63

29 COM 7B.54

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 2,752 for training

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: 5,710 Euros (France – UNESCO Convention)

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO-Tehran Cluster Office mission in June 2004

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Construction of a commercial complex with high towers in the vicinity of the World Heritage site

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received on 1 February 2006 a brief note on the follow-up of the decision of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the state of conservation of the property from the Iranian Cultural Heritage and Tourism Organization. In this note, the State Party fully supported the above-mentioned decision of the Committee and clearly stated that a plan for the demolition of the top tower of the commercial complex had been prepared accordingly. A schedule for the demolition works was also provided in the note whereby the top tower would be demolished within a period of 40 days from 29 January 2006, and the demolition work for other parts of the complex which might affect the World Heritage value would be finished by the end of October 2006.

The State Party expressed in the same note its appreciation of the above-mentioned Committee decision concerning the possible extension of the World Heritage property to include the historic axis consisting of the Friday Mosque, bazaars, ancient bridges, Zayandehroud River and Chahar Bagh Avenue, and presented its commitment to submit the elements required for such an extension to the Committee as soon as possible.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.57

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.54, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the actions taken regarding the demolition of the structures negatively affecting the outstanding universal value of the property;*
4. *Congratulates the State Party on its firm commitment to the possible extension of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report on the above-mentioned demolition by 1 February 2007, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

58. Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1997

Criteria:

C (iii)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.66

29 COM 7B.55

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 40,000, of which USD 20,000 in 2001 for Brick Conservation and Geophysical Survey of the Core Zone of the property.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7,200 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust in 2006 for the elaboration of a project proposal towards the establishment of an appropriate site-management system.

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission, 8-9 May 2004; World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission, 13-18 November 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Impact on the archaeological remains as well as on the visual integrity of the site by the newly constructed Maya Devi Temple in 2002.

Current conservation issues:

The joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, carried out in November 2005, at the request of the World Heritage Committee, assessed the state of conservation of the World Heritage property, focussing on the issues related to the recent construction of the Maya Devi Temple and the elaboration of a management plan. These two issues had raised the concern of the Committee, which considered the negative impact of the new temple as an indicator of inappropriate management of the site.

The mission determined that the root of most problems is the lack of a conservation policy, based on a full assessment of the heritage values of the property. The Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage site of Lumbini is related to two fundamental aspects, reflected in the two criteria under which the Committee decided to inscribe this property on the List, i.e. criteria (iii) and (vi). As the birthplace of the Lord Buddha, the sacred area of Lumbini is one of the holiest places of one of the world's great religions, and its archaeological remains contain important evidence about the nature of Buddhist pilgrimage centres from a very early period.

To maintain the World Heritage value of Lumbini, it is necessary to protect the tangible and intangible attributes that represent and embody the two above-mentioned aspects. However, these features and attributes are yet to be elaborated or articulated as stated in the *Operational Guidelines* with a view to safeguarding the outstanding universal value of the site. This is illustrated through the inappropriate perimeter of the core area of the property, which cuts through important archaeological structures; the inadequate landscaping; the inappropriate uses taking place within the setting of the Maya Devi Temple, currently resembling more a public leisure park (with parking space, cafes, shops, etc.) than a place inspired by a sense of sacredness, spirituality and communion with nature.

Despite the commitment of the Lumbini Development Trust (LDT) to the implementation of the Kenzo Tange Master Plan for the development and enhancement of the birthplace of Buddha, the lack of a clear conservation policy can potentially result in inappropriate decisions. At the time of the visit by the mission, the LDT was apparently planning the erection of several meditation shelters around the Maya Devi Temple. Moreover, landscaping and infrastructure works such as the digging of trenches (with loss of archaeological layers) and the completion of the water levee foreseen within the Master Plan had been carried out or were being planned. The issue of the Maya Devi Temple, which in itself had previously been overestimated by previous reports in terms of impact over the overall significance of the property, is a clear symptom of this problem. While the World Heritage property of Lumbini does not seem to be threatened by a serious and specific danger, the weakness of its overall conservation framework requires urgent action.

As requested by the Committee, the mission made a number of specific and time-bound recommendations. These include as a priority the elaboration of a management plan, of which a definition and scope of work were clarified for the benefit of the Nepalese authorities. LDT was requested to formalise the decision to develop a management plan and set up a dedicated Task Force within February 2006, and to possibly complete the management plan by end 2007. The mission, moreover, recommended halting any new development within the core and buffer zones at the World Heritage site, until completion of the management plan.

Pending completion of the management plan, the mission also recommended a series of actions, divided into “essential” (within six months) and “desirable” (within two years) actions. These concern specific measures on the Maya Devi Temple to avoid damage to the archaeological structures, to enhance the appreciation of the heritage values of the site, and other general suggestions to strengthen the overall conservation of the property.

The “essential” recommendations included:

- a) Execute small openings in the outer wall below gallery level to improve ventilation at Maya Devi Temple in a phased manner;
- b) Establishment of a monitoring system and conservation protocol within the Temple, to record the changes in the parameters affecting the development of biological attack and salt efflorescence on the structures, including the identification of appropriate benchmarks to orient conservation actions;
- c) Ensure waterproofing of the Maya Devi Temple to avoid leakages and establish maintenance protocol;
- d) Stop all new constructions, including shelters or gazeboes, in both core and buffer zones; core and buffer zones should be declared no-construction areas; prayer and meditation space should be provided under existing trees by means of removable timber platforms or mats;
- e) Do not plant any trees and do not carry out landscaping works or other activities to implement the Kenzo Tange Master Plan, such as the completion of the water levee or the 80x80 grid, within core and buffer zones until a clear vision has been established, through the management plan. Subject all future infrastructure works (e.g. trenches for drainage, cabling and pipes, roads, etc.) to archaeological impact assessment and ensure continuous presence of an archaeologist during execution of works; all findings during works should be documented according to appropriate archaeological standards.

The “desirable” recommendations consisted of actions including replacement of the plastic false ceiling inside the temple structure, redesign of temple staircases and ramp, removal of temple roof railings, reutilisation of the old decorative copper ceiling above the Maya Devi image, possible replacement of some sections of the outer wall of the Maya Devi Temple with more sympathetic natural materials, preparation of non-destructive surveys of archaeological potential on core and buffer zones, and improvements to existing documentation systems used by the LDT.

Considering the need for more specific expertise on heritage conservation and management within the LDT, the mission also recommended that the State Party request assistance through the World Heritage Fund or another source of funding to provide its

staff with the necessary resources to include training opportunities for the preparation of the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre received on 30 January 2006 a progress report from the State Party. This report contained information on the progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations included in the report of the mission undertaken in November 2005, as well as on other activities that took place in 2005. A workshop was held in November 2005 to consult all parties concerned on the issues to be addressed and possible measures for the development of the site. The LDT installed a new security system within the Maya Devi Temple and has commenced studies to identify the original botanic environment of the site at the time of Buddha. The State Party also explained that shops located at the entrance of the World Heritage property shall be removed within 2006.

With respect to the recommendations of the November 2005 World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission, the State Party has set up an inter-sectoral Task Force in December 2005 for the implementation of “essential actions” to reverse the negative impact on the Maya Devi Temple. As of mid-April 2006, the removal of the staircase and roof railings, as well of the heavy ceiling in the interior was foreseen. It was also decided to execute openings of three full sized windows on the eastern and western walls of the temple, in order to improve ventilation and reduce humidity. The colour of the outside wall has been revised (from white to earthen) to mitigate its visual impact on the archaeological remains. All new constructions on site have been halted, as well as all landscaping interventions. The establishment of a monitoring system and conservation protocol within the temple will be finalised in the medium-term, within the establishment and implementation of an integrated management system. The State Party also indicated the planning actions now underway to respond to the “desirable” actions described in the mission report.

Concerning the development of a management plan, the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu and with funding from Italy, has made available the services of a consultant for a period of three months to work together with LDT and other concerned national authorities in order to prepare a project proposal to be presented to potential donors.

ICOMOS felt considerable confidence in the commitment of the LDT and the responsible authorities at national level to move incrementally and carefully to a new comprehensive management regime for the property, from the detailed and thorough analysis in the State Party’s progress report. ICOMOS however draws the attention of the Committee to the following additional points, raised in the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission report, but not directly addressed in the report’s recommendations:

- a) The fragility of the so-called “Marker Stone”, maintained in situ under the new temples in ground water conditions which keep it constantly wet ;
- b) The need to survey and monitor ground water levels and movements under and adjacent to the temple, which affect the long term health of the very significant archaeological resources on the property ;
- c) The need to improve rainwater disposal from the temple roof and structure and to divert such flows away from the archaeological material ;

- d) The need to develop both a policy and a strategy to deal with the vast excavated and unexcavated areas of archaeological worth on the property, whose long term survival is at present often undocumented, not monitored and as a consequence seriously threatened. The mission recommended that archaeological surveys should take non-destructive approaches. The State Party appeared to suggest it would have difficulty implementing this recommendation given the costs of excavation, while ICOMOS suggests the importance of inexpensive surface survey to indicate likely areas of archaeological potential.

On item (d) above, ICCROM is of the view that both unexcavated and excavated areas should be addressed within the framework of the management plan, through conservation and research strategies, and that the Geophysical Survey undertaken in 2001 by the Bradford University, which was more than a surface study, could be used as important reference. In general, ICCROM agrees with the findings of the 2005 World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission and endorses the proposals contained in this document.

ICOMOS and ICCROM recommend to the Committee, when requesting preparation of management plans by States Parties, to consider the need to ensure adequate time for this work, if the management plan is to have broad support with realistic possibility of full and effective implementation.

ICOMOS and ICCROM do not believe that the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is further noted that while the State Party's responses to the many recommendations of the 2005 mission are very positive, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should co-operate closely in order to monitor the State Party's progress in implementing the mission recommendations.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29COM7B.55**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Endorses the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission of November 2005 jointly undertaken by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre;*
4. *Commends the State Party for its thorough and action-oriented response to the mission's recommendations as well as for the consultative measures being undertaken;*
5. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission and particularly to:*
 - a) *Develop an effective management plan;*
 - b) *Avoid carrying out any development pending completion of the management plan;*
 - c) *Implement corrective measures on the Maya Devi Temple as indicated in the mission report;*

- d) *Survey and monitor the ground water levels and movements, under and adjacent to the Maya Devi Temple, to ensure the long-term protection of the significant archaeological remains as well as the Marker Stone maintained in situ under the temple;*
 - e) *Develop non-destructive archaeological strategies to ensure long-term conservation of the vast excavated and unexcavated areas of archaeological significance in and around the property, through adequate documentation and monitoring;*
6. *Invites the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the State Party in these activities;*
 7. *Requests the State Party to continue its full commitment to establishing a management plan based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for possible completion by the end of 2008;*
 8. *Encourages the State Party to consider requesting assistance through the World Heritage Fund to support the elaboration of the management plan for the property; and*
 9. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2008, a report on the progress made on the above points, for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

59. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2001

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.57

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2005): USD 30,000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Joint UNESCO Tashkent Office/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission on 6-12 March 2006; a brief assessment mission by an international expert of the UNESCO Tashkent Office in April 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Serious impact of a large-scale restoration;
- b) Urban landscaping programme impacts upon the authenticity and integrity of the property.

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to provide a complete documentation concerning the large restoration and urban landscaping programme, at the Shakhi-Zinda complex which appeared to be severely affecting the integrity and authenticity of the property. In response, the Permanent Delegation of Uzbekistan provided a report on 3 February 2006, in Russian, then translated into English by the same delegation, concerning the state of conservation of the property.

The report specifies that a special Decree (No. 337) was adopted on 16 July 2004 on “the Organization of Restoration and Improvement Works in Shakhi-Zinda Memorial Complex”. In the framework of this Decree, the specialised institute of restoration, “Tamirshunoslik” has worked out a programme for 2004-2005 of scientific-research, restoration and conservation works on the Shakhi-Zinda complex. This programme has been considered and approved by the Uzbek Scientific-Methodical Council for the protection of cultural heritage objects.

Furthermore, this report emphasises that each monument of the Shakhi-Zinda complex has been carefully studied and that conservation works have been carried out in accordance with international norms and rules. The report states that, during the period 2004-2005, the domes of some monuments have been restored, and that this was an essential measure in order to save the remaining part of the buildings. Before starting the main works, a complete cycle of archaeological excavations was carried out. The main works consisted of strengthening the buildings’ foundations and successfully preventing humidity from rising from the lower level. The State Party further mentioned that the reconstruction of the ceilings of Khoja Akhmad and other mausoleums, as well as the reconstruction of the domes, has provided good protection for the mausoleums and has partially saved wall decorations.

As requested by the Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) an ICOMOS mission was carried out from 6-12 March 2006, accompanied by the Head of the UNESCO Office in Tashkent. According to the mission report, the condition of various mosques and mausoleums had reached a critical stage after a long period of neglect, and intervention was required in order to avoid further deterioration. Subsequently, the above-mentioned restoration works were carried out in order to reduce humidity in the walls. This changed the immediate appearance of the site through the clearance of accumulated soil around the buildings. These restoration works have been undertaken within a very short period, less than two years from inception to completion and have revealed foundations of previous structures. This haste has been critical to the quality of some details of the work and resulted in mediocre finish of brick coping and zinc flashing at Kusam-Ibn-Abbas.

Simultaneously with the restoration project, the Municipality of Samarkand has also completed a major enlargement of the trunk road passing between the archaeological site of Afrasiab and the Timurid section of Samarkand. This project is part of a larger city development scheme 2004-2025 (“Project for the reconstruction of the central part of Samarkand”), which could have considerable impact on the property and its buffer zones.

With work almost accomplished at Shakhi-Zindah, the ICOMOS report recommends that adjustments to the finish of brick copings, flashing, and other details of mediocre quality should be made. Moreover, the reconsideration of the landscaping and lay-out of the new trunk-road passing in front of Shakhi-Zindah and separating the Afrasiab and the Timurid part of Samarkand is imperative. This new road construction, 16 metres wide and bordered by retaining walls up to five metres high, is very obtrusive to the historic environment. Plans for demolishing additional housing bordering on the Afrasiab should urgently be reconsidered.

The loss of authenticity occasioned by the recent work at the Shaki-Zindah Complex is very alarming and the mission believes that all development and conservation decisions must be guided by a management plan. Therefore, the authorities urgently need to develop a coherent urban conservation and planning policy for the management of the whole historic town, including the World Heritage areas and its buffer zones. An inventory and documentation of the historic features and the architectural values also needs to be prepared and should form the basis of an overall management plan. In addition, an integrated conservation strategy for the existing residential quarters, as well as for the reintegration and rehabilitation of the surrounding areas that have been demolished should be developed.

The large-scale urban planning schemes, such as the proposed “Project for the reconstruction of the central part of Samarkand”, should therefore be reviewed on the basis of the above recommendations. Any further demolition of traditional housing areas should be prevented and measures should be taken to encourage their sustainable development and rehabilitation.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.59

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.57**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with concern the loss of authenticity occasioned by the large-scale restoration carried out on the Shakhi-Zinda complex and the enlargement of the trunk road between the archaeological site of Afrasiab and the Timurid section of Samarkand;*
4. *Also notes with concern the on-going urban planning scheme (“Project for the reconstruction of the central part of Samarkand”) which might have considerable impact on the integrity of the property and its buffer zones;*
5. *Requests the State Party as a matter of priority to:*
 - a) *develop a management plan with a coherent urban conservation and planning policy for the management of the whole historic town, including the World Heritage areas and its buffer zones;*
 - b) *prepare an inventory and documentation of the historic features and the architectural values;*

- c) *establish an integrated conservation strategy for the existing residential quarters, as well as for the reintegration and rehabilitation of the surrounding areas that have been demolished;*
6. *Urges the State Party to review the large-scale urban planning schemes, such as the proposed “Project for the reconstruction of the central part of Samarkand”, and to immediately refrain from further demolition of traditional housing areas pending the adoption of the above mentioned conservation policy and management plan;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, a detailed report on the progress made in developing the management plan and on the state of conservation of the site for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007. Should the State Party fail to initiate the above mentioned recommendations and decisions the World Heritage Committee may decide to inscribe the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

60. Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C642)

See Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

61. Angkor (Cambodge) (C 668)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1992

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1992-2004

Previous Committee decisions:

27 COM 7A.22

28 COM 15A.23

International assistance received:

Total amount allocated to the property up to 2004: USD 142,193

UNESCO Extrabudgetary Funds:

Total amount allocated to the property up to 2006: USD 52 million.

Previous monitoring missions:

A legal expert mission concerning the level of protection of Zones 1 and 2 of Angkor (September 2005).

Inspection of the property and on-going projects by an ad hoc group of experts on behalf of the International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Sustainable Development of the Historic Site of Angkor (November 2005).

Main threats identified in previous reports :

- a) Tourism pressure;
- b) Lack of presentation and interpretative materials.

Current conservation issues:

Following the organization of the Second Intergovernmental Conference for Angkor (November 2003) and the decision of the World Heritage Committee during its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), the property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, given the improvement in the physical state of the monuments within the site, and the measures adopted by the national authority APSARA to strengthen the management and monitoring methods for the site.

The Paris Declaration and Recommendations adopted by the Second Intergovernmental Conference in 2003 defined the general orientation of activities for the site for the coming ten years, and launched a new decade of international assistance by deciding to focus more particularly on sustainable development, and by dividing the International Coordinating Committee (ICC/ANGKOR) into two parts to address the problems concerning a) safeguarding, conservation and research; b) sustainable development.

The technical session of the International Coordination Committee for Angkor (ICC/Angkor) held in June 2005, attended by UNESCO's Assistant Director-General for Culture, examined some very important initiatives, among which were safeguarding, conservation and research projects for several monuments and urban development projects (including the master plan for the sustainable development of Siam Reap) and water and forest management.

Furthermore, new projects for the safeguarding of the Temples of Bayon (Angkor Thom) and Angkor Wat were presented. These projects, implemented by UNESCO in cooperation with the national authority APSARA, will be funded by the Governments of Japan and Italy as of 2006.

At the beginning of 2005, UNESCO learned of the alarming situation affecting the protected areas, particularly Zone 2, linked to ongoing developments not in conformity with existing regulations. At the request of His Excellency Sok An, Vice Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Cambodia and President of the national authority APSARA, the Director-General of UNESCO decided to send a legal expert (Mr Lucien Chabasson) in September 2005, to examine the present situation regarding the zones in question and to make appropriate recommendations.

The mission highlighted the following problems:

Among the many factors of pressure being experienced by the Angkor property, the most pressing is very rapid tourism development, with a 43% increase in the number of visitors

over two years and the consequent steady increase in the number of buildings to cope with this massive influx of visitors.

Despite this pressure, the overall situation of the protected zones was judged to be satisfactory. Nevertheless, although the existing regulatory conditions for the development of these zones are clear in their principles and with respect to the participation of local populations in maintaining the intrinsic values of the property, they appear to be obsolete or lacking in clarity from the standpoint of concrete modalities with regard to their application.

The ambiguity regarding property rights of the zones concerned and the lack of an accurate cadastral survey makes it difficult to judge the legality of some building requests.

The lack of technical expertise of the APSARA Authority in the areas of urban planning and communication, and of legal competence in matters relating to land was noted.

The following recommendations were made by the legal expert to respond to the problems identified:

- a) Update the existing legal tools concerning the statutes of the zones in question, in particular the 1994 Royal Decree, if necessary by preparing sub-decrees to clarify the application modalities of this Decree;
- b) Draw up an inventory of the new buildings located in Zones 1 and 2, as well as the establishment of a register of residents in these two zones;
- c) Clarify the rules regarding property rights and ownership applicable to Zones 1 and 2;
- d) Strengthen the capabilities of the APSARA Authority with regard to urban planning, land-use control and communication with the various players.

These questions, among others, were discussed during the planning session of the ICC/Angkor held on 28 and 29 November 2005, attended by the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The ICC fully supported the analysis and proposals contained in Mr Chabasson's report and reiterated the need to adopt an « integrated » and federative approach to all the ongoing initiatives.

Accordingly, in these initiatives the ICC supported the creation of a new tool for the global management for the site of Angkor (management plan) in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*. This Plan must provide a general methodological framework for the conservation, restoration and maintenance of the Angkor monuments, which is still today very heterogeneous, as well as improved approval and monitoring procedures for the execution of cooperation projects and the coordination of all parties involved in the daily maintenance of the property.

The ICC/Angkor also recalled, twice, the urgent need for the establishment of a second ad hoc group of experts, specifically with regard to questions relating to sustainable development. This had already been recommended by the Second International Conference in 2003.

Draft decision: 30 COM 7B.61

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Congratulates the State Party and the APSARA Authority for their commitment in pursuing various actions regarding safeguarding and sustainable development, in cooperation with the international community;*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that the international community continues its commitment to the protection of Angkor even after the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, through the implementation of a variety of safeguarding and development projects;*
4. *Expresses its full support to the recommendations made by the State Party and the international community, represented by the ICC/Angkor, during its sessions in 2005 concerning the strengthening of the management for protected Zones 1 and 2, and the preparation of a management plan for the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to work in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre in the implementation of the ICC recommendations and those of the September 2005 mission, and in the preparation of a management plan that should include a general methodological framework for the conservation, restoration and maintenance interventions for the monuments of Angkor;*
6. *Encourages the donor countries to give priority support to the preparation of a global management plan for Angkor;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to strengthen the legal and planning capabilities of the national authority APSARA;*
8. *Recommends that a new ad hoc group of experts for sustainable development be established at an early date;*
9. *Requests the State Party to submit, before **1 February 2008**, a report on the activities carried out and progress made in the implementation of the recommendations with regard to the strengthening of management control for Zones 1 and 2 of Angkor, and the preparation of a management plan, for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

62. Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1997-2000

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.56

International assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

ICOMOS monitoring mission of June 2004.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Lack of legal provision for the protection of buffer zone of the property and within the historic town;
- c) Absence of an updated comprehensive management plan for the property.

Current conservation issues:

At its 28th session, the Committee expressed concern over the extent of urban development pressures in Suzhou, and the renewal and reconstruction of the historic and traditional urban fabric of the city. In this context, the State Party was requested to review the legal framework and management plan for the protection of cultural heritage properties in Suzhou and to strengthen legal provisions for the protection of the buffer zones of the Classical Gardens of Suzhou and within the historic town. Meanwhile, the Committee encouraged the Chinese authorities to continue their efforts to protect the urban historic fabric of Suzhou surrounding the World Heritage property, by carrying out a thorough survey of the historic buildings and urban landscape of the Old City area. The Chinese authorities were also advised to study, in the future, the possibility of an extension of the World Heritage property of the Classical Gardens of Suzhou to include the entire historic town of Suzhou, together with other historic canal towns, within the same geo-cultural area in the provinces of Jiangsu and Zhejiang.

The progress report submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2006 provides information on measures taken to enhance the conservation and presentation of the property, including the results of an initial architectural survey of historic buildings in the Pingjiang area, a typical historic sector not yet included in the World Heritage property.

In response to the Decision **28 COM 15 B. 56**, the State Party has taken the following measures to ensure follow-up action since the last report in 2004:

a) Strengthening promotional activities on cultural heritage protection:

The organization of the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in Suzhou gave its people a better understanding on the importance of cultural heritage protection. The Municipal Government of Suzhou declared 28 June to be “Cultural Heritage Protection Day”, which was also endorsed by local law. Various promotional activities such as meetings, forum, and exhibitions were organized to raise local people’s awareness of cultural heritage protection.

b) Legal protection of old villages and historic buildings

To follow-up on the Committee’s decision, the Suzhou Municipal Government took measures to review the legal framework for the protection of cultural heritage properties in Suzhou, in particular for historic buildings and historic areas. “The Legal Measures on the Protection of Old Villages” and “Protective Regulations of Old Buildings in Suzhou City” were adopted in October 2005. At present, there are twelve local heritage protection laws, regulations and regulatory documents governing the protection of historic areas/townships, the classification of protected buildings and the restoration of old buildings. Suzhou has now established a comprehensive framework for legal protection of cultural heritage properties in the buffer zones of the World Heritage property and within the historic town. However, an updated comprehensive management plan for the protection of cultural heritage properties in Suzhou is needed to ensure long-term conservation and management of the urban fabric and landscape, and fully effective integration of the application of the many legal and regulatory measures described above.

c) Protection of historic setting of heritage property and architectural survey of historic area :

Inspired by the concern expressed by conservation experts and the public concerning the design of the New Suzhou Museum by I.M. Pei, the Management Authority gave thought to the question of how best to scientifically define and protect the setting of the World Heritage property in practical ways. An inventory system for architectural and cultural heritage properties was established and case studies were carried out at the Humble Administrator’s Garden and Pingjiang historic area to ensure protection of their traditional appearances and the overall urban environment. An architectural survey of historic buildings in the Pingjiang historic area has been made and the final publication will be made available by end of 2006. A thorough survey of historic buildings and urban landscape of the Old City area will be carried out at a later stage. Meanwhile, Suzhou city has established a comprehensive system for monitoring, early warning, emergency and disaster-prevention to raise its standard of heritage conservation and management.

d) Possible extension of the World Heritage property :

The Suzhou Municipal Government has attached great importance to the suggestion made by the World Heritage Committee in July 2004 for the possible extension of the World Heritage property of the Classical Gardens of Suzhou to include the entire historic town of Suzhou, together with other historic canal towns in the provinces of Jiangsu and Zhejiang. In this regard, the Site Management Authority decided, following careful study and consultation, to include the Pingjiang historic area, Shantang historic area, Panmen Gates, the historic area around the Humble Administrator’s Garden and other old canal towns of Tongli, Zhouzhuang and Luzhi in Jiangsu Province. The documentation of these cultural heritage sites has been prepared and submitted to China’s State Administration of Cultural

Heritage (SACH) for inclusion on the national Tentative List for World Heritage nominations.

ICOMOS strongly supports the interest of the State Party in extending the nomination to include the adjacent and nearby canal towns. This is very much in line with the recommendations of the General Assembly of ICOMOS held in 2005 in Xi'an, China, concerning the importance of maintaining setting. ICOMOS would also stress the importance in carrying out the inventory described above for Pingjiang historic area, of keeping in mind the group or streetscape character of the individual inclusions.

The importance of maintaining these traditional residential districts and historic towns as living towns should also be stressed, balancing the concerns of everyday life of the citizen with validating and maintaining structures of historic and cultural importance. While tourism is an important and powerful component for regional economic enhancement, too much tourism can degrade the regional community. This situation can result in over-use of the historic property, which results eventually in depletion of historical assets. When maintaining the actual life of residents is given priority within a historic and cultural town, visitors inevitably see and appreciate the dignity of the traditional life style interwoven into the regional culture. Tourism promoted in this way guarantees natural and healthy cultural tourism and attraction for the region.

An overall management plan for the property should be prepared, to ensure:

- a) that presently planned urban planning controls for height and land use, and design guidelines and regulations for new buildings and renovation of non-traditional architecture will function together to create a harmonious city environment.
- b) the fully integrated application of the more than a dozen recent heritage protection laws and regulatory documents, including the "Suzhou Municipal Measures to Protect its Own Villages" (June 2005), and "Detailed Rules for the Implementation of the Law of Cultural Relics of China" (1 October, 2005).

The preparation of a comprehensive and integrated management plan must be understood as a necessary precursor to submitting a new or extended nomination. Finally, more explicit reference should be made to the framework being used for conservation decision-making for individual structures, such as the recently completed "China Principles", so that the philosophical framework in place may be clearly understood and consistently applied.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.62

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 28 COM 15B.56, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Notes the positive achievements in the conservation and management of the property and particularly in adopting legal provisions for the protection of old villages and historic buildings in Suzhou and for the protection of historic setting of the property;*

4. *Commends* the State Party for its efforts to follow-up on the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee in its decision **28 COM 15B.56** and *encourages* it to maintain and augment such effort;
5. *Urges* the State Party to give high priority to the development of an updated comprehensive and integrated management plan for the World Heritage property which would ensure a harmonized approach to new development and renovation, fully integrate the application of all existing heritage laws and regulatory measures, and ensure that the historic villages maintain their “living” character;
6. *Requests* the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to respond positively to calls for support from the State Party in developing this comprehensive management plan for the protection of cultural heritage properties in Suzhou;
7. *Urges* the State Party to consider the possible extension of the World Heritage property to include the entire historic town of Suzhou, together with other historic canal towns within the same geo-cultural area in China;
8. *Requests* the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a report, before **1 February 2008**, on progress made in the development of an updated comprehensive management plan for the protection of cultural heritage properties in Suzhou, for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.

63. World Heritage properties in Beijing (China)

A. Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing and Shengyang (China) (C 439bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:
1987-2004

Criteria:
C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:
27 COM 7B.43
28 COM 15B.54
29 COM 7B.49

International assistance:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Missions in May and October 2005.

B. Summer Palace, and Imperial Garden in Beijing (China) (C 880)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1998

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.54

29 COM 7B.49

International assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission in October 2005.

C. Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing (China) (C 881)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1998

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.54

29 COM 7B.49

International assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission in October 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Tourism pressure;
- c) Lack of management mechanism (no legislation for protective buffer zone).

Current conservation issues:

On 30 January 2006, the World Heritage Centre received a comprehensive Report on the Conservation Status of the World Cultural Heritage properties of the Imperial Palace in Beijing, the Temple of Heaven, the Summer Palace and their Buffer Zones from China's State Administration of Cultural Heritage. The Report provides updated information on major progress made in the conservation of the Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties and other cultural heritage properties in Beijing, which includes:

- a) details on the redefinition of the boundary (86 hectares) of the Imperial Palace and buffer zones (1377 hectares), a total area of 1463 hectares, together with maps and detailed requirements for their protection, i.e. regulation on construction control and classification protection adopted in the buffer zone;
- b) development and implementation of a Conservation Master Plan for the Imperial Palace in Beijing;
- c) status of the major restoration/maintenance projects being carried out at the Imperial Palace, the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace;
- d) information on the adoption of specific laws and regulations to ensure the protection of buffer zones and historic setting of cultural heritage properties in Beijing, particularly for the Imperial Palace, the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace;
- e) clarification on the conservation projects in the Imperial Palace, the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace.

Attached to the report, the State Party also submitted an assessment of remaining traditional buildings in the buffer zone of the Imperial Palace of Beijing. According to the State Party, while a Conservation Master Plan was adopted for the Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing dynasties in 2002, the development of conservation master plans for the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace are still under way.

In response to Decision **29 COM 7B.49**, a Joint ICOMOS/World Heritage Centre Reactive Monitoring Mission was carried out to the property from 26 to 28 October 2005 to assess the actual impact of the restoration and conservation works on the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage properties in Beijing, namely the Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties, the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace.

Concerns were expressed from various circles of professionals and the general public, both nationally and internationally, over the quality of the restoration works and their possible negative impact on the authenticity of the properties. In the case of the Imperial Palace in Beijing, no sufficient maintenance was carried out in the past 100 years, since the end of 19th century. With time passing without much intervention, decay and degradation continued to advance until a comprehensive conservation and restoration plan was made in 2002. The plan has been implemented since 2002. According to the outline of the comprehensive plan for the conservation of the Imperial Palace, the first phase took

place in 2002-2005, with a total of 21 buildings included as the object of conservation/restoration during that period. The second phase, scheduled from 2006 to 2008, will concern seven buildings including the Taihe Men (Gate of Supreme Harmony) and the Taihe Dian (the Hall of Supreme Harmony). The third phase, scheduled for the period from 2009 to 2020, will cover six Palaces in the East Wing and six Palaces on the West as the last intervention.

In the Summer Palace, a repaving project for the square outside the Dong Gong Men (East Gate), Ren Shou Dian (the Hall of Benevolence and Longevity), and Dong Di (East Dam) was completed in 2001. Between 2003 and 2005, a landscaping project in the north-western part of the garden was carried out, including the removal of unfit buildings, paving and replanting of trees. In 2005, the restoration of the Cloud Dispelling Hall and of the Pagoda of Buddha Fragrance started, to be completed by October 2006.

At the Temple of Heaven, the on-going restoration project includes the correcting of inappropriate restoration carried out in the 1970s, such as the removal of chemical materials, and the restoring of polychromic decorative motifs. The foundation platform, which had been partially reconstructed with concrete, is being reinstated using Chinese traditional black fired bricks.

The joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Mission noted that the restoration works underway at the Imperial Palace, the Summer Palace and the Temple of Heaven included the restoration of roofs, the retouching of polychrome painting, and the partial restoration of wooden elements. Although these works did not require the dismantlement of structural members, they were nevertheless very conspicuous and changed considerably the overall appearance of the buildings. The Mission noted that these works are being carried out very rapidly, presumably in order to be completed in time for the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games.

Indeed, the poor quality of previous restoration works and the effect of time required some sort of intervention. However, it was not clear to the Mission on what documentary evidence the on-going restoration works were based, especially as regards the reconstitution of the polychrome painting. Moreover, the Mission observed that the excessively fast pace of the restoration works might affect the quality of the final result. Overall, the concern about the impact of the current works on the authenticity of the World heritage properties could not be completely removed, and further clarification would be needed.

During a debriefing with the Imperial Palace Management Authority, the mission was also informed of a 2004 plan to build an Exhibition Centre at the Shansiyuan (eastern wing of the Imperial Palace), later abandoned by the Chinese authorities. The Imperial Palace Management Authority was considering updating the Conservation Master Plan and proposing a new Exhibition Centre on the western wing of the Palace Museum. The proposed project is located north to the Gate of Western Flower and on the site of the former Qing Imperial Household Department, which was destroyed. According to the Management Authority, this plan is under discussion. Some obtrusive buildings, erected during the 1970s and not compatible with the visual integrity of the Imperial Palace, would also be removed. The mission found that this was appropriate and recommended that, in principle, no new buildings should be planned within the compounds of the Imperial Palace, the Summer Palace and the Temple of Heaven.

The mission recommended to the responsible Chinese authorities that:

- a) Clarification be given on what principles are guiding the current conservation works be provided in writing. ICOMOS is aware for example that the State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH) in China, in collaboration with the Getty Conservation Institute, and the Australian Heritage Commission, recently completed a document called the *Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China*. These have been promulgated since late 2000 by ICOMOS China. If these are in use, it would be useful for the State authority to signal this but if another philosophical framework is being used, then that should be stated. The use of a clear, explicitly shared philosophical framework for conservation decision-making will ensure consistency among all projects, ensure avoidance of ad hoc responses to particular site or project conditions and ensure that everyone involved is working in a common direction.
- b) A Regional Symposium on the Outstanding Universal Value, Authenticity and Integrity of cultural heritage properties in Asia might be organized in China in 2007 or 2008 to enhance the understanding of the conservation principles deriving from the international charters and conventions developed for conservation of cultural heritage in the region.
- c) A collaborative study on the restoration of polychromy and ways to ensure its authenticity within East Asia could be carried out. An Expert Group might be established for this purpose including representatives from eastern Asian countries such as Japan, Korea and Vietnam.
- d) The Conservation Master Plan for the Imperial Palace should be reviewed to integrate elements such as risk preparedness and tourism management. Meanwhile, development of a comprehensive site management plan is urgent for World Heritage properties of the Summer Palace and the Temple of Heaven in Beijing.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.49, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party of China for its continued commitment to address the conservation concerns of the cultural heritage properties in Beijing and for providing an updated management plan for the Imperial Palace of Beijing;*
4. *Notes with great concern, however, that current restoration works at the Imperial Palace, the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace in Beijing are carried out in a hasty manner, lack of documentary evidence and clearly formulated principles to guide the conservation works;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre with a report clarifying what documentary evidence are being used for the restoration of the polychromy within the three World Heritage properties;*

6. *Encourages* the State Party to make explicit the philosophical framework being used for conservation decisions on the property, whether this be “Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites” promoted by ICOMOS China or another vehicle;
7. *Further requests* the State Party to integrate risk-preparedness and tourism management within the Conservation Master Plan for the Imperial Palace and to develop appropriate Conservation Master Plans for the World Heritage properties of the Summer Palace and the Temple of Heaven in Beijing;
8. *Encourages* the State Party to initiate a collaborative study on the restoration of polychromy and ways to ensure its authenticity with other East Asian countries such as Japan, Korea and Vietnam;
9. *Further encourages* the State Party to organize, in collaboration with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, a Regional Symposium on the Outstanding Universal Value, Authenticity and Integrity of Cultural Heritage Properties in Asia, in 2007 or 2008, to assess the relevance of conservation principles developed at the international level within the region;
10. *Requests* the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, with a report on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

64. Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2002

Criteria:

C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.46

28 COM 15B.57

29 COM 7B.52

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission in April 2005

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of co-ordinated and functional management system;

- b) Lack of detailed property documentation; increasing number of visitors.

Current conservation issues:

The progress report, submitted by the State Party on 31 March 2006, provides brief information on the steps taken by the authorities in response to the recommendations made by the 29th session of the Committee (Durban, 2005).

The report states that the Bodhgaya Development Plan, entitled the “Heritage Led Perspective Development Plan of Bodhgaya, Vision 2031”, has been discussed with local stakeholders following the request of the Committee to adopt the provisions of the Site Management Plan of April 2005 within the development plan. The Gaya regional development authority is presently revising the Plan by incorporating the issues raised by local stakeholders with a view to finalising the document. The zoning proposed in the management plan has been incorporated into this development plan which also includes a focus on heritage protection. ICOMOS notes that a management plan and a development plan have different goals, and that it is important to define the relationship between them in ways that shall ensure that the protection of the outstanding universal value of the property is the basis for all decision-making in both plans.

Furthermore, the State Party reports that the Bodhgaya Development Plan includes heritage guidelines for the town that are to be followed by all major construction projects, notably a height control for buildings, as well as a ban on construction within the World Heritage boundaries and its buffer zone. At present, until the Bodhgaya Development Plan is approved and implemented by the State Government, any construction carried out within the designated World Heritage property area is being banned. However, in the context of the illegally approved constructions noted by the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission in 2005, the State Party has not reported whether the ban on construction is respected.

The State Party’s efforts to implement the Committee’s decisions concerning the management plan are commendable. However, ICOMOS recommends that the implementation of this plan should be further monitored to ensure that the concerns expressed in the joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission of 2005 are fully addressed, particularly those related to the recognition of the outstanding universal value of the site, and that a timeframe should be set in this regard.

In response to the Committee’s request that appropriate management mechanisms be explored, the State Party reports that the capacity of the existing agency, the Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC), is presently being strengthened in co-operation with the State Government of Bihar and the Central Government. The State Party underlines that a consensus on the management mechanism needs to be established amongst the different interest groups and stakeholders before any major change can be made in the present management system. ICOMOS reinforces the importance of this point and of ensuring full participation of the BTMC in the finalization of the management plan.

The report further mentions that detailed property documentation of existing conditions within buffer and periphery zones, as a basis for future monitoring, has been initiated and is expected to be completed by end July 2006. No specific details concerning the progress of this work have been provided in the report.

Regarding the invitation by the Committee to explore the appropriateness of an extension of the Mahabodhi Temple Complex nomination to include the cultural landscape that is identified with the wanderings and enlightenment of the Lord Buddha in this region, the State Party considers that detailed archaeological surveys and excavations are required to determine the locations and extent of specific associated sites, and that the issue of the extension of the property can only be considered once this work has been completed. ICOMOS regards the area in question as a large cultural landscape, which may be defined without the need for archaeological analysis and comments that the State Party should give this issue the highest priority as this area is inextricably linked with the outstanding universal value of the property, and a delay in including the related landscape as an essential part of an extended nomination puts its survival at risk.

Regarding the possible designation of the property under national legislation, the State Party reports that the living religious nature of the site makes it necessary to initiate a process of consensus-building around any move to national legislation. This process is presently underway, notably at the local level. ICOMOS underlines the importance of the Government of India providing for sites inscribed on the World Heritage List the highest level of national legal protection, as is the case with other religious properties on the World Heritage List.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.64

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Recognises the efforts and progress made by the State Party to respond to the requests made at the 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to adopt and implement the provisions of the management plan of April 2005 within the Bodhgaya Development Plan, if possible by 1 February 2007;*
5. *Invites the State Party to request assistance from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to advance the implementation of the management plan and to ensure the protection of the outstanding universal value of the property, as well as of the adjacent buffer and periphery zones;*
6. *Reiterates its recommendation to the State Party to undertake all necessary actions to ensure the nomination of the related landscape identified with the wanderings and enlightenment of the Lord Buddha in this region as an extension to the Mahabodhi Temple Complex;*
7. *Strongly recommends that the State Party, as a matter of priority, follow-up on the possible designation of the property under national legislation;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2007**, a detailed report on the progress made on the above points, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

65. Borobudur Temple Compound (Indonesia) (C 592)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1991

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.47

28 COM 15B.59

29 COM 7B.53

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 for promotional assistance in 1999.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7,000,000 between 1972 and 1983.

Previous monitoring missions:

16-20 April 2003 and 17-25 February 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Tourism development pressure;
- b) Uncontrolled vendors around the property;
- c) Lack of institutional coordination.

Current conservation issues:

A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission (17-25 February 2006), carried out at the request of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **29 COM 7B.53**), assessed the state of conservation of the World Heritage property of Borobudur Temple Compound, in Indonesia. The mission paid particular attention to issues related to the overall heritage and tourism management of the locality, and the status of earlier development proposals for roads, shopping centre and a retail precinct (Jagad Jawa).

As requested by the Committee, the State Party has confirmed in writing (in the report submitted in February 2006 to the World Heritage Centre) and reiterated during the Mission that no major road developments will be carried out in zones 1, 2 and 3; no major commercial complexes will be built within any of the 5 zones; and that the Jawa Jagad Project has been now cancelled. The very strong commitment of the Indonesian authorities to protect the heritage value of the site and address the requests by the Committee should be given adequate recognition, considering also the substantial interests attached to the proposed development projects.

In the absence of clear policies, regulations and procedures for the land use of the area surrounding the World Heritage property, however, the potential for new and inappropriate development proposals remains a constant threat to the integrity of the landscape. Indeed, a new proposal was brought to the attention of the Mission for the

execution of a commercial street along the northern edge of the buffer zone for a length of approximately 1.5km.

Another potentially harmful project under way is that of an asphalt mixing plant in the vicinity of the Temple, which has been constructed but is not operational due to a dispute in court between the owner and the competent authorities which had not accorded their agreement to the project. Dust emissions from this plant could threaten the stone conservation program of the Temple structure.

As stressed by the report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission of 2003⁴, the temple of Borobudur cannot be seen as a monument isolated from its context. While the nomination file of 1991 referred mainly to the artistic and historic significance of the Temple, it is apparent that its Outstanding Universal Value (i.e. the ultimate justification for its inscription on the World Heritage List) depends also on the extraordinary relationship between the monument and its setting. The latter is at serious risk of losing its integrity if urgent steps are not taken. The protection of this setting is also crucial for the long-term sustainable development of the local community.

As for the requested Visitors' management Plan, although such a document has not been prepared by the State Party, significant efforts have been made since the previous mission of 2003. These include the new so-called Borobudur Ship Museum as an added attraction, live open-air dance performances near the site entry to manage congestion on the monument, some new visitor facilities, increased security measures, a clearly defined tourist movement route across the site, clear directional signage and basic training of local guides.

The extent of the vendor stalls around the car park and site entry forecourt, however, remains a major concern. The current, visually chaotic situation is not compatible with the visitor's expectation of a world class heritage site as it detracts significantly from the experience and is a cause for frustration for visitors and local community alike. This problem is related to the lack of an effective policy to develop sustainable tourism in the area of Borobudur by using the Temple as a platform to bring benefits to the entire community.

Concerning the mechanisms to ensure coordination among the various institutions having some interest in the management of the site and its surrounding, these are predominantly informal (i.e. through occasional meetings). A steering Committee was set up by the Minister of Culture in 2004, but it apparently only met once in 2005 (in February). These meetings of the Committee, moreover, seem to be more forums for discussions rather than a formalised coordination mechanism. The coordination seems therefore to be still weak and not governed by any written policy document or formal procedures.

At the meeting of February 2005, for example, an Action Plan for the development of the World Heritage sites of Borobudur and Prambanan was agreed upon. This included short, medium and long term actions, but it did not indicate the responsibilities for their implementation. Some of these actions, moreover, seem to be rather formulated as

⁴ Borobudur Temple Compound, Central Java, Indonesia – UNESCO – ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission, 16-20 April 2003, Mission report. By Richard Engelhardt and Graham Brooks

objectives (e.g. “improving the role of the community in the preservation and protection of the World Heritage sites”).

The division of the responsibility for zones 1, 2 and 3 among three separate institutions with different mandates and objectives is at the root of most of the problems at Borobudur. Decisions taken by each of these institutions, especially by PT Taman Wisata (managing zone 2, i.e. the buffer zone), are likely to impact on the zones under the responsibility of the other two institutions, in the absence of a common vision and clear mechanisms to coordinate. The issue is not just that these institutions do not coordinate enough among themselves, but that their respective objectives appear to be sometimes conflicting, and no formal regulatory and planning framework exists to reconcile these different mandates within a single agreed vision and policy.

To address this situation, which undermines the effective management for conservation of the World Heritage property, there is a need for a reform of the management system. This will have to ensure stronger coherence for the protection of the wider setting of the World Heritage temple and a regulatory and planning framework to enable the concerned authorities to more effectively manage the property and its buffer zone.

The Mission examined as well the state of conservation of the stone of the Temple. Direct observation of the poor state of the bas-reliefs and the data provided through the monitoring programme conducted by the national authorities, showing that the rate of material deterioration of the stone continues to increase, seem to indicate that the current methodology of conservation may not be appropriate, and call for its reconsideration.

A complete set of recommendations, with indicative time-frames for implementation, is included in the mission report, whose conclusions were discussed at length with the national authorities in Jakarta.

These recommendations include:

- a) Not carrying out the proposed development of a commercial street along the northern edge of zone 2;
- b) A review of the Presidential Decree of 1992 to establish a single, combined, management authority for zones 1 and 2, and the extension of the boundaries of zone 3 (i.e. to become the new buffer zone of the site);
- c) The development of appropriate regulatory & planning framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property, with a view to preserving its rural character;
- d) The development of a management plan for the Borobudur World Heritage property, once the new management authority has been established;
- e) Maintaining the current layout of zones 1 and 2 and improving the quality and appearance of the existing infrastructure where the vendors are located, by reducing its extent and controlling it so as to avoid over spilling throughout zone;
- f) Upgrading the urban design, facades and infrastructure of the street and square leading to the site (where the existing village is developing in a chaotic way).

Concerning the deterioration of the stone of the Temple, the Mission recommended, as initial steps, to:

- a) Develop and conduct a diagnostic monitoring programme to identify the causes of the current increasing rate of deterioration of the stone;
- b) Organize an international stone conservation experts' meeting to review results of the monitoring and discuss future options.

Further recommendations included in the Mission Report concern specifically ways to improve management of tourism at the site.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.65

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.53, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the national authorities for having cancelled the projects for major road developments, commercial complexes and a retail precinct in the vicinity of the World Heritage property, as well as for the significant improvements in the management of visitors within the core area of the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party not to implement the proposed commercial street development along the road on the northern edge of zone 2 of the World heritage property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to conduct an impact assessment of the asphalt mixing plant to determine whether or not it could cause any damage to the values of the World heritage property and, in the affirmative, to take the appropriate measures to remove or mitigate the involved risks;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to review the legal and institutional framework for the protection and management of the World Heritage property and its surrounding area, along the lines indicated in the report of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Mission. To this end, the State Party should accomplish, within one year, the following benchmark tasks:*
 - a) *Elaborate a draft of the Presidential Decree to be revised, developed through a preliminary consultation among all concerned parties, and according to the concept outlined in the report of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Mission,*
 - b) *Develop a detailed design proposal, including plans and elevations at the adequate scale, for the improvement of the entry area;*
 - c) *Improve the interpretation at the site Museum according to the standard of the Ship Museum, and provide brochures in foreign languages at the latter, including reference to the status of Borobudur as a World Heritage property and the reasons why it was inscribed on the World Heritage List;*
 - d) *Develop and put in place a specific diagnostic monitoring programme aimed at identifying the cause for the increasing rate of deterioration of the stone, if necessary with assistance by the World Heritage Centre.*

7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, a report including information on the progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Mission, as well as of the specific benchmarks indicated in paragraph 6 above, for the consideration of the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

**66. Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range (Japan)
(C 1142)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2004

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 14B.28

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

At its 28th session, the World Heritage Committee inscribed the Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Sites in the Kii Mountain Range on the World Heritage List and requested the Japanese authorities to develop a more detailed management plan and medium-term strategy to address the sustainable management of both the natural and cultural aspects of the property. It was suggested that such a plan might consider the appropriate placement of overhead wires and visitor facilities. The State Party was asked to submit the plan for examination by the Committee at its 30th session in 2006.

On 17 February 2006 the State Party submitted a preservation and management plan for the site produced by the Three Prefectures Council for the World Heritage property. The inscribed property consists of three sacred sites, Yoshino and Omine, Kumano Sanzan, and Koyasan, in the heavily forested Kii Mountains, and a complex pattern of tracks and paths which link the sites together and to the ancient capitals of Nara and Kyoto, which flourished from the 6th century to 1868. The sites are distributed through three Prefectures: Mie, Nara and Wakayama.

The Plan has been prepared by the Boards of Education of Mie, Nara and Wakayama Prefectures in cooperation with the Agency for Cultural Affairs. To support the overall Plan, the three Prefectures have produced supplementary plans for the sites within their territories. Furthermore, it is stated that these territory plans will be augmented by specific preservation and management plans for individual historic sites. The preparation of the management plan was guided by a Coordinating Academic Committee for the World Heritage property, consisting of specialists from each of the Prefectures, and by Academic Committees within each of the Prefectures. These latter included relevant experts and representatives of local people.

The main overall Plan sets out six basic Principles of Preservation and Management. These are:

- a) Necessary identification and documentation;
- b) Criteria for modification;
- c) Recognition of value as living heritage;
- d) Integration of cultural and natural features;
- e) Conservation and utilization (as a means of ensuring preservation and management);
- f) Public participation.

The Plan stresses the need for landscape scale planning encompassing monuments, the natural environment and the overall cultural landscapes that includes many modern interventions, such as roads. It also stresses the need to consider appropriate management of natural elements that produce an 'awe-inspiring atmosphere'.

In order to implement the Plan, the following is recommended:

- a) Full-time officers within each of the relevant city governments, town governments and village governments;
- b) Reinforced support provided by Prefectural governments;
- c) Improved coordination amongst custodial bodies, Prefectural governments and the Agency for Cultural Affairs through the establishment of a Three Prefectures Council, which will over-arch the Three Prefectures' Expert Committee and other expert Prefectural Committees;
- d) Increased educational and communal activities;
- e) Training of local staff.

The three Prefectural Plans set out in detail the cultural and natural elements of the property, using an agreed methodology for identifying component features, both cultural and natural, together with their use and vulnerabilities and recommendations for improvement relating to, for instance, visitor facilities and overhead wires. They also give details of the collaborative arrangement in place within each of the prefectures such as Promotion Councils, Liaison meetings (liaison between councils) and arrangement to coordinate activities with owners of shrines, paths and forests.

Overall the Plans are very accessible documents. Although detailed and thorough, they are presented in a user-friendly way using straightforward language and encapsulate well the values of the sites as well as their challenges. What the plans do not set out are any benchmarks or ways of monitoring or evaluating the effectiveness of the Plans. It would be helpful if these aspects could be integrated into the plans.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.66

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 14B.28** adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the preparation of the overall Preservation and management plan for the Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range World Heritage Site, and for the three supplementary Prefectural Plans;*
4. *Suggests that these Prefectural Plans could be complemented, in time, by benchmarks and indicators, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of these Plans over time.*

67. Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1998

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.49

28 COM 15B.64

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

At its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003), the Committee reviewed the potential negative impact of a proposed highway (Keinawa Motorway) to be constructed in the vicinity of the property. It also requested the State Party to examine carefully the issue, in full consultation with all the concerned parties, with a view to preserve the authenticity and integrity of the World Heritage property. The Committee further requested the State Party to keep it informed of the status of the decision-making process regarding this project.

These recommendations were reiterated in 2004. In its reports submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2003 and 2004, the State Party reported that an Expert Committee had been established to review the proposal, and that the standard Environmental Impact Assessment process was being followed, including a wide consultation with the concerned communities. The Chair of the Expert Committee for the Yamato-Kita Road Construction and Public Involvement has also been appointed as Chair of the Expert Panel for Environmental Assessment. One of the options advanced by the Expert Committee was the execution of the highway underground.

In July 2005, the World Heritage Centre received a report from the NGO “Society for Protecting the Heijyokyo Capital Site”, reiterating concern for the impact of the proposed highway on the World Heritage property, including its underground features. The report emphasized in particular three issues that would need to be addressed. These were:

- a) Rationale for the construction of the expressway. The document claimed that the accident rates and traffic volumes figures used to justify the need for an express way are in reality much lower, thus questioning the very necessity for such infrastructure;
- b) Structural impact of the proposed tunnel solution (one of the options considered). The digging of a tunnel underground might affect the levels of the ground water, thus causing soil settlements under the historic monuments of Ancient Nara, whose stability might in turn be compromised;
- c) The lack of a truly open consultative process, involving local residents and other concerned stakeholders.

The World Heritage Centre forwarded this report to the concerned national authorities, on 16 September 2005, requesting their comments. The State Party replied by its letter dated 1 February 2006. In its response, the State Party addressed the three issues raised by the NGO as follows:

- a) On the question of the rationale for the construction of the highway, the State Party questioned the methodology adopted by the NGO to collect data concerning traffic volumes and accident rates, and reiterated the need for the new infrastructure;
- b) The State Party also provided information on the possible fluctuation of the groundwater level resulting from the construction of the highway, stating that this will not cause any adverse on the World Heritage property, based on accurate studies carried out by experts from the concerned national authorities;
- c) On the issue of the public consultation, the State Party confirmed that all the standards legal procedures had been followed. In particular, information on the project was made public on three occasions (as well as on a web-site) and seven questionnaire-based surveys were conducted among residents, totalling 4,693 answers. 79% of the residents allegedly felt the need for road improvements in the northern Nara prefecture due to traffic congestion. Almost 4 million brochures and handouts on the project were also distributed. The Government of Japan, moreover, had consulted six times with the NGO “Society for Protecting the Heijyokyo Capital Site”, including during public events.

Finally, the State Party confirmed that the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment under preparation will be made public as soon as completed.

ICOMOS appreciates the efforts of the Government of Japan to clarify the nature of the traffic congestion which the new highway is meant to address, and to analyse the impacts of the tunnel building on the water table for the chosen route. Many of the points made by the NGO and by the State Party in their respective documents, however, are hard to evaluate without more time and more information. One way of facilitating the necessary internal debate could be to take the process for the Environmental Impact Assessment outside the Government, in a neutral fashion, by consultants hired for that purpose.

It would be also important to ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment includes consideration of alternative options for the highway with a cost-benefits analysis based on an evaluation of the impact on the World Heritage property.

ICOMOS would further suggest that the State Party describe the monitoring procedures that they would put in place to measure possible groundwater fluctuations during the building of the tunnel and subsequent operation of the highway, and the emergency mitigation measures that would be in place should fluctuations threaten the sub surface wood on the World Heritage property. ICOMOS would however request the State Party to demonstrate that the option being developed offers least potential impact to the Nara World Heritage property, and to assure the World Heritage Committee that the outstanding universal value of the property is not at any risk.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.67

The World Heritage Committee

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.64** adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State party of Japan concerning the progress made in the elaboration of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed execution of a highway through the northern Nara prefecture;*
4. *Appreciates the efforts of the Government of Japan to clarify the nature of the traffic congestion which the new highway is meant to address, and to analyze the impacts of the tunnel building on the water table for the chosen route;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to consider the possibility of entrusting the elaboration of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the highway project to an independent consultant hired for that purpose;*
6. *Requests the State Party to ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment include consideration for alternative options for the route of the Highway, as well as a cost-benefit analysis demonstrating that the option being suggested, with the necessary mitigation measures, offers least potential impact to the Nara World Heritage property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007 at the latest, a report illustrating the outcome of the Environmental Impact Assessment, as well as the process followed for its elaboration, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007. Such*

report should be submitted as soon as the EIA process is completed and in any case before decisions that would be difficult to revert are taken concerning the project for the Highway.

68. Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1981

Criteria:

C (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.103

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

No recent missions have been undertaken to the property.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

A very brief report dated 31 March 2006 was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. However, this report does not provide any substantial information regarding the state of conservation of the site.

The site was included in the List of the 100 Most Endangered Sites of the World Monuments Watch in 2005, owing to its poor state of conservation affected by the severe local climate conditions (rain, wind, etc.). The site also suffers from loss of groundwater and topsoil erosion caused by the shift of the riverbed.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.68

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Regrets that insufficient information on the state of conservation of the property has been provided by the State Party;*

4. *Notes with great concern that the site has been included in the List of the 100 Most Endangered Sites of the World Monuments Watch in 2005, due to the significant decay of the property caused by the local climate conditions and the shift of the riverbed; and*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission to the property to examine the urgency of the situation, in close consultation with the responsible authorities, and report to the Committee on the outcome of the mission at its 31st session in 2007; and*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2007 a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

69. Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1980

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

19 COM D.3.2

21 COM C

International Assistance:

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 23,500,000 (total of contributions for the International Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro).

Previous monitoring missions:

Missions to the site were carried out by international experts working on the post-campaign strategy for Moenjodaro in December 2005 and January 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of appropriate conservation work;
- b) Deterioration of structures;
- c) Suspension of management system.

Current conservation issues

The site, among the largest Bronze Age cities world-wide, was included in the ICOMOS World Report on Monuments and Sites in Danger in 2000. Despite the recommendations and resolutions adopted by the Executive Committee for the Safeguarding of Moenjodaro at its 13th session, concluding the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign in

1997, threats to the site caused by continued deterioration and lack of an appropriate management system have persisted.

A post-campaign strategy (Medium-Term Strategy for the Preservation and Conservation of Moenjodaro) was developed by UNESCO in co-operation with the national authorities in 2003/2004. The post-campaign strategy addressed the need for a sustainable conservation programme, improved general condition of the site and its management, as well as the future development of the site. In 2000 the Pakistani authorities established a management structure which, within the framework of the post-campaign strategy, was revised in 2003. It involved the creation of an Executive Board composed of representatives of the national and regional governments, UNESCO and the Department of Archaeology and Museums, as well as a Technical Consultative Committee. The Board reviewed the annual workplans and budget and had the responsibility of authorising the release of funds (National Fund for Moenjodaro) for conservation works and national staff. An international project manager and national site manager were also appointed to oversee the site activities and liaise between the site and the authorities. This structure has recently been dissolved by the Pakistani authorities, but no new structure has been put in its place.

The site continues to be threatened by lack of an appropriate management system. Specifically, the threats and issues which remain of concern are:

a) Management structure

One of the main priorities of the post-campaign strategy was the creation a new management structure, carried out in close co-operation with the State Party at the time. Despite this priority, the overall management system for Moenjodaro is ineffective.

b) Scientific research and documentation

Only 10% of Moenjodaro has been excavated. Conservation can only be carried out in co-ordination with thorough research and documentation. A research database and documentation centre is of great importance.

c) Conservation and restoration methods

In the past, the national authorities removed around 20% of the original wall parts and inserted damp proof slabs, without appropriate documentation. The conservation interventions of the 1970s and 1980s, involving the drilling of tube wells to control the groundwater, have been largely ineffective. This is due mainly to the high maintenance costs, lack of upkeep of equipment and irregularity of electricity supply. Moreover, the salt action in the bricks, causing deterioration to the exposed structures, is not halted by the groundwater control. Thus, sealing off the wall surfaces with mud slurry has proven successful in halting the process of sodium sulphate. This can be easily carried out and maintained by trained local experts.

d) Capacity building

In the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign, UNDP contributed greatly to capacity building in Pakistan. The Moenjodaro Conservation and Research Centre was created for this purpose. Due to insufficient support from national authorities in recent years, the lack of national capacity and knowledge of international standards of conservation techniques at local and national levels continues to be of grave concern.

In light of the above, a World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission to the site should be carried out as soon as possible to evaluate the current situation in collaboration with the relevant authorities. The mission should examine the boundaries and buffer zone of the site and discuss with the State Party possible changes to these boundaries in order to address the threats of encroachment. Considering that the timetable for the implementation of the Medium-Term Strategy and the Action Plan has been considerably delayed, the national authorities should prepare a revised Action Plan for the site, possibly in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.69

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes with concern the threats to the site caused by lack of an appropriate management system, continued deterioration of original wall structures, as well as inappropriate conservation measures which threaten the authenticity of the site;*
3. *Further notes, with regret, that despite the considerable efforts and the important international campaign funds provided to the site in the last 26 years, this World Heritage site is still lacking an appropriate management structure, conservation plan and conservation capacities;*
4. *Strongly encourages the national authorities to take all necessary measures to strengthen the administrative, management and technical structures for the site;*
5. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *establish an appropriate management structure and long-term conservation plan for the site;*
 - b) *identify training needs so as to address the shortcomings of national experts;*
 - c) *ensure the conservation programme at the site is undertaken according to international conservation standards;*
 - d) *prepare and submit to the World Heritage Centre a revised Action Plan for the site;*
 - e) *urgently review the boundaries and buffer zone of the property in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies; and*
6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS mission to the property to examine the current state of conservation and define, in close consultation with the responsible authorities, solutions and concrete actions to address the above concerns, including a clear timetable for implementation, and report to the Committee on the outcome of the mission at its 31st session in 2007; and*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a detailed report on the progress made in the implementation of the*

above recommendations for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

70. Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2001

Criteria:

C(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.56

28 COM 15B.68

29 COM 7B.62

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2005): USD 30,000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

A monitoring mission by an international expert from 23-29 October 2002.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Lack of comprehensive conservation and management plan.

Current conservation issues:

On 3 February 2006, a report was sent, in Russian, by the Permanent Delegation of Uzbekistan to UNESCO, concerning the state of conservation of the property. This document has been later translated into English by the same delegation.

Unfortunately, in this document, nothing is mentioned concerning the management plan of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz, nor does it provide updated information on the state of conservation of the site. Such management plan should include a description of the physical attributes that it aims to conserve, specific activities to protect these attributes, provisions for monitoring the state of conservation, comprehensive landscape planning, and details on how the management system operates in aspects such as decision-making structure, budgeting, monitoring, specific conservation / restoration projects.

During the reactive monitoring mission to Samarkand, the ICOMOS expert also paid a short visit to Shakhrisyabz. Time was not sufficient to review the general situation of the whole site, however the mission was informed that the Ak-Sarai Palace compound area had been exposed after demolition of military barracks. There is an urgent need for archaeological excavations and comprehensive landscape planning to integrate these parts

into the general urban development with proper concern for the integrity and authenticity of the site. This planning goes beyond the traditional approach to conservation of individual historic monuments. It will require the strengthening of the local capacities in urban development and cultural heritage preservation in order to create a positive understanding, by all stakeholders, that conservation and development are not mutually exclusive objectives, but part of a single process.

The UNESCO-Tashkent Office has pointed out that the line of very ancient mulberry trees probably planted as part of the original layout of Timur's Ak Sarai palace gardens may be cut down. These trees should be preserved as part of a large-scale archaeological investigation and preservation project.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.70

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.62, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Notes with concern that a management plan for the property based on the principles set out in the Operational Guidelines still needs to be prepared;
4. Requests the State Party, with assistance from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a comprehensive management plan specifically targeted at the situation in Shakhrysyabz, and clearly based on the outstanding universal value of the property;
5. Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a progress report by **1 February 2007** on the preparation of the above-mentioned management plan, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

71. Complex of Hué Monuments (Viet Nam) (C 678)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1993

Criteria:

C (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.61

29 COM 7B. 58

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2004): USD 307,111.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: International Safeguarding Campaign (amount not available).

Previous monitoring missions:

A monitoring mission by an international expert, 8-18 November 2003.

Main threat(s) identified in previous reports:

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Illegal constructions or renovations within the Citadel;
- c) Absence of an overall management plan.

Current conservation issues:

With a report submitted on 20 March 2006 to the World Heritage Centre, including a number of Annexes, the State Party reported on the implementation of the recommendations issued by the Committee by its decision **29 COM 7B. 58**.

Concerning the issue of the illegal buildings erected within the World Heritage Property's perimeter, notably after the November 1999 floods, a comprehensive photographic survey was carried out. According to this, 2,824 private houses were illegally built on the rampart and bastions of the Citadel, or close to other relevant monuments.

Based on the list, during the last quarter of 2005 and the first quarter of 2006, an unspecified number of illegal houses around the boundary of the Imperial City were demolished. One hundred private houses were removed in the Bach Ho Bridge area, and their occupants resettled, to create green areas along the riverside. The report of the State Party does not clarify whether these one hundred buildings had been constructed illegally. Further demolitions, to start in March 2006, will target 159 houses in the southern part of the Citadel, and the clearance of other illegal structures on the two sides of the Royal Canal. The authorities intend to continue the work gradually, until completion by the end of 2010. A plot of land has apparently been identified to accommodate the occupants of the illegal houses, in the northern part of the city.

To control changes within the historic areas, moreover, regulations defining height-limit and architectural specifications were developed by the local authorities. These include guidelines to assist owners to re-build or repair their houses with due consideration for their heritage significance. In addition, an embellishment project has been implemented, while repair and consolidation works were carried out to restore the natural scenery in front of the Citadel and prevent erosion, along the Huong riverside.

Concerning the establishment of a complete inventory of the traditional urban buildings of Hué, 690 traditional houses were measured and photographed. This documentation was not enclosed in the State Party report. In addition, the Hue Monuments Conservation Centre (HMCC) compiled a list of 234 listed "relics" considered of historic value in the Hue region, including communal halls, pagodas, temples, garden houses, offices, schools and some famous landscape sites, enclosed to the State Party report. This list, however, indicates only the names of the concerned properties and their location, with no information on their significance and/or state of conservation. The State Party also expressed its intention to request financial assistance through the World Heritage Fund, in 2006, to compile a GIS data-base of all historic structures and houses. In this regard, cooperation is underway with the Waseda University and with a European Union funded

project for the safeguarding of the traditional “*ruong*” houses (traditional houses with wooden frame) in Hue.

As pertains to the elaboration of a comprehensive management plan for the Hué World Heritage property, the State Party held a workshop, in August 2005, in cooperation with the Waseda University. This workshop, which considered the preservation of Hue in the context of the sustainable development of its wider area, resulted in a short document containing basic principles for the establishment of a management plan for the World Heritage property. Among the principles, special mention is made of the need to ensure the preservation of the particular link of Hue with its environmental context, including the extraordinary cultural landscape formed by the Huong River Valley, within the framework of the Feng Shui principles.

Based on these principles, as well as on the relevant provisions of the *Operational Guidelines*, HMCC intends to develop a management plan by the end of 2006, upon instruction by the responsible Vietnamese authorities. To this end, a second workshop is foreseen for the third quarter of 2006, to review the progress and integrate comments in the final draft. At the same time, HMCC is developing new zoning and regulations for land-use and building activities within and around the boundaries of the World Heritage properties. The State Party confirmed that the elaboration of the management plan will be carried out in consultation with the World Heritage Centre.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre was informed that a large tourist resort is likely to be constructed on the Vong Canh hill along the Huong River, with potential negative impact on the integrity of the landscape. The area is outside the current Hue World Heritage property, but within the area that could be considered for its possible extension.

The State Party’s extensive efforts in addressing the issue of the illegal constructions should be highly commended, especially taking into account the strong pressure exerted by the socio-economic and tourism development of the country and the impact of recent natural disasters. Over the next years, it will be important to monitor the progress made in completing the process for the removal of the identified illegal constructions and ensure that appropriate alternative housing solutions are identified in consultation with the concerned occupants.

Concerning the request for an inventory of traditional urban buildings, it is not clear whether the work carried out so far include consideration for all historic buildings within the World Heritage property, or just a part. Moreover, the list of “relics” prepared by the State Party does not appear to be sufficient as an instrument to inform conservation decisions. A conservation-oriented survey of all the historic elements of cultural significance within the World Heritage boundaries, but covering also areas of heritage interests in Hue, should be carried out, possibly based on a GIS data-base.

Action should be pursued to establish a management plan with a view to ensuring the long-term protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Such a plan should necessarily be based upon a full understanding of the nature and extent of the heritage present in Hue, and therefore will need to integrate the outcome of the above-mentioned survey. This Plan should include appropriate regulations for land-use and buildings and should integrate concern for all monuments and landscape areas considered as having significant heritage value associated to Hué, which are currently not included in the property inscribed on the World Heritage List, in view of a possible re-nomination of

the property. It is recommended that the State Party continues its work towards the establishment of the management Plan in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

Finally, the State Party should consider carefully the proposal for the development of a tourist resort on the Vong Canh hill along the Huong River by conducting an environmental impact assessment, to determine its possible negative consequences on the Outstanding Universal Value of Hue.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.71

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.58, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the significant efforts made by the State Party of Viet Nam towards the removal of the illegal constructions that negatively impact on the value of the World Heritage property;*
4. *Notes with appreciation the positive steps undertaken by the State Party to implement the recommendations made by the Committee at its 29th session in 2005;*
5. *Notes however that the full implementation of those recommendations requires further substantial work, and requests the State Party to pursue its efforts by:*
 - a) *Continuing the implementation of the programme for the removal of the illegal constructions within the World Heritage property, in particular those built after the floods of 1999, and the resettlement of their occupants, within the established timeframe (i.e. within 2010) in close consultation with all the concerned parties;*
 - b) *Establishing a complete inventory of all traditional buildings of Hué, possibly based upon a GIS system, that conforms to relevant international standards and which include information on their character, significance and state of conservation, so as to inform appropriate policies for their safeguarding. This inventory should be completed by June 2007;*
 - c) *Developing a comprehensive management plan, to be operational by the end of 2008, based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and on the outcome of the above-mentioned survey, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. As previously recommended, this plan should involve all monuments and landscape areas considered as having a significant heritage value associated with Hué and which are currently not included in the property on the World Heritage List, in view of a possible re-nomination of the property to include more of its cultural landscape. A first draft of the management plan, including its contents, should be prepared by the end of 2006;*
 - d) *Conducting an Environmental Impact Assessment, including consideration of cultural heritage aspects, of the proposed tourist resort project on the*

Vong Canh hill along the Huong River. This should be carried out as soon as possible and, in any case, before irreversible decisions are taken that may affect the value of the World Heritage property;

6. *Also request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS monitoring mission in 2007 to assess the state of conservation of the property and assist in defining the scope and content of the management plan to be developed;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, on the progress achieved in the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

72. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

See Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add*

73. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1985

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.79

28 COM 15B.80

29 COM 7B.70

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property (from 1987 to 2004): USD 371,357.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 211,900 (Conservation of Hagia Sophia); USD 36,686.30 (Convention France UNESCO); UNESCO CLT/CH USD 100,000 (in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign for Istanbul and Göreme).

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre missions in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and in April 2006 (World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint mission).

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Continued degradation of the vernacular architecture within the protected areas (mainly the Ottoman period timber houses in the district of Zeyrek and Süleymaniye);
- b) Quality of repairs and reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls;
- c) Uncontrolled development and absence of a World Heritage management plan;
- d) Lack of coordination between national and municipal authorities, and of organisational relationships between decision-making bodies for the safeguarding of World Heritage at the site;

- e) Potential impacts of new buildings and development projects on the World Heritage values and integrity of the site.

Current conservation issues:

As requested by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party provided a progress report on Istanbul dated 30 January 2006 together with supplementary information prepared by the Mayor and Governor of Istanbul.

A joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission to Istanbul was carried out from 6 to 11 April 2006, upon the request of the Turkish authorities and in response to further information on continuing threats to the site. The mission successfully concluded its technical review of the situation based on an on-site visit and on extensive documentation and meetings with relevant stakeholders. The report including detailed recommendations is available at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>.

In conformity with the decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th and 29th session, the Turkish authorities provided a report which was reviewed by the UNESCO/ICOMOS mission taking also into account Decision **29 COM 7C** paragraph 5:

a) *Urgent completion and enforcement of the Urban Conservation and Development Plan*

The Urban Conservation and Development Plans were completed in the period 1995 - 2005 and were approved by the Protection Board in 2005. The plans designate new conservation areas within the Historic Peninsula and will be integral tools for conserving the historic environment. Furthermore, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality has allocated USD 30,075,000 for management projects in the Historic Peninsula, thereby strengthening the Historic Environment Protection Directorate. For projects carried out in 2006 the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Metropolitan Municipality and the Governorship of Istanbul have each allocated 1 million YTL.

The mission specifically welcomed the newly instituted system of grants now available from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism for cultural heritage conservation projects. Grants at a municipal level for the repair of privately owned historic buildings should also be encouraged.

b) *Strengthening of the Istanbul Board of Protection of Cultural Property*

The State Party's report mentioned that a new Protection Board No.4 was created in 2006 to speed up applications for conservation measures and new constructions in the Historic Peninsula, and that Fatih and Eminönü Municipalities have established Heritage Units which will be expanded in the future. These will strengthen the capacity of the district municipalities to fulfil the obligations under the new legislation.

The mission considered that the new conservation legislation (2004) will give considerable powers to the municipalities. Fatih Municipality has recently established a Historical Environment Conservation Directorate and Eminönü Municipality has created a Conservation Bureau, but these are not yet sufficiently strong to fulfil an effective role in managing the property.

c) *Develop a more proactive urban management plan*

As mentioned in the 2005 report, the regional Conservation Council evaluated the impacts of the project and excavations permitted at Yenikapi and Yedikule stations. Three

excavation zones have been identified in the Yenikapi area of which two were completed. Reports on the preservation of ruins and findings have been submitted to the Regional Conservation Council for evaluation. As part of the archaeological mitigation procedures, mosaics and the remains of eight historic ships of the Byzantine-Ottoman periods were discovered. It is planned to display these finds in a new museum. The mission noted with satisfaction that part of the recommendations of UNESCO to the Government of Turkey and the Japan Bank for Cooperation contained in the “Report of the UNESCO Advisory Team on the Marmaray Rail Tube Tunnel and Gebze-Halkah Surface Metro System” of December 2003, were implemented for the excavation at Yenikapi and Yedikule. Four archaeological teams have been established.

d) Greater national and local authority participation in the on-going European Union (EU) funded urban conservation and renewal project

Recognizing the threats affecting the historic timber houses, important initiatives have been undertaken during the past year. The UNESCO World Heritage Fund project at Zeyrek has been completed. A special unit “Historical Environment Conservation Directorate” has been established by the Fatih District Municipality. To address conservation problems in other core areas with traditional timber houses, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality is currently preparing a large-scale restoration project in the area of Süleymaniye.

The mission applauded the successful implementation of the Rehabilitation of Fener and Balat Districts Programme (with funding from the EU secured with the support of UNESCO), and recommended that the authorities should utilize it as a model to implement further community-based regeneration projects in deprived historic districts. The mission further urged Fatih Municipality, as beneficiary, to show increased commitment to the project, including by allocating municipal personnel to benefit from the transfer of experience and know-how. If implementation of the project is not extended beyond 31 October 2006 by the European Commission, Fatih Municipality should make adequate administrative and financial provisions to complete the project so that all 132 houses proposed for rehabilitation can be conserved.

The mission further commended the efforts of the Turkish Timber Association, within the framework of the “Save Our Roofs” Campaign (2003), in implementing repair projects to timber houses in Zeyrek, but noted that serious erosion of traditional urban fabric in Zeyrek and in Süleymaniye has nevertheless continued between 1985 and 2003. No effective measures were taken to reduce the threats to the traditional timber architecture of the four core areas and there was no programme to reduce the number of houses lost through neglect, destruction by fire or reconstruction. The mission urged the authorities to resolve the problems by spending the public funds that are now available to repair further houses, concentrating on in-situ repair (rather than demolition and reconstruction) and the maximum retention of original fabric.

e) Exert greater care in the conservation techniques applied in the consolidation of the Theodosian Walls

The city walls of Istanbul are approx. 20km long in the core area. A Land Conservation Plan was determined in 1987 and by 2002 some parts of the walls had been restored. Consolidation techniques were mostly used and renovation was avoided as much as possible. In order to ensure that the future work on the city walls meets international standards, all restoration tenders have been suspended until conservation standards and procedures have been agreed upon.

The State Party, in their 2006 progress report, also stated “minimum intervention was planned to retain the aesthetic features of the city walls and to preserve the existing remains”. The mission reported, however, that this is not the case. The mission noted serious problems with current and on-going works on the restoration of the Theodosian Land Walls because of the excessive replacement of original fabric and the use of inappropriate restoration techniques which destroys the ‘vertical archaeology’ of the monument and severely compromises its authenticity. It therefore recommended that all work to the walls and the integral Byzantine palaces of Tekfur Seray and Ayvansaray (Blachernae Palace) be immediately halted until the craftspersons and professionals involved have received training, incorporating international experts, on the conservation of ruined monuments.

f) Istanbul Museum-City project

The Museum-City project, managed by an intersectional coordination unit under the Historic Environment Protection Directorate of the Istanbul Municipality, is supervising a pilot project for the restoration of the area between the Süleymaniye Complex and the Sehzade Mosque, which will be extended to the rest of the Historic Peninsula. Infrastructure projects for the Historic Peninsula are also under preparation. A special unit for implementing and supervising the construction activities in the region is being planned.

The mission recommended that the Süleymaniye Renewal Project should be substantially revised to constitute a Conservation Implementation Plan, with a new focus on the conservation of existing buildings of heritage value rather than on new construction and development, and the project boundaries should be extended to cover the whole Süleymaniye World Heritage core area. The Museum City Project should prioritize the core areas and relevant components should be utilized in the preparation of Conservation Implementation Plans for the Zeyrek, Eminönü and the Theodosian City Walls core areas and should identify buildings at risk and seek to find appropriate solutions to secure their future. All Conservation Implementation Plans should comply with the Vienna Memorandum (May 2005). Relevant elements of current proposals, including the Zeyrek Area Study, the Ayvansaray Turkish Quarter Urban Renewal Area Studies, the Anemas Dungeon Restoration, the Tekfur Palace Restoration proposals and the Cankurtaran and Sultanahmet Implementation for Conservation plans should be incorporated in the Conservation Implementation Plans for the relevant core area, following comprehensive revision for in-situ conservation.

g) Law on Conservation of Cultural and Natural Wealth (Law No 5226) of 2004

As stated in the report of 2005, the Law No 5226 had been amended and accepted. A new legislation on the “Preservation by Renovation and Utilisation by Revitalisation of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties” came into force on 16 June 2005. These laws, together with related regulations, provide a more efficient technical and administrative tool in the field of conservation for the central Government and local authorities. It is believed that it will enhance public participation and state support for conservation of historical properties.

The mission welcomed the recent improvement in Protective Legislation, but noted that implementation lags behind. The District Municipalities lack capacity to implement responsibilities that the new laws will confer on them and Fatih and Eminönü Municipalities should ensure that their respective Conservation Offices have qualified professional staff to adequately safeguard the integrity of the core areas.

h) Other projects

Golden Horn Bridge: Since July 2005 the Regional Conservation Council has decided that a third bridge is to be constructed. The draft project has been evaluated and approved by the Council and the implementation project is requested from the Municipality. Furthermore, the mission expressed concern about the potential impact of the proposed extension project for the Four Seasons Hotel on the archaeological remains of part of the Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors located in the core zone; impacts of the new Golden Horn bridge projects on the setting of Süleymaniye Mosque and the wider World Heritage property and of other new development projects such as the “Dubai Towers” and the proposed high-rise development at Hydarpaşa and the Galataport project. The mission made specific recommendations in this regard in their detailed mission report (<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>).

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.73

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.80** and **29 COM 7B.70** adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the continued efforts made by the national authorities, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the district municipalities with specific projects including the European Capital of Culture 2010 initiative, the substantive inventory process of core areas of the World Heritage property at the Historic Peninsula as well as improving legal provisions;*
4. *Endorses the detailed recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission;*
5. *Notes with great concern the continued degradation and loss of timber houses, in particular in the Zeyrek and Süleymaniye core areas, constituting a loss of World Heritage values;*
6. *Requests the State Party to urgently implement the recommendations of the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission, and in particular:*
 - a) *Immediately halt all works at the Theodosian Walls and the Byzantine palaces of Tekfur Seray and Ayvanseray (Blachernae Palace) in order not to undermine the authenticity of the property, and review the situation with the support of international experts;*
 - b) *Review all new large-scale development and infrastructure projects, which could threaten the visual integrity of the Historic Peninsula (including skyscraper development such as the Dubai Towers, the proposed high-rise development at Hydarpaşa), the Galataport project, and the new bridge across the Golden Horn as well as the extension project for the Four Seasons Hotel; and carry out impact studies according to international standard;*

- c) *Improve the cooperation between District Municipalities, the Metropolitan Municipality, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and other stakeholders, including universities, NGOs, professional organisations, inhabitants etc., enhance coordination of all planning organs and establish clear management and monitoring responsibilities, including the designation of a specific World Heritage site coordinator;*
 - d) *Re-establish and reorganize the World Heritage Coordination Unit of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism to provide effective support from the central Government for the safeguarding of the integrity of the World Heritage property;*
 - e) *To prepare an integrated and comprehensive World Heritage management plan, by **1 February 2008** at the latest, utilizing the 1:5000 Urban Conservation Plan and the 1:1000 Implementation Plan for the Historic Peninsula (2005) and the current Museum City project;*
 - f) *To submit a Progress Report on the preparation of the World Heritage management plan, by **1 February 2007**, and ensure that the World Heritage management plan be developed according to international standards;*
 - g) *To submit by **1 February 2008** a revised Süleymaniye Renewal Project to constitute a Süleymaniye Conservation Implementation Plan, with a new focus on the conservation of existing buildings of heritage value and extend the project boundaries to cover the whole Süleymaniye World Heritage core area;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007, a progress report including all issues indicated above **to enable the World Heritage Committee to consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger**, in the case of absence of tangible remedial measures to prevent the loss of World Heritage value of this property, at its 32nd session in 2008.*

74. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1988

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.83

28 COM 15B.103

29 COM 7B.89

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Possible impacts of development and high-rise projects in the immediate vicinity of the property.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party submitted a report for the site on 30 January 2006, which was reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. Four main issues have been identified:

- a) Two tall buildings which impact on the Tower have been given planning permission and further high rise buildings are being considered, which could impact adversely on critical views of and from the Tower;
- b) Policies to protect London World Heritage sites within the London Plan currently seem not to be applied effectively;
- c) Revised planning guidelines on London views, currently out for consultation, could limit the protection of views around the Tower;
- d) The management plan for the Tower of London, which should strengthen protection for this site, has not yet been finalised or approved by the relevant authorities.

These are considered in further detail:

Proposed High-rise Constructions:

Two tall towers, the *Minerva Tower*, 217m, near the Tower of London and the so-called *Shard of Glass Tower*, 306m, at London Bridge, were both opposed by English Heritage for their impact on the Tower of London World Heritage property and its setting, and yet were still given planning permission. The *Minerva Tower* will appear directly behind the White Tower when viewed from Tower Bridge. Two further tall buildings, the *Bishopsgate Tower*, 324m, and *20 Fenchurch Street*, 209m, have now been submitted for approval by developers. Both will be highly visible to the north-west of the Tower of London when viewed from London Bridge.

Although modern buildings have been built around the Tower complex, they have not altered significantly the relationship of volume and scale. However, it is different in the case of high-rise towers in the vicinity, including the so-called “Gherkin”, designed by Foster, and for the new development authorised. In this case, regardless of the high quality of the design, the new architecture constitutes an alteration of the historic urban landscape of the World Heritage site.

The London Plan:

The planning approvals are not in line with policies within the agreed London Plan. Approved in 2003, this contains policies that clearly spell out the need to protect World Heritage properties and their settings.

London Views:

Current protection for key London views is being revised and the proposals recently put out for consultation narrow the protected views to a point that would give much reduced protection, particularly to the north across the River Thames.

Management plan:

Although a Plan was drafted in 2001, this has still not been approved.

The State Party provided a combined report on 30 January 2006 for both the *Tower of London* and *Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church* World Heritage properties. This sets out the planning framework within which decisions are taken and acknowledges that decisions on new development have to balance heritage considerations against others and decide 'which should be given greater weight'. It further states that 'this may mean that on occasion it is necessary to accept some small diminution of the visual setting of a World Heritage property in order to meet other planning objectives'. It also states that 'decisions on developments have to be taken within the context of why London is important. Unlike many other urban centres ... London is not a product of one architectural period or style'. It quotes the Vienna Memorandum and says that accepting a small adverse impact in order to maintain the overall vitality of the area is justified and is in line with this document.

The report submitted by the State Party indicates that the management plan is unlikely to be agreed upon before 2007, as further discussion is still needed amongst key stakeholders. On the question of a detailed study of the impact of development, the State Party maintains that this was initially proposed by the State Party and appears in the decision of the 27th session but that no discussion has taken place. On the current state of development, the State Party records the way approval has been given for the two approved tall buildings: the further two applications are not mentioned; one of these was submitted after the end of January.

ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre consider that the impacts of the tall buildings already given approval and those subsequently submitted will have far greater than a "small adverse impact" on the Tower of London. If built, these buildings could confuse what remains of the Tower's silhouette.

In order to determine more precisely the impacts on views, both of the Tower and outwards from within its Inner Ward, a thorough skyline study should be commissioned to assess and document the setting of the Tower and the key views connected to its World Heritage status.

Any new development within London should aim to maintain or enhance the setting and critical views associated with the Tower, as well as the World Heritage property of *Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church*. It is of concern that the management plan for the Tower has not yet been finalised in the light of the rapid development planned in the surrounding area. Any reduction in statutory protection of the views associated with the Tower, or narrowing of those views, would mean a diminution in protection of its World Heritage values.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.74

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.89**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with great concern that proposed new developments around the Tower of London and Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church World Heritage properties, appear not to respect the significance of either World Heritage property, their settings and related vistas;*
4. *Regrets that the London Plan policies to protect the World Heritage property and its environment do not seem to be applied effectively, that statutory protection for views to and from the Tower could be diminished, and that the management plan has still not been finalised;*
5. *Deeply regrets that the requested in-depth study on the possible impact of development projects in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage property has not been submitted and that no detailed skyline study of the Tower, its setting and views has yet been carried out and urges the State Party to carry out such a skyline survey as soon as possible to provide a qualitative framework for assessing the impact of new development on views and setting that contribute to the outstanding universal value of the Tower;*
6. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission to assess the impact of current planning proposals and **to review the possibility of inclusion of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger**, including benchmarks and timeframes for corrective action;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report, by **1 February 2007** on the progress of its undertakings in this area, and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

75. Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)

Years of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1992, 1999

Criteria:

C (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1997-2005

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21 (a) 9

28 COM 15A.28

29 COM 7A.27

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 47,000 for implementation of the immediate actions proposed in the report of the October 1997 mission.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

1997 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/Butrint Foundation mission; 2001 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; 2003 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; 2005 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Looting of the Museum of Butrint in 1997;
- b) Lack of adequate protection, management, and conservation of the site led to its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1997;
- c) Lack of management mechanisms and tourism pressure;
- d) Poor state of conservation of the property.

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the World Heritage Committee endorsed the recommendations made by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission of March 2005, and called upon the State Party to give appropriate attention to their timely implementation while removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

A report from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, Youth, and Sport on activities at the site during 2005 was received by the World Heritage Centre in February 2006. It listed work on the maintenance and preservation of monuments, including treatment of vegetation, consolidation, etc., and archaeological projects by Albanian, Butrint Foundation, and expert teams. This work was carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the Round Table and the Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Mission in March 2005.

A further communication was received from the Director of Butrint National Park on 3 April 2006. It reported that the Butrint Foundation, in collaboration with the Institute of Archaeology, was preparing an online archive of all archaeological excavations and finds from Butrint between the 1930s and 2006. New archaeological stores will be constructed in 2006/2007.

In July 2006 a hydrological survey into the effects of water action on the monuments and the reinstallation of water pumps will be carried out by an Italian expert with Albanian counterparts. The protective barriers around the site will be repaired and improved during 2006, and a new ticket office is to be built. Improvements will be made to the surveillance of the site by the Park rangers.

There is to be a survey and condition assessment of the Baptistery mosaic in 2006 and consideration given to its eventual long-term display. Conservation of the Triconch Palace was completed in 2005 and the training programme is continuing during 2006. The Butrint Museum reopened after refurbishment in October 2005. Twenty-two interpretation panels have been installed around the site and 20km of marked trails have been created. The report also indicates that the Park has been expanded by a decision of the Council of Ministers in December 2005 to cover an area of 86 km² providing a more than adequate buffer zone for the archaeological monuments.

Concerning tourism, the preparatory phase of the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) project (sponsored by the World Bank), which is aimed at fostering the economic development in the region through ecological and archaeological tourism through training and capacity building, international outreach and sustainable tourism, and university cooperation, has been completed.

No explicit mention is made in either reports of the site management under the terms of the 2003 “Law on Control Heritage”. It is implicit from some statements, especially those on “Park monitoring,” that certain aspects of the Law are slowly being applied. This is supported cautiously by comments of the 2005 Joint Mission in its report. The latter includes strong recommendations on the management regime made at the time of the mission. The April 2006 document reports that a new Director has been appointed, along with four specialists in archaeology, monuments, tourism, and environment. In December 2005, staff took part in a three-day management training session; other courses have taken place or are planned on tourism management, vegetation management, conservation of monuments and mosaics, and project proposal writing.

The 2005 Joint Mission report insisted that “the need for a solid and realistic management as a useful tool has become more obvious than ever before.” Nonetheless, the report submitted by the State Party contains no reference to any work on the improvements of the management and conservation plan. It only mentioned that the management plan 2000-2005 has been adopted by the Butrint National Park Board and the initiatives and projects implemented in 2005-2006 are in accordance with the objectives of the management plan. The State Party also noted that in 2006 a project funded by the World Bank to develop an integrated coastal zone management plan will commence, which will include Butrint National Park.

While commending the State Party for the improvements that it has made in a number of sectors, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre regret that there has been no progress on updating of the existing management plan to bring it in line with international standards.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.75

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7A.27, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the authorities’ continuing efforts towards the improvement of the general situation of the site;*

4. *Notes with satisfaction* that the State Party expanded the area of Butrint National Park and thereupon the buffer zone of the World Heritage property and *requests* the State Party to submit the relevant documents including maps of the revised buffer zone of the World Heritage property in accordance with chapter III.I of the Operational Guidelines;
5. *Regrets* that there has been no progress on the updating of the existing management plan and *requests* the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report by **1 February 2007** on the implementation of the 2005 mission's recommendations and the progress made with the updating and implementation of the integrated management plan of the property according to international standards, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007;
6. *Acknowledges* that the State Party has invited a World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM joint mission to the property in 2007, as requested in Decision **29 COM 7A.27**, to assess the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee in cooperation with the State Party and submit a report on its findings at the 31st session in 2007.

76. City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1999

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.82

29 COM 7B.63

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission from 25 to 27 February 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Urban development pressures.

Current conservation issues:

The 2005 UNESCO/ICOMOS monitoring mission had identified several problematic large-scale building projects in the core zone and the buffer zone. One of these was the

construction project by *Zaha Hadid* at Kommod-Haus location, which had not been significantly altered by the investor despite requests from city authorities. While the city authorities appear willing to adapt to World Heritage Committee expectations, officials also acknowledge that the existing legal framework does not appear to provide adequate protection for the property. The extension of *Thalia Theatre* that was reviewed by the joint mission in February 2005, has been partly completed excepting the most problematic vertical extension including a hotel. The project thus continues to be under discussion.

In addition to the cases discussed by the 2005 mission, the construction project of the Department Store Kastner & Öhler located in the core zone has caused public concern. The project foresees a contemporary construction to replace the traditional store and enlarge its floor-space by adding one floor to the building. An international competition was held, and the winning project design has been criticised by NGOs and individuals as not having a suitable roofscape in the context of the World Heritage property. The city authorities of Graz informed the World Heritage Centre that the final decision on the construction is postponed until September 2006 in order to take into account the World Heritage Committee's decision (at its 30th session). ICOMOS has retained reservations about the quality of the design proposed for the Kastner & Öhler Department Store, stating that although the process followed to secure a design for this extension has been credible and professional, the present scheme does not respect adequately the character of the town, or of the site on which it has been imposed.

The management plan is under preparation involving all stakeholders, and is expected to be completed in early 2007. In addition to the management plan, a master plan is under preparation, using a zoning scheme for the core and buffer zones to give planning reliability to owners and investors. However, the legal basis for such a master plan still needs to be created. The State Party informed that the Municipality of Graz confirmed the designation of two World Heritage site manager(s), one on the political, and one on the administrative level.

The legal prerequisites that led to the demolition of the Kommod-Haus were examined by the city authorities concluding that such an event is unlikely to occur again.

ICOMOS noted that the reports on local developments in Graz appear to have been produced without involvement of the national level authorities. It was further noted that the State Party and the local authorities have been going through a learning process in the last few years, confronted by some unfortunate projects and choices, and have been adjusting their process to meet higher standards and expectations. The city authorities show considerable commitment to comply with the World Heritage safeguarding needs of Graz, with the mission's recommendations and the Committee's requests. However, the main and underlying problem remains the lack of mechanisms to fully implement the legal provisions available to the local authorities, particularly in view of the priority given to investors' rights and the economic influence that continue to threaten the protection of the World Heritage values of the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.76

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.63, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Commends the local authorities for initiating preparation of a management plan and a master plan for the World Heritage property, thus taking into account the World Heritage status in the urban planning processes;
4. Notes with concern the potentially negative impact of the ongoing and new large-scale construction projects in the core and buffer zones of the World Heritage property on its outstanding universal value ;
5. Encourages the authorities to reconsider the overall design, volume and roofscape of the construction project for the Department Store of Kastner & Öhler;
6. Requests the authorities to fully take into account the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture (May, 2005) in the preparation of the World Heritage property's management plan;
7. Requests the State Party to provide an update report by **1 February 2007** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

77. Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (C 1156)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2004

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) CL

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 14B.40

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received a number of complaints and reports from individuals and local NGOs concerning the construction of a four-lane bridge ("Waldschlösschen-Bridge") crossing the Elbe at a crucial point for the view axis, located within the core

zone of the World Heritage cultural landscape. Although the project already existed at the time of the ICOMOS evaluation in September 2003, the application papers of the State Party state that “No traffic arteries are planned in this area, though there is the possibility for new bridges”. Enclosed was a territorial land use plan (FNP) with five different alternatives for Elbe crossings, and further photo montages of the competition result for the project of the “Waldschlösschen Bridge”. In the ICOMOS text this project is mistakenly mentioned as “foreseen 5 km down the river from the centre.”

The Municipality of Dresden, which is responsible for both the conservation of the World Heritage property and the urban development, explained that the bridge project had been developed through an extensive process including an international architectural competition for the bridge construction, and involving a referendum of the citizens of Dresden that resulted in an approval of the bridge project. The bridge project is based on traffic assessments undertaken by the city of Dresden which indicated the need for an additional crossing of the river. Several counter-studies propose a tunnel solution for the river crossing, but also question the need for an additional traffic artery. It is further criticized that the traffic from and towards the bridge will be channelled through, and would affect the central part of the inner city.

After documents of the planning brief (*Planfeststellungsverfahren*) showed the entire extent of the intended building measures, which have resulted in fierce public discussion, ICOMOS made a statement on 10 January 2006 pointing out that “this valley crossing is no longer an ‘urban bridge’, but instead an important road connection resembling a motorway. After evaluating the documents, which have now been made available, ICOMOS comes to the conclusion that the realisation of the Waldschlösschen Bridge will lead to a considerable disturbance of the World Heritage site Dresden Elbe Valley. By all means there should now be a pause for thought to have the opportunity to inform the World Heritage Committee as well as to discuss less harmful alternatives, including a tunnel construction and other possible locations.”

On 20 January 2006, a meeting took place at the World Heritage Centre with the Mayor of Dresden, the Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO, the German Foreign Office and the German National Commission to discuss the matter with World Heritage Centre staff. The Director of the Centre appealed to the authorities not to commence any construction prior to the 30th session of the Committee. He also encouraged the authorities to carry out a visual impact study of the bridge proposal.

On 18 April 2006 the World Heritage Centre received copies of a report entitled “Waldschlösschenbrücke Bridge World Heritage status”, a printed brochure and statement by the City of Dresden providing background on the decisions for the Waldschlösschen Bridge. The city authorities informed the Centre that any construction would be postponed until August 2006. Furthermore, a visual impact study of the proposed bridge project was carried out by the Institute of Urban Design and Regional Planning of the Technical University of Aachen (RWTH Aachen) and submitted to the World Heritage Centre in April 2006. This study concludes that:

- a) The Waldschlösschen Bridge does not fit in with existing series of Dresden City bridges;
- b) The Waldschlösschen Bridge obscures a number of views of the Dresden skyline and the Elbe Valley which are of historical importance as well as continuing relevance to daily life in the city;
- c) The Waldschlösschen Bridge cuts into the cohesive landscape of the Elbe river bend at its most sensitive point, splitting it irreversibly into two halves.

Both documents by the City of Dresden and the visual impact study by the RWTH Aachen were received at the Centre on 24 April 2006, and have been submitted to ICOMOS, whose detailed review is awaited.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.77

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling that the World Heritage property was inscribed in 2004 for its values as a Cultural Landscape,*
3. *Notes with great concern that the construction project of the “Waldschlösschen-Bridge” is located in the core area of the cultural landscape;*
4. *Regrets that the information on the project has been submitted at such a late stage, and takes note of the referendum that represents a legally binding commitment of local authorities;*
5. *Notes that the national authorities have immediately commissioned a visual impact study, and the City of Dresden has halted the construction project of the bridge until the Committee’s 30th session;*
6. *Further notes the negative results of the visual impact study carried out on the Waldschlösschen bridge;*
7. *Urges the State Party and the City authorities to halt any construction until further discussions are taken up with all stakeholders to find appropriate solutions for the safeguarding of the values and integrity of the World Heritage property;*
8. *Requests the State Party to urgently review the construction project in the core zone taking into account the results of the visual impact study and to provide a comprehensive update report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2007 for discussion by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

78. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation) (C 540)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1990

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission February 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

As a follow-up to concerns about construction with the World Heritage site, and in particular the new Mariinsky Theatre proposal, a meeting was organized with the Russian authorities at the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on 5 January 2006. At the subsequent request of the Russian Federation National Commission and following an invitation by the State Party, a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the site was carried out from 3 to 7 February 2006 with the main aim to review the state of conservation of the World Heritage site of Saint Petersburg.

The full report of the mission is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>. Specific concerns focused on the site's integrity and authenticity; its boundaries and buffer zone; and how proposed constructions and new developments (specifically the plans for the Mariinsky Theatre) will potentially affect the outstanding universal value of the site. The mission specifically noted:

Mariinsky Theatre:

The extension of the Mariinsky Theater consists of three sub-projects, a) the restoration of the old Theatre (an early 19th century classical architecture); b) the construction of a new second Stage; and c) the construction of a third Stage re-using the Scenes Depot building that burned in 2003, located in the vicinity of the Theatre. The restoration of the old Theatre is being carried out according to international conservation standards and does not raise any major concern. The reconstruction, extension and re-use of the burnt Depot has also been planned according to acceptable standards.

The component that has raised questions is the new construction. This project was subject to a formal and transparent international competition, managed according to the best international standards. The winning design (by architect Dominique Perrault) is inspired by the golden domes and spires of the city but intends to create a sharp contrast with the traditional architecture of the site. The contrast is accentuated by the size of the extension, 10m. higher than the existing Theatre. The building design of a second stage of the

Mariinsky Theatre is enveloped in a metal golden shield, and is of an irregular, mountain-like shape that has no relationship with the surrounding architectural context.

While examples of this design style are found in many other cities, it should be noticed that this issue has been a subject of discussion and preoccupation of the Committee for a long time and has led to the Vienna conference and the Vienna Memorandum (May 2005), which clearly states the need to link in a continuum modern developments to the historic landscape.

A meeting had just taken place at the municipal level in the days preceding the mission, and the decision was taken to lower the height of the new complex by 10m, in order to equal the height of the existing structures. The Mission concluded that if this decision is confirmed, the impact of the new structure on the World Heritage values would be acceptable, as the structure will not create any visible intrusion in the city landscape and would only be visible from the vicinity of the Theatre.

Small Holland project:

The rehabilitation of this area for public use is very sensitive to the preservation of the integrity of the area and does not impact negatively on the World Heritage values of the site.

Extension of the Hermitage Museum:

The expansion of this museum will also not impact negatively on World Heritage values, and will in fact give a homogenous use to the Square and deter traffic invasion.

Borders and buffer zone:

There are longstanding difficulties with definitions of the borders and buffer zone for this site which accumulated with the change from the Soviet Union (under which the nomination was first prepared) to the privatized and uncontrolled conditions prevailing subsequently in the Russian Federation. The confusion surrounding ongoing privatization led the authorities to initiate development of a Master Plan to govern urban development. This is due to be completed in July 2006 and will include 72,000 ha. of regulated (height controlled) territory and all listed buildings in the City Centre and the surrounding City District. Excluded from this regime are those buildings and spaces included in the adjacent Leningradskaya Oblast created after the fall of the Soviet Union. The mission was unable to obtain precise information about buildings in this district during its short visit.

The World Heritage Centre mission report outlines an agreed process for follow-up by City officials and representatives of the Russian Federation. The points are as follows:

- a) The City of St Petersburg will send to the World Heritage Centre, via the Russian National Commission by 15 April 2006, all the maps with the indication of borders, protected zones, listed buildings and areas of Landscape Protection. Furthermore, the City will send a document listing all the areas included in the World Heritage site outside of the Historic Centre but inside the City District, with the indication of the surface of each parcel and the geographic coordinates;
- b) By 30 September 2006, the City of St Petersburg will send, via the National Commission, a draft proposal for the new borders of the core zone of the World Heritage site, with an explanation for the changes proposed. Furthermore, the City will send a proposal for the new buffer zone of the World Heritage site;

- c) Similar proposals (core and buffer zones) will be transmitted for all the serial sites located in external areas, within the City District;
- d) The authorities of the Russian Federation will request the Leningradskaya Oblast to provide the same information and maps for the areas of the World Heritage site located in its territory;
- e) The World Heritage Centre will examine the proposal and will send its comments to the authorities in October 2006;
- f) The Russian Federation will send a request for the inclusion of the buffer zone and the other proposed changes to the World Heritage property (according to paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*) by 1 February 2007;
- g) The file will be transmitted to the Advisory Body for evaluation and will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.

Overall state of conservation:

While some cases of alterations of historic structures have been observed, the integrity of the urban landscapes of St. Petersburg has been protected, and there are effective conservation institutions and mechanisms involved in that effort. At the same time, there is a need to plan ahead and prepare for emerging issues in a timely manner: namely, the future upgrading of the housing stock to higher standards of accommodation, and the dramatically increasing traffic congestion.

Conservation efforts within the city are effective and implement appropriate planning and management tools. This is evidenced by the near doubling of the buildings listed for legal protection, including examples of modern architecture and industrial structures; the growing scale of investment in heritage protection; and the current conservation zoning system (comprising of one zone where changes are not permitted and a second zone permitting urban development within defined limits) and the use of a “landscape regulation zone”, which is roughly equivalent to a World Heritage property buffer zone.

Conservation efforts would be aided by development of a conservation strategy designed to address negative perceptions in the local community and aimed at bringing local citizens groups into the conservation process in positive ways. A more in-depth overall assessment of the state of conservation of this World Heritage site would require a thorough examination of all the initiatives undertaken by different public and private actors. Provided the World Heritage Centre is kept informed of major renovation and construction initiatives and any new major policies and plans both within the World Heritage site and the area surrounding it, the state of conservation of the site seems to be positive.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.78

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes the initiative taken by the State Party to invite the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of 2-7 February 2006 and the current efforts of the authorities to conserve this World Heritage property;*

3. *Notes that the height of the new Mariinsky Theatre has been lowered by 10 metres;*
4. *Requests the authorities to fully take into account the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture (May, 2005) in the protection of the historic urban landscape;*
5. *Endorses the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission, specifically the timeline of actions and the preparation of maps, which have been agreed to by the representatives of the Russian Federation and the officials of the City of St. Petersburg during the mission;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a proposal for the modification of the boundaries of the World Heritage property including precise definition of borders and buffer zones for all components of the property by 1 February 2007 for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

79. Old Town of Ávila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1985

Criteria:

C (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.78

28 COM 15B.97

29 COM 7B.69

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission March 2005;

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Building volume of a new building and re-designing of the Plaza Santa Teresa, located between the town walls and the extra-muros Church of San Pedro;
- b) Lack of buffer-zone

Current conservation issues:

As requested in Decision **29 COM 7B.69**, the State Party submitted a status report dated 1 February 2006 on the situation of Avila specifically addressing the issues of protection

measures and the current state of conservation situation. A report was also submitted by the State Party as part of the Periodic Reporting exercise.

In view of the new building and re-design of the Plaza Santa Teresa, ICOMOS reiterated its view that the building does not negatively impact on the overall integrity and the outstanding universal value of the property. However it also noted that the specific legal protection and planning of the World Heritage property have not been improved to prevent possible similar cases in the future. Despite Decision **29 COM 7B.69** paragraph 9 encouraging the State Party to improve specific legislation to ensure appropriate legal protection of the historic urban fabric and structure on a national level by reinforcing the national and regional institutions in the decision-making process, no specific changes have been made to amend the current legal framework, which allows the city authorities to make short-term changes to the adopted planning documents. It is therefore suggested that the concerned authorities make it obligatory to integrate external expertise into the management system to ensure a balanced view in the decision-making process.

A letter of intention has been signed by the city authorities and the regional authorities to establish an integrated management plan for the property. However, no concrete schedule is proposed for the implementation of this cooperation project. In its review of the documentation, ICOMOS considered that a realistic timetable must be established as soon as possible. It also considered that the PEPCHA (Special Plan for the protection of the Avila Historico-Artistico Ensemble) needs to be refined, if not altered, to ensure the protection of the property. The question of a possible exclusion of the extra-muros church of San Pedro from the World Heritage core zone is not considered to be justified by ICOMOS.

The State Party stated that a buffer zone has been designated in the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise with legal arrangements to protect the World Heritage property. The review of the designated buffer zone by the Committee will be processed separately as a follow-up to the Periodic Reporting exercise.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.79

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.69, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has designated a buffer zone;*
4. *Notes with concern that the legal protection has not been significantly improved to ensure the conservation of the values and integrity of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Urges the State Party to improve the legal protection of the property on the national level, as requested in Decision 29 COM 7B.69;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit detailed maps presenting the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones, and ICOMOS to carefully review the boundaries of the property once the boundary modifications have been presented;*

7. *Notes the intention of the City authorities to create an integrated management plan for the property and requests that a realistic time-frame for this be established as soon as possible;*
8. *Requests the authorities to fully take into account the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture (May, 2005) in the management of the historic urban landscape of the World Heritage property;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the implementation of all Committee decisions regarding the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

80. Madriu – Perafita – Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:
2004

Criteria:
C (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:
28 COM 14.36
29 COM 7B.71

International Assistance:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:
N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:
a) Modification of the buffer zone;
b) Legal protection; management plan and inventory.

Current conservation issues:
At the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party reported that the legal decree to protect the cultural landscapes of the property had been published in January 2005 and was open for comment until June 2005. The State Party has now confirmed that the legal process has been taken forward in two stages. In the first stage, a Decree adopted on 19 October 2005 will give protection to the property as a cultural site in the category of cultural landscape. The second Decree adopted on 8 March 2006 sets

out the process of defining the limits of the valley, particularly concerning the two municipalities of Encamp and Escaldes-Engordany. As the legal process for defining and protecting the property is close to being completed, work on the management plan needs to be taken forward once a final agreement has been reached.

In inscribing the site on the World Heritage List at its 28th session, the World Heritage Committee asked for confirmation that the buffer zone covered the plateau west of Pic Negre to Camp Ramonet, to give added protection to the Claror Plateau. This recommendation was aimed at ensuring control of the motorized access to the Claror Plateau. The State Party has now addressed this recommendation and has proposed a small extension to the buffer zone which extends the original buffer zones to the south, on the west side of the nominated area, until it meets the international border between Andorra and Spain. This means that the whole of the nominated area within Andorra is protected by a buffer zone. Although the proposed buffer zone does not extend as far south as Camp Ramonet, it covers part of the motorized access to the Claror Plateau. ICOMOS, IUCN and the Centre support this proposed extension to the buffer zone.

IUCN considers that these decrees constitute real progress for the conservation and management of the property and suggests that the State Party move the Camp de Claror plateau from area 2 to area 1 within the zoning of the buffer zone.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.80

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the progress made with legal protection, and encourages the State Party to follow up on the process with the definitive legal text concerning the buffer zone;*
4. *Commends the State Party for clarifying the buffer zone protection on the western boundary of the property;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to redefine the Camp de Claror Plateau from area 2 to area 1 within the zoning of the buffer zone;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a progress report on the implementation of the management plan by **1 February 2008** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

81. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1996

Criteria:

C (i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.73

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission March 2006

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Visual impact by high-rise construction project

Current conservation issues:

As requested by the Committee, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission took place to the site from 15 to 17 March 2006 to review the situation of the project of a proposed high-rise structure in the Meidling area. The mission concluded that the proposed development project at the *Kometgründe-Meidling* in close proximity to the World Heritage property would have considerable impact on the integrity of the site. The suggested reduction of the high-rise tower from 120m to 90m, proposed by the architects in the first review of the project in February 2006, did not substantially change the situation. The mission suggested the general necessity for the development of the Meidling area to be based on a different architectural concept and integrated in a broader urban planning context. As an outcome of the mission's discussions with the authorities, the responsible planning authority of the City of Vienna announced on 17 March 2006 to stop the high-rise project of the *Kometgründe-Meidling*, and to support the development of the area through smaller scale projects.

In terms of the management of the World Heritage property, the mission noted that the competences and formal responsibilities for the World Heritage property are much diversified, and therefore suggested the need to improve dialogue between all stakeholders and to set clear rules in site management to ensure future sustainable use and preservation of the values of the World Heritage property. To this end, the mission underlined the need to elaborate a comprehensive management plan for the property based on the requirements of the *Convention*. In addition, the mission proposed to improve specific national legislation enabling harmonization of development and preservation of cultural values in their tangible and intangible dimension in order to improve the management of the World Heritage property.

Concerning high-rise development in Vienna in general, the mission further pointed out that the issue of high-rise buildings in the panorama of Vienna is very complex and not limited to this specific case. Although the city authorities have at their disposal planning instruments controlling land use density, height and location of high-rise buildings, the implementation of these tools does not clearly reflect the World Heritage status of the city, and priorities for protection of cultural heritage. It is suggested that the city coordinates closely with the national heritage preservation authorities and related

professional bodies for the further development of the vision of Vienna, so as to fine-tune the “High-rise Concept of Vienna” adopted in 2002.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.73**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with appreciation the decision by the Vienna authorities to stop the high-rise Kometgründe-Meidling project, as well as the results of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission in March 2006;*
4. *Encourages the authorities to review the buffer-zone of the World Heritage property so as to enlarge the protected area and to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the property that takes into account the broader urban landscape of the property;*
5. *Recalls the importance of the provisions of the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture (May 2005) in safeguarding the historic urban landscape;*
6. *Requests the State Party, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to inform the World Heritage Centre on any major urban development projects that may adversely affect the integrity of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about any further new development for the Kometgründe-Meidling.*

82. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2005

Criteria:

C (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 8C.33

29 COM 8B.49

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,000.

Previous monitoring missions:

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

The State Party informed the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2006 of the efforts made by the state and local authorities to interrupt the works for the construction of a Hotel in the vicinity of the World Heritage property. The Centre had already been informed by the UNESCO Venice Office that the construction of a hotel was noted during the inscription ceremony of the property and that discussions have commenced with local authorities.

A further communication was received from the State Party on 16 February 2006. It requested assistance and two experts from the World Heritage Centre to participate in consultations regarding solutions to the inappropriate construction. ICOMOS has already identified two experts who would be available to go on mission to the site from 21 to 24 June 2006.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 8B.49, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Expresses its great concern about the inappropriate construction of a hotel in the vicinity of the World Heritage property;*
4. *Notes that the State Party invited an expert mission to find appropriate solutions to protect the World Heritage values and integrity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by 1 February 2007 on the state of conservation of the property, and the construction project for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

83. Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1992

Criteria:

C (iv)

Year(s) of inscription of the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.101

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: Emergency Assistance (USD 50,000) in 2003 for the restoration of the Historic Centre of Prague and Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov which were severely damaged by the floods of August 2002.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, January 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Inappropriate placement of a revolving theatre in the 17th century garden in front of the rococo summerhouse “Bellaria”;

Current conservation issues:

In the 1950s, a revolving theatre with 80 seats was installed inside the 17th century garden in front of the Bellaria in order to use this historic setting as a backdrop for the theatre. The theatre expanded in the 1960s, and in 1998 became a permanent construction with a present seating capacity of 650 visitors. At the invitation of the Czech Ministry of Culture, an ICOMOS monitoring mission was carried out from 20 to 24 January 2005 to assess the impact of the revolving theatre situated in the castle garden on the values recognized by inscription, and to discuss the proposed new location for the theatre.

The construction of the revolving theatre includes a 6m deep foundation and is linked to a number of under- and above- ground infrastructural components, heavily impacting the visual integrity and the archaeology of the site. The mission observed that all elements of the former garden design around the current location of the theatre had disappeared, and heavy use of the place resulted in extensive trampling and affected the area beyond the immediate surroundings of the theatre. While the theatre only operates in the summer, the facilities block the vistas along the baroque axis and the central part of the garden. A feasibility study was carried out regarding the possible relocation of the revolving theatre to a new location currently occupied by a derelict tree nursery in the buffer zone of the property. The study concluded that relocation of the theatre would be beneficial to all aspects of the theatrical events, but called for an architectural competition to design the new revolving theatre and its surroundings to lessen any negative visual impacts. The mission also recommended that removal of the theatre should be accompanied by archaeological excavation, and that efforts should focus on conserving and restoring the Bellaria summerhouse.

The removal of the revolving theatre from the current location is strongly supported by the Ministry of Culture, the National Institute for Preservation, ICOMOS Czech Republic and the town of České Budějovice. However, there is also some opposition in the area, which considers the revolving theatre part of the traditional theatrical life in Český Krumlov.

The mission concluded that:

- a) the revolving theatre is severely impairing the integrity of the castle garden;
- b) the current placement of the revolving theatre is far from ideal from the theatrical point of view, and
- c) the revolving theatre should therefore be removed and relocated as soon as possible and the international community should support the efforts of the Czech national authorities in this action.

Furthermore, the mission drew the attention of the authorities to Article 19 of the Florence Charter for Historic Gardens (1982), which states “by reason of its nature and purpose, a historic garden is a peaceful place conducive to human contacts, silence and awareness of nature. This conception of its everyday use must contrast with its role on those rare occasions when it accommodates a festivity”.

The State Party wrote to the Centre on 27 January 2006. The letter does not specifically endorse the conclusions of the 2005 mission and appears to move away from the commitment to remove the theatre. The letter appears to propose “replacement of the existing stage by a structure on the same site that would be less robust in terms of material used and aesthetic expression, yet functional and removable outside the summer theatre season”.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are disturbed by this change of perspective. The permanent construction of theatrical elements in this garden is a late 20th century phenomenon. Furthermore, its presence in the garden has resulted in the destruction of the garden’s elements and patterns as well as blocking the vistas along the baroque axis and the central part of the garden. The State Party should be urged to maintain its earlier commitments.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.83

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.101**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with great concern the State Party’s letter of 27 January 2006, which appears to ignore the recommendations of the 2005 mission and the Committee’s Decision;*
4. *Requests the State Party to re-affirm its commitment to the removal of the theatre from the Summerhouse Garden and its replacement in the adjacent buffer zone site, and also to establish a firm schedule for the associated activities;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the progress of its undertakings in this area, and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

84. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1997

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,600 for training (1998).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: Italian Funds-In-Trust USD 4,279 for an expert mission in December 2005.

Previous monitoring missions:

Upon the request of Estonian National authorities a UNESCO expert mission to Tallinn was carried out in December 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

In response to the request by the National Commission of Estonia for expert advice on development projects in the buffer zone, an international expert, funded through the Italian Funds in Trust with the World Heritage Centre, carried out a mission to Tallinn in December 2005.

The mission report (<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>) detailed that the project proposal for the Viru Hotel extension, located in the buffer zone, is questionable in terms of volume and height. The current building is located close to the Old Town and the extension would obstruct this view from the north-east. The expert found that the whole area of Viru Square which includes the main entrance to the Old Town, city walls, a park, theatre and car park, is in need of an overall development plan. Similarly, the Skoone bastion and the city walls are in need of a comprehensive plan. The Old Town and buffer zone would benefit from an integrated management/development plan. The report also mentioned the potential threat to the Old Town posed by the transportation of hazardous material to the naval port of Tallinn, in the framework of a possible NATO naval base and recommended a formal risk assessment.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre has been contacted by the Estonian authorities regarding this issue and the links between the Hague Convention (1954) and the World Heritage Convention have been explained. The World Heritage Centre continues to follow this matter in collaboration with the concerned Section within the Division for Cultural Heritage of UNESCO and the national authorities.

In their letter of 26 April 2006, the Estonian authorities provided the World Heritage Centre with comments from the Tallinn City Government on the expert mission report and described the activities in tackling the problems outlined by the expert mission. The Tallinn City Government noted that maintaining the unique historic features of Tallinn is one of its priorities. It furthermore pointed out that: "Construction activities in the heritage protection area of Tallinn Old Town and in its buffer zone are regulated by the Statutes of Tallinn Old Town Heritage Protection Area. The Statutes have been approved by the Government of the Republic of Estonia and the activities of both city authorities and developers must be in line with the requirements contained in this document".

Furthermore, they stated that the Tallinn City Council has adopted a decision to prepare a thematic plan of built-up areas in the centre of Tallinn. The work is already underway and it is envisaged that the thematic plan will be ready in 2007. Also, a comprehensive plan of Tallinn Central District is being elaborated. It covers Tallinn Old Town, its buffer zone and also the surrounding areas and provides planning indicators for new constructions. The plan will be submitted to the Tallinn City Council for their endorsement in 2006. In addition the thematic plan for high-rise buildings is being finalized. This plan designates the areas in Tallinn suitable for erecting high-rise buildings, taking into account the need to maintain view corridors of the Old Town. This plan will be submitted to the Tallinn City Government for endorsement in 2006, after which the plan will be made public and will be put into effect by the City Council.

Regarding the implementation of decisions taken in the 1990s (such as reconstructing the buildings next to the city wall in Laboratoorium Street; high building volumes in the buffer zone, such as the planned extension to Viru hotel approved on 6 May 1999), the legal situation makes it difficult to change the process, as all plans and projects have been approved by the relevant institutions, including heritage protection institutions. Concerning the Skoone bastion, the City Enterprise Department organized a design contest. A detailed plan for the area will be initiated and Skoone bastion will remain a municipal property in the future.

The Tallinn City Government has established an ad-hoc committee to elaborate a development plan for Tallinn Old Town. This committee brings together heritage conservation specialists, city planning specialists and the representatives of the cultural institutions located in Tallinn Old Town and aims to improve the sustainable use for Tallinn Old Town architectural heritage. In the heritage protection area of Tallinn Old Town, car traffic has been limited and pedestrian areas enlarged.

The Tallinn City Government noted that it is aware of the dangers involved in transportation of hazardous materials and that it is cooperating with the state through amending legislation. Furthermore, a comprehensive plan of Northern Tallinn has been initiated, which will also change the use of the area of the Kopli freight station. The companies on Paljassaare peninsula that transport great quantities of oil products and fertilizers have been informed of the city authorities' position to strive for termination of such activities. Tallinn City Government has adopted a regulation which forbids transport of dangerous goods during rush hours. Ground storage tanks in petrol stations will be removed by 1 October 2006 and negotiations with the owners of petrol stations have started. In March 2006 the handling of ammonium nitrate in Paldiski port was halted. As a result the quantities of ammonium nitrate transported through Tallinn were cut down about 80%. Tallinn City Government has ordered several studies and concluded agreements with the private sector in order to spare Tallinn from the transportation of

dangerous goods. Finally the Tallinn City Government considers it of utmost importance that all the City Departments in their proposed solutions take into consideration the preservation of the outstanding universal value of the Old Town of Tallinn.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.84

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes that the State Party has taken the initiative to invite a mission to the property, and provided detailed information in reply to issues raised in the mission report including the project proposal for the Viru Hotel extension and the naval port;*
3. *Encourages the national authorities to carefully review and revise the Viru Hotel project, taking into account the Vienna Memorandum (May 2005), and requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of future developments in the Viru Hotel project and the naval port;*
4. *Urges the State Party to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the property and its buffer zone;*
5. *Notes that the State Party has addressed the issue of the transportation of hazardous materials and requests the State Party to carry out an overall risk assessment;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report on the issues above by **1 February 2007** including a progress report on the revision of the Viru Hotel project for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

85. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994, extension 1996

Criteria:

C (i) (ii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.91

29 COM 7B.66

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring mission:

Joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission 2005

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Construction project of a highway extension in the vicinity of Villa Saraceno;
- b) Uncontrolled development in the Veneto region.

Current conservation issues:

On 1 February 2006, the State Party submitted a detailed report responding to the decisions by the Committee at its 29th session. A second summary report was submitted in late March 2006 to the World Heritage Centre. This report contained some new information concerning the construction of the highway affecting the property. In an additional report dated 9 March 2006 the State Party also referred to the changes of the project design (relocation of the infrastructure about 800 m, construction of a trench gallery etc.), already indicated in 2005, to be considered an acceptable mitigation measure.

In essence, the State Party report underlined three points:

- a) The process of preparing the management plan instruments requested by the Committee, given the great number of municipal authorities involved (21 in four different provinces), is very complex and takes much longer than the time suggested by the Committee as appropriate for the work. The State Party also pointed out that the component of the management plan being developed by Vicenza was well advanced. Concerning the development of the management plans for the villas, the State Party notes that on “19 July 2005 most of the organizations involved signed a Memorandum of Understanding for the Drafting of the management plan”, and that “in October 2005 a management plan Steering Committee was set up”, and that progress was being made.
- b) The State Party also noted that due to the suspension of the approval procedures, the detailed engineering drawings requested by the Committee have not been prepared and that as soon as they are ready, they will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. However, the report also noted that the Council of State on 14 October 2005 “accepted the appeal of the “Società Autostrada Brescia Padova” company, thus cancelling the effects of the previous sentence of the Veneto Regional Administrative Court in May 2005”, and allowing the continuation of the construction of the highway.
- c) The State Party further noted efforts to better protect the immediate environment of the Villa Saraceno, through identification of a buffer zone surrounding the villa (map provided by the State Party) in order to “maintain its rural appearance, providing for the conservation of the existing traditional architectural structures and the landscape of the countryside”. The State Party reported that the procedure for imposing the restriction on the area has been initiated, and can be expected to be in place by the end of 2006. The State Party further noted the administrative endorsement by the Regional Directorate for the “Park of the Plain” between Berici and Euganei, “envisaged by the Veneto Region as a necessary and

preliminary condition to the creation of the road infrastructure in a landscape protection context”, becoming operative.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the complexity of the management situation in the region and that the production of a management plan involving public and stakeholder consultations adequate to build trust, confidence and support for the results, will take several years to complete. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS also note that the decision of the Council of State should be accompanied by adequate efforts to control and review the project design in line with the recommendations by the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission of March 2005.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.85

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.66**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the authorities to strengthen control on developments in the immediate environment of the Villa Saraceno;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre further clarification on how the proposed buffer zone planned near the Villa Saraceno would ensure the control of development processes and the integrity of the setting near the World Heritage property and encourages the State Party to submit the revised buffer zone in accordance with the procedures established in the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Acknowledges the progress being made in the development of the management and conservation plans (including buffer zones), however, regrets that the management and conservation plan for the area concerning the Villa Saraceno has not been finalized as requested (Decision **29 COM 7B.66** paragraph 6);*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as available, the detailed technical drawings concerning the highway, and notably of the interchange infrastructure foreseen in the section closest to the Villa Saraceno, so as to assess its impact on the integrity of the landscape, before proceeding with the construction of the section of the highway closest to the Villa Saraceno;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to continue the efforts towards the finalisation of the management and conservation plans, including the establishment of appropriate buffer zones, for all the components of this serial World Heritage property;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a progress report on the implementation of the management and conservation plan for the World Heritage property and its buffer zones, as well as detailed designs and drawings of the interchanges, and of the landscaping of the highway in the vicinity of the Villa, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

86. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.79

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 114,550 between 1995 and 2000.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: Within the framework of the Revitalization Strategy for Vilnius, UNDP – SPPD provided USD 64,000.

Previous monitoring missions:

World Heritage Centre project missions 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000; World Heritage Centre site visit May 2005.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) High rise buildings located in vicinity of Vilnius Historic Centre which have an impact on the visual integrity of the site;
- b) Demolition of wooden heritage in the construction areas.

Current conservation issues:

Responding to the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session, the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of Vilnius submitted a joint report dated 27 January 2006 with information on the actions taken to strengthen the existing legislation and cultural heritage protection framework.

The Ministry of Culture initiated a new Law on the Protection of the Immovable Cultural Property which became effective in spring 2005. The Law stipulates more strict requirements whereby the repair, restoration, reconstruction and construction of buildings are regulated. A Plan of Action has been drawn up in close cooperation with the Vilnius Municipality concerning revision of the buffer zone, as well as ensuring better protection of the territories around the Old Town. A draft project for the Vilnius Historic Centre buffer zone has been prepared including the revision of regulations on its protection.

Efforts are also being made to draft legislation and principles that will ensure effective protection, management, monitoring and usage of the World Heritage property.

Regulations on high-rise construction in the Vilnius city centre entitled “The Scheme on the Restriction of High-rise Construction” were approved in January 2004. Following a detailed analysis of the Historic Centre panoramas and visual impact assessment of constructions in the vicinity of the Historic Centre, permission for constructing high-rise

buildings has been denied in the areas defined in the Scheme. No new high-rise construction is planned in the buffer zone of the historic centre of Vilnius. Discussions for a Master Plan have started and solutions to issues regarding construction are planned for approval in late 2006.

A “Strategy for Wooden Architecture Heritage Preservation” was commissioned by the Municipality in 2004. Two thousand wooden buildings were examined in Vilnius’ centre and the areas of wooden buildings to be preserved were defined. A plan of action for the preservation of wooden architecture was drawn up and pilot projects for the renewal of these buildings were launched in 2005. A programme for 2006 has been drawn up for wooden buildings in the historical suburbs of Zverynas and Antakalnis.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.86

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.79, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the positive efforts made by the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of Vilnius during the last two years to strengthen the legal and regulatory framework for heritage conservation, specifically the steps undertaken to address the concerns expressed by the Committee with regard to the high-rise buildings constructed and planned in the vicinity of the historic centre of Vilnius and their visual impact on the World Heritage property;*
4. *Recalling the provisions of the Vienna Memorandum (May 2005) to protect historic urban landscapes,*
5. *Acknowledges the work undertaken to set up a plan of action for the revision of the buffer zone of the property;*
6. *Notes with appreciation the information provided on the follow-up to the “Strategy for Wooden Architecture Heritage Preservation” adopted in 2004;*
7. *Notes with great concern the continued lack of integration and co-ordination of initiatives in the heritage and other sectors at both State and local levels which hinder protection efforts for the World Heritage property;*
8. *Urges the State Party to initiate development of a fully integrated management plan, to govern and co-ordinate all decisions affecting the Old Town development and conservation, through participatory consultation processes over the next two years, and requests the State Party to explore how the Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency (OTRA) may be given the authority and independence to develop and manage the implementation of such a plan under the shared supervision of the Ministry of Culture and the Office of the Mayor of Vilnius;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2008** a detailed report on the development of an integrated management plan for Vilnius Old Town as described in the recommendations above, including*

the redefinition of the buffer zone surrounding the historic core, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.

87. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2000

Criteria:

C (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7B.70

28 COM 15B.75

29 COM 7B.67

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 for technical cooperation in 2002.
USD 40,000 for emergency assistance in 2000.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN mission 2001; World Heritage Centre mission 2-6 November 2003.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Potential pollution from the oil exploitation of the D-6 oil field in the Baltic Sea by the Russian Federation;
- b) Lack of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation including joint assessment of environmental impact of the D-6 project.

Current conservation issues:

At the 29th session, both States Parties were requested to provide the World Heritage Centre with state of conservation reports for the property, including information on progress of cooperation specified in the action plan attached to their letter of 28 January 2005.

The States Parties of Lithuania and the Russian Federation, on 30th January 2006, submitted a joint report dated 19 January 2006 on preserving the Curonian Spit. The report details a series of joint meetings and investigations between February 2005 and January 2006 specific to the D-6 oil field project, including two meetings on the implementation of the Action Plan, two meetings of the Working group on emergency plans and the third and fourth meeting of the joint Environmental Protection Commission. The report notes the development of a draft cooperation plan in case of pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea as well as proposals to implement the Action Plan with respect to post-

project environmental impact assessment (EIA). Both States Parties are committed to: completing the post-project EIA; continuing bilateral environmental monitoring of the Curonian Spit and Baltic Sea; signing the bilateral agreement concerning cooperation in pollution accidents, pollution prevention/mitigation and compensation measures; and signing the cooperation plan in case of pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea. No timetable for signing the bilateral agreement or cooperation plan was indicated in the report.

The increasing levels of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation in response to threats from the D-6 oil field project is to be noted. This has strengthened collaboration and secured agreement and joint commitment to completing the post-project EIA for the D-6 project. In addition, agreement has been reported on measures to monitor impacts and to respond and protect the Curonian Spit in the event of pollution incidents arising from the oil operation.

The commitment of both States Parties is clear. However, the actual status of implementation of the joint post-project EIA, funding available for implementation and activities agreed to under the Action Plan remains unclear.

Notwithstanding the positive progress made on collaboration around the D-6 oil field project, the States Parties have not fully responded to the request of the 29th session of the Committee regarding the broader state of conservation of the property. The Russian Federation submitted on 1 February 2006 a letter as a state of conservation report for their part of the property. It is disappointing to note that the report submitted in 2006 appears to repeat verbatim the report submitted on 27 January 2005.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.87

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.67**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the States Parties for their continued collaboration to complete the joint Lithuanian-Russian post-project environmental impact assessment (EIA) of the D-6 oil platform and to continue bilateral environmental monitoring;*
4. *Notes that both States Parties have recognized the necessity of a bilateral agreement concerning co-operation in case of pollution accidents, pollution prevention/mitigation and compensation measures, and a cooperation plan in case of pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea and urges both States Parties to sign the agreement and plan as soon as possible;*
5. *Further notes that the States Parties have not yet reported on the general state of conservation of the Curonian Spit, in particular the actual status of implementation of the joint post-project EIA and activities agreed to under the Action Plan;*
6. *Requests both States Parties to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed and updated report, by **1 February 2007**, on the general state of conservation of the property with reference to the cultural landscape values for which the property was inscribed and including the status of implementation of the joint post-project EIA*

and activities agreed to under the Action Plan, especially regarding the signature of a bilateral agreement concerning co-operation in case of pollution accidents, pollution prevention/mitigation and compensation measures, and a cooperation plan in case of pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

88. Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

C (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.68

28 COM 15B.93

27 COM 7B.71

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: in 1998, USD 20,000 (preparatory assistance) for the organisation of an international expert meeting on the planning and protection of the surroundings of the World Heritage Site Auschwitz Concentration Camp.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 by the State Party of Israel for an expert workshop (13-15 May 2004) on the preparation of a management plan for the Auschwitz Concentration Camp as well as the visit of a Polish expert to the Documentation Centre at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, Israel.

Previous monitoring missions:

Mission of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee with UNESCO and ICOMOS from 1 to 2 July 2001.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Lack of a management plan

Current conservation issues:

The state of conservation report submitted on 31 January 2006 outlined the implementation of the second stage of the Governmental Strategic Programme for the Oświęcim Area for the years 2002-2006. The State Party had also informed the World Heritage Centre by letter on 7 April 2005 of progress made in the preparation of a management plan for the property. The draft management plan was expected by January 2006, but at the time of preparation of this report (April 2006), it had not been received.

However, a progress report on the drawing up of the draft management plan was submitted on 23 January 2006. This focused on efforts to complete the property

management plan, on the Stage II Oświęcim Strategic Government Programme for 2002 - 2006, and on educational work being carried out by the International Centre of Education, attached to the State Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum in Oświęcim.

Specific members of the Steering Committee and Planning Group for the management plan and their roles were identified, and a timeline was given in 4 Phases for the expected completion of the management plan with a completion date of Phase II by March 2006 and an estimate for Phase III to take 3-5 months, beginning in April 2006. Many of the activities carried out under the Stage II Oświęcim Strategic Government Programme for 2002-2006 were successfully carried out and described in this report.

A second letter was received from the State Party on 25 April 2006 to inform the World Heritage Centre that the second phase of work on the management plan had been completed and was then submitted to the Steering Committee and to experts. Once comments from the Steering Committee and experts are taken into consideration, consultations will be carried out with international World Heritage experts.

Despite the fact that the State Party has failed to keep to the targets assigned in the original contract, the efforts currently in place to complete the management plan are significant. The targets for management plan completion may have been unrealistic, and ICOMOS is sympathetic to allowing the State Party the necessary time to carry out this work properly. The State Party may seek additional funding to complete the management plan for 1 February 2007.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.88

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.68, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the preparatory work done to date on the management plan for the site and under the Stage II Oświęcim Strategic Government Programme;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party was unable to provide the World Heritage Centre with the management plan by 1 February 2006, as requested in Decision 29 COM 7B.68, paragraph 5;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with the management plan by 1 February 2007, and a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

89. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1995

Criteria:

C (ii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

26 COM 21(b) 66

27 COM 7B.72

28 COM 15B.77

29 COM 7B.81

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Joint ICOMOS/IUCN mission November 2000; Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN mission March 2006.

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) Lack of overall conservation of the site, its parks and palaces;
- c) Urban development pressure.

Current conservation issues:

At the request of the Committee (**28 COM 15B.77, 29 COM 7B.81**) a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN monitoring mission was undertaken to evaluate the overall state of conservation of the site as well as of its buffer and transition zones six years after the first monitoring mission and ten years after inscription, and to assess the implementation of the management plan submitted in two parts, in 2003 (Part 1) and 2005 (Part 2). The first joint ICOMOS/IUCN mission in 2000 highlighted both the serious condition of some structures and the urgent need for a management plan that addressed conservation needs and prioritized repairs, restoration and maintenance.

The recent mission found that the overall state of conservation of the palaces and parks included in the core zone has improved considerably compared to the situation of 2000. Well-trained and committed professional staff is available for restoration works. The mission concluded that there is no severe problem of threat or loss concerning the outstanding universal value for which the property has been inscribed. The remaining problems have not changed the integrity and authenticity of the World Heritage site.

Threats nevertheless exist due to the absence of a clear management structure and of a comprehensive management plan, the significant debt of the Monte da Lua S.A., the serious urban pressure on the rural and semi-natural landscape surrounding the World Heritage core zone. The conditions of integrity of the property with reference to the values for which it was inscribed are satisfactory in the core zone.

The key monuments under the State control are in good general condition (Palacio real de Sintra, Palacio da Pena). The Palacio de Monserrate and the Convento dos Capuchos,

under the Monte da Lua S.A. management, are equally well restored and maintained. The Quinta da Regaleira, property of the Municipality managed by the Cultursintra Foundation is in a particularly good condition.

In terms of natural and landscape values of the area, the protection and the management of the World Heritage property have supposedly had a positive indirect effect on the biodiversity of the region: circa 80% of the high biological values of the Natural Park are still present in the site. As the general trend for the natural values (flora and fauna) is the risk of decreasing numbers of species and the loss of habitats, the importance of a coherent overall management plan is obvious.

Critical points concerning the integrity of the core area of the property are related to: a) the existence of inappropriate pre-fabricated offices at the entrances of some sites; b) the urgent need for restoration of the Chalet of the Countess Edla; c) the absence of any assistance for private owners of high value properties (buildings and parks) to maintain their heritage (colours, volumes; species of plants etc) and ensuring that the essential elements of the properties are kept on site.

For the buffer and transition zones, the rapid urbanisation with the construction of infrastructures and houses creates a major potential threat for the next years. The interface between the core area and the buffer and transition zones could suffer crucial change, leading to a loss of the values of the property, including cultural, semi-natural and natural values.

The mission proposed a detailed agenda for elaborating the following documents that will serve as benchmarks against which to evaluate the progress of future conservation works and development in Sintra in the coming five years: Management structure; Short term action plan; Urban development strategy; Plan for site interpretation; Sintra-Cascais Natural Park management plan (2010-2014); Sintra Municipality management plan (2010-2019); Updating of the World Heritage site management plan (2010-2014).

Given the short- and mid-term planning for the above documents, approval would need to be achieved before the end of 2009. It is proposed that the follow-up of the above measures be done on a regular basis. For the preparation of the related documents, the State Party may wish to request technical advice from UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies if required.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.77** and **29 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that significant work has been carried out to improve the state of conservation of the parks and palaces in the core zone of the World Heritage property and notes the efforts made by the State Party and the responsible authorities;*

4. *Requests the State Party to set up a clear management structure for the World Heritage site and to prepare an integrated comprehensive management plan, that takes into account all the relevant planning documents for the area of Sintra;*
5. *Also requests, as a first step, that the State Party ensure the preparation of a short-term action plan for the period of 2007-2009, defining the overall concept and measures for enhancing the World Heritage values including the buffer zones;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to seek technical support, if necessary, for the elaboration of the above requested documents;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit an up-dated report including the above-mentioned action-plan to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2007 for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

**90. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Serbia and Montenegro)
(C 125)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1979

Criteria:

C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

1979-2003

Previous Committee Decisions:

27 COM 7A.27

28 COM 15B.78

29 COM 7B.84

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 46,000 (and Participation Programme 2002-04, USD 47,000).

Previous monitoring missions:

UNESCO/ICOMOS mission 2003

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Earthquake damage;
- b) Lack of management planning;
- c) Urban development and urban pressure.

Current conservation issues:

The State Party submitted a progress report at the end of January 2006, which addresses both progress in the preparation of the management plan for the World Heritage property,

and the impact of the proposed bridge at the Verige Strait at the entrance of the Bay of Kotor.

The State Party noted delays in preparing the management plan launched three years ago. In essence because of changes in personnel involved in preparing the plan, efforts to prepare it have slowed down considerably. In general, it seems that earlier efforts have been abandoned and the process of preparing the plan restarted recently. The State Party designated the Regional Institute for the Protection of the Cultural Heritage of Kotor as the agency responsible for the preparation of the management plan in October 2005, with the expectation that work be launched by 31 January 2006 and be completed by 1 July 2006. The State Party report referred to a workshop carried out by ICCROM/UNESCO-BRESCE in January 2006 intended to define the process to be followed in preparing the management plan. The aim of the training workshop was to introduce the principles, practices, and planning methodologies that guide the preparation of a management plan, with specific reference to the Kotor World Heritage property. The workshop concluded with a plan of action for the local authority to complete the plan and a new proposed deadline for completion of 1 February 2007.

The analysis of the proposed Verige Bridge in the State Party report indicated some ambivalence about the proposed routing. The State Party report suggested that a UNESCO expert mission be organised to look closely at alternatives and potential impacts.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS support the efforts of the State Party to complete the site management plan at the earliest opportunity, but are concerned about the long delays in launching this process, in particular as the cause of these delays has not been fully explained. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS were pleased to see the involvement of ICCROM in the January workshop to assist, redefine and redirect the management planning process. Following considerable concern about the decision to build the Verige Bridge, and its proposed location, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS suggest that a mission be sent to the property to examine the suitability of the proposed bridge at Verige and to further advise on the management planning process.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.84**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Noting with concern the long delays in launching the process of the preparation of the site management plan despite the efforts by the State Party,*
4. *Noting with appreciation the results of the January 2006 workshop to assist, redefine and redirect the management planning process and the collaboration between the State Party, ICOMOS, ICCROM, the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Venice Office,*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission with natural heritage expertise to the property to examine the suitability of the*

proposed bridge at Verige and its impacts on the cultural and landscape values of the property;

6. *Encourages the State Party to call on the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for any expertise which may be required to complete the management plan;*
7. *Strongly encourages the State Party to complete the management plan at the earliest opportunity and requests it to provide the World Heritage Centre with a progress report on its elaboration as well as a timetable for its implementation by **1 February 2007** for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

91. Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain) (C 311 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1985

Criteria:

C (i) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.103

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

N/A

Current conservation issues:

At its 29th session, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property, given that the Segovia Aqueduct was listed as one of the “100 Most Endangered Sites” by the World Monuments Fund in 2005.

The processes for including a site on the World Monuments Watch List are linked to a specific conservation or restoration project suggested by local authorities, associations, individuals etc. and are not necessarily linked with potential or ascertained threats to the World Heritage values of a property. Between 1998 and 2005 UNESCO staff and ICOMOS members participated in the World Monuments Watch panel and provided information on World Heritage whenever appropriate. In a case where clear threats to the World Heritage values and the authenticity/integrity of properties are being identified

through the World Monuments Watch listing process, the States Parties is requested to report through the World Heritage procedures in compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The State Party report underlines that the differences between the World Monuments Watch and World Heritage processes. It states that the World Monuments Fund “has fully comprehended the need to protect this monument from the dangers threatening its future conservation. However, the inclusion of the monument on the *List of the 100 Most Threatened Sites* ... has given rise to a series of misunderstandings regarding the monument’s state of conservation and to speculation about an alleged situation of abandonment which at no time has arisen,” and concludes with the hope that “these issues have been sufficiently clarified in this communication.”

Following the review of the report by ICOMOS it is suggested that a leading expert in the conservation of major classical monuments be invited by the State Party to visit Segovia and make an independent report for presentation to the next session of the Committee.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.91

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.103, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Encourages the State Party to seek specific international expertise in the conservation of major classical monuments and to keep the Centre and ICOMOS informed on its outcome.*

92. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:
1988

Criteria:
C (i) (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:
27 COM 7B.76
28 COM 15B.98
29 COM 7B.86

International Assistance:
Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

ICOMOS mission 2002

Main threats identified in previous reports:

Urban development pressure

Current conservation issues:

As requested by Decision **29 COM 7B.86**, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS reviewed the state of conservation of the property based on the following material submitted by the State Party: the Periodic Report Section II on the property submitted on 31 October 2005 (see working Document *WHC-06/30.COM/11A*); a letter dated 12 January 2006 of the City of Salamanca concerning the designation status of the “Old Provincial Hospital”; a report by the city authorities of Salamanca; as well as a copy of the management plan for the property submitted with letter dated 8 March 2006.

In its Periodic Report, the State Party stated that the management of the property relies on the involvement of the national, regional, and local public authorities. It mentioned details of the heritage legislation and planning documents currently in force, both national and regional, and submitted respective documentation. The General Plan for Urban Zoning of the Municipality of Salamanca (*Plan General de Ordenación urbana del municipio de Salamanca*), revised and approved in 2004, was referred to as the main planning document.

The Centre noted that the boundary included in the submitted planning document of the “*Plan General de Ordenación urbana del municipio de Salamanca. Revisión-Adaptación 2004. Aprobación Inicial*” corresponded to the one in the nomination document, but that the seven serial elements that were clearly incorporated in the property in the last version of the nomination are omitted in the Plan.

The State Party declared that at present all actions carried out are supervised by the Territorial and Municipal Heritage Commissions. Furthermore, it is planned to appoint a World Heritage site manager and to form a management team, to improve co-ordination on the actions carried out by the different administrations of the City of Salamanca.

Having reviewed all available information, ICOMOS noted that many of the concerns expressed in earlier Committee decisions remain unclear or unanswered. The ICOMOS mission of 2002 very clearly described why the “auditorium” proposed for the Huerto de las Adoratrices site constituted an inappropriate intrusion on the chosen site, and would have a negative impact on the values recognized by inscription. The mission report noted that in 2000 revisions were made to the “Special Plan for the Protection and Interior Reform of the University Area and Historic-Artistic Ensemble” specifically to facilitate building the new structure, forbidden by the existing Plan.

While a State Party letter of 25 February 2005 noted a “decision to defer the building of the Auditorium pending the approval of the new General Plan”, the 2006 information by the State Party does not provide new information on the status of this project, nor has the State Party responded to the concerns expressed by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee concerning the nature of the proposed development.

The State Party Periodic Report stated that the *Plan General de Ordenación Urbana del Municipio de Salamanca* is the management plan requested by the Committee. ICOMOS considered that the *Plan General* is a conventional urban development master plan, and does not correspond to the Committee's request that the State Party undertake an integrated management plan involving all stakeholders.

The State Party Periodic Report suggested that the initial property boundaries established in 1988 with inscription have not been modified. The Report however does not address the ICOMOS statement that the *Plan General Revisión-Adaptación* "recognized that the boundaries of the World Heritage property have already been reduced and almost fragmented when compared with the consolidated historic fabric, since they exclude the areas that are undergoing immense change".

The exchanges of information between Committee, Advisory Bodies and the State Party over the last four years illustrate that the expectations of the World Heritage Committee seem to be not well understood by the responsible authorities. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS would therefore consider it helpful to organise a training seminar for all involved in management of this World Heritage property (and similar cases in Spain) in order to ensure that the concepts of the *Operational Guidelines* are fully understood by those with management responsibility for the property.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.92

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.86**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not yet submitted the integrated management plan requested during the 28th and 29th sessions of the World Heritage Committee and also regrets that the State Party has not made progress in the last year as requested by the Committee to improve and implement specific legislation so as to ensure appropriate legal protection of the historic urban fabric and structure on a national level;*
4. *Requests the authorities to fully take into account the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture (May, 2005) in the management of the historic urban landscape of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Invites the State Party to consider organizing jointly with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM a training and information seminar in Salamanca, which would clarify the obligations under the World Heritage Convention concerning control and management of urban planning for World Heritage cities and this property in particular;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide a map of the inscribed site that includes not only the property shown on the most recent map submitted, but the seven outlying properties also inscribed by the Committee in 1988: the Churches of San Marcos, Sancti Spiritus, San Juan Barbalos, and San Cristobal, as well as the Colegio de los Irlandeses, the Convento de las Claras, and the Casa-Convento de Santa Teresa;*

7. *Further recalls point 7 of its Decision 29 COM 7B.86 and requests the State Party to provide an updated report to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, on progress made in meeting the Committee's requests for improved legal protection and management of the property, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

93. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2004

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription of the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 14B.49

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Urban pressure;
- b) New construction in the area surrounding the site.

Current conservation issues:

In response to concern about proposals for the construction of a 'Fourth Grace' building on the Pier Head waterfront, the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session had recommended that the national authorities pay particular attention to monitoring the processes of change in the World Heritage areas and their surroundings in order not to adversely impact the property, and had requested that the State Party assures proper height for any new constructions, respect the qualities of the historic area, and that they complement the historic buildings.

A significant number of letters have been received at the World Heritage Centre from private citizens and community groups on new developments which were transmitted to the State Party for comments and to ICOMOS for review. At the time of preparation of this report, there has been no response from the State Party.

The concerns expressed included a scheme for a new extension to the Museum in 2005. This is a large, asymmetrical building, sited just to the south of the three Graces and projecting forward from them towards the River Mersey. This proposal was given

planning permission in December 2005. The design has attracted some adverse comments locally for its prominent setting and dominant form and for its impact on the Three Graces and the River Mersey waterfront. Two further building projects are now being considered which could also have an adverse impact. The first is a tall tower at Central Station. The second is a group of three large buildings on the waterfront just to the south of the proposed new Museum on Mann Island. There is also a scheme for a new canal along the waterfront.

The thrust of the World Heritage Committee statement for the Pier Head was that any new buildings should not seek to challenge the dominance of the existing Three Graces but rather should complement them and the overall historic quarter. ICOMOS does not consider that the proposed museum building follows this recommendation. Its slanting and sliding monolithic form has been designed to be seen. The massive scale and asymmetry of its components dwarfs the rhythmic architectural detail of the Three Graces, even though the proposed building is much lower.

Liverpool as a port city is a remarkable survival, complete with many docks, waterfront buildings, warehouses, and commercial and cultural centres. It is now thriving as a future European Capital of Culture and there is great enthusiasm for re-development in and around the World Heritage site. A large number of development projects are currently being considered.

When the site was nominated, it was accompanied by a management plan, which set out the framework for future development. That does not seem to have been translated into detailed development plans for discrete areas of the city. Currently there is no master plan for the waterfront, for instance. Nor have any of the proposed buildings now being considered emerged from agreed design briefs. All major development schemes within the World Heritage site should emerge from a structured process that sets out the constraints and context, as well as desired spatial improvements within an agreed brief.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.93

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 28 COM 14B.49, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Commends the City Council on securing investment to construct a new Museum building;*
4. *Notes with great concern that the new Museum building next to the Three Graces does not comply with the recommendation of the 28th session as it is designed to be dominant rather than recessive; and also notes that three additional new buildings are being planned on the waterfront, one of which could also be intrusive in architectural terms;*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint monitoring mission to consider the impact of these proposals on the World Heritage property;*

6. *Urges the State Party to put in place strategic plans for future development that set out clear strategies for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with an updated report by **1 February 2007** on the progress of strategic plans for future development and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION

94. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1990

Criteria

C (ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.93

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 82,207

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

Monitoring missions in 1993, 1995, 1998, 2002

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Urban Pressure including inadequate land use changes;
- b) Tourism Pressure;
- c) Lack of capacity in conservation techniques;
- d) Lack of management mechanisms (including legislation and service infrastructure);
- e) Lack of presentation and interpretation of the site;
- f) Deterioration of structures caused by natural and human hazards (including environmental pollution and lack of sensitisation of local residents).

Current Conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received a document from the State Party, dated January 2006, using the format of a Periodic Report. The report provides information on institutional progress made on the adoption of the new Law on Monumental Heritage, as requested by the Committee in 2003 (**27 COM 7 (b) 90, 5**). Furthermore, the documents provide information on development of an Integrated Revitalisation Plan and a Risk management plan.

The State Party reports that the National Directorate of Monumental Heritage and the City Council of the National District have installed a Directing Commission at the local level for the administration of the site. The document asserts, however, that the Directing Commission lacks qualified human and financial resources for the effective protection of the site. Furthermore, it underlines a lack of inter-institutional coordination between the different governmental departments approving and supervising conservation work in the Colonial City of Santo Domingo and suggests the need for a closer institutional coordination, as were recommended by the committee in its 27th session. **(27 COM 7 (b) 90)**.

The World Heritage Centre received a further brief report, dated 12th of April 2006, on the State of Conservation (DPCC-041-06 Informe de Estado de Conservación de la Ciudad Colonial de Santo Domingo) from the State Party, identifying among others the following threats to the site:

- a) Lack of a buffer zone to protect the Colonial City of Santo Domingo.
- b) Environmental contamination and the lack of an ongoing conservation programme, as well as, a lack of incentives for private interventions, resulting in bio-deterioration of the facades and the ceilings of protected buildings.
- c) Incompatible land use with the physical structure of the buildings.
- d) Inadequate means of transport in the protected site and lack of parking space.
- e) Marginalisation of the historic quarter of Santa Barbara.
- f) Lack of public services, particularly in waste management issues.
- g) Annual threats of tropical storms and cyclones.

Furthermore, the reports submitted include an Integrated Revitalisation Plan (financed by the Inter-American Development Bank) in two parts. The first part is a strategic plan, which outlines the general objectives and priority actions to be undertaken. The actions proposed are focussed on validating urban diversity by interventions in the southern residential zone and the harbour zone, by the construction and restoration of residential buildings, by the rearrangement of the urban road-infrastructure system and by further activities to stimulate the tourist industry. The Second part, the Revitalisation Plan, consists of regulatory laws identifying different types of buffer zones. It contains conservation laws, regulations on the use of public space and protected buildings, construction laws and land use laws and laws on the protection of green spaces. Finally, the report contains an Emergency Action Plan, which is to function as a pilot project for the protection of the historic districts. However, the Integrated Revitalisation Plan and the new Laws for the Protection of the Historic District have not yet been adopted by the State Party.

The report mentions the need for a revision of the nomination document with the intention of widening the protected zone of the World Heritage Site and to propose a surrounding buffer zone. (Sección 2 II.9 1b Límites y zona de amortiguamiento, Model)

So far, these proposed actions remain in the planning phase.

ICOMOS recognizes the importance of the proposed Risk Management Plan. In Dec. 1998, following a hurricane that damaged the historic city in October 1998, the

Committee asked the Advisory Bodies to propose actions to improve risk preparedness in the region. ICCROM organised two regional training workshops for 20 countries in 1999 and in 2001, and both involved efforts of local officials to develop a risk preparedness plan for the historic city. ICOMOS commends the municipality for these efforts. ICOMOS would encourage the State Party to ensure that the local measures now developed are included in national strategies for risk preparedness, and are supported with adequate resources.

ICOMOS would appreciate efforts linking current planning mechanisms to the WH Centre mission carried out in 2002, which put in question the degree of control over renovation projects in the core of the historic city, particularly the restoration of the Hostal Nicolas de Ovando, and to what extent planning provisions have been improved to enable the city to better deal with and control investor proposals.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.94

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.93 adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Strongly recommends closer institutional coordination among the different governmental departments in approving and supervising restoration and rehabilitation works in the Colonial City of Santo Domingo;*
4. *Encourages the adoption, and strict enforcement of the new law on monumental heritage; the adoption of the Integrated Revitalisation Plan and the implementation of the related actions proposed; and the adoption and full implementation of the Risk Management Plan for the Zona Colonial;*
5. *Encourages furthermore the revision of the nomination documents including the establishment of a buffer zone, as proposed by the State Party, for the protection of the site, and the early submission of this proposal to the World Heritage Committee for review;*
6. *Requests the States Party to submit a progress report by 1 February 2007 on progress made in addressing all of the above points, including outcomes of efforts made to improve the management of investment (as in the earlier case of the historic core of the Hostal de Ovando in 2002), for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

95. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1980

Criteria:

C (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.115

29COM 7B.90

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 167,825 for the elaboration of the management plan and the Nomination file; provision of equipment; emergency measures for the protection and rehabilitation of the Maya Site of Copan; replacement of the protective canopy over the Hieroglyphic Stairway at the site.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Monitoring Mission in 1999

Main threats identified in previous reports:

The construction foreseen for an airport in the archaeological area of Rio Amarillo, 17 km from the core zone of the World Heritage property.

Current conservation issues:

After transmitting to the State Party the Committee's Decision **29 COM 7B.90**, the World Heritage Centre repeatedly asked for information on the status of the Environmental Impact Assessment report in relation to the building of an airport in the valley of Rio Amarillo. In November 2005, the National Institute of Anthropology and History informed the World Heritage Centre that the Secretariat for Human Resources and the Environment intended to subject the above-mentioned report to further study. Through non official channels, the World Heritage Centre has been informed that the process has been halted due to a court injunction. Moreover, the World Heritage Committee, by its Decision **29 COM 7B.90**, has requested the State Party to elaborate a Public Use Study, as a precondition for the construction of the new airport at Rio Amarillo. However, only a preliminary draft of this study has so far been received from the State Party. This draft does not address the concerns expressed by the Committee regarding the impact of the airport on the archaeological site of Copan.

Towards the end of January 2006, the State Party sent to the World Heritage Centre the State of Conservation report of the site, requested by the Committee. This report gives an account of the progress made on the preparation of the management plan.

With respect to the management plan for the site, the World Heritage Centre noted the lack of a participatory methodology in its elaboration, although this was one of the conditions stipulated in the framework of the agreements with the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank. Such a participatory approach was particularly necessary in relation to the issues concerning the Copan Ruins Community, Sociedad de Buenos Compondores (Society of Good Repairers), and the communities adjacent to the Río Amarillo area. Moreover, the management plan does not cover the entire Copan Valley, which is protected by national legislation on a special basis.

The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide clear and accurate cartography, showing the official limits of the registered site. Unfortunately, no information has been received on the matter nor on the possible purchase of lands in order to link the Las Sepulturas area with the main Copan site.

Finally, the Getty Conservation Institute has completed the Copan Hieroglyphic Stairway conservation plan. However, the monitoring programme is continuing and the monitoring equipment is still in place. In addition, the State Party reported on the state of conservation of underground stuccoes throughout the site, which is considered to be fair. This particular report was prepared in cooperation with the Mexican INAH.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.95

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.90**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Requests the State Party to ensure the full involvement of all the stakeholders in the development of the management plan and that the latter cover the entire area of the Copan Valley;*
4. *Urges the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre detailed information on the status of the Environmental Impact Study for the project of the construction of an airport within the Rio Amarillo Valley, by **30 August 2006**, and in any case before any irreversible decision is taken regarding the construction of the airport, and to consult closely with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the appropriate steps to be taken;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **30 August 2006**, the terms of reference for conducting a Public Use Study;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to continue monitoring the state of conservation of the Copan Hieroglyphic Stairway, based on the programme developed by the Getty Conservation Institute;*
7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination of the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

96. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1987

Criteria:

C (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

29 COM 7B.103

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Pressure from Urban Development;
- b) Urban decay of the Historic Centre;
- c) Natural disasters (seismic instability and continued sinking of the city caused by the depletion of the aquifer);
- d) Water and environmental pollution;
- e) Lack of infrastructure;
- f) Pressure from Tourism;
- g) Lack of management mechanisms (including legislation);
- h) Lack of institutional coordination;
- i) Lack of monitoring systems;
- j) Lack of human and/or financial resources.

Current Conservation issues:

Conservation and restoration works have been undertaken in the Historic Centre of Mexico City during the period 2002-2006. The Xochimilco area of the site, in particular, has been subjected to investigations to determine which World Heritage criteria would justify extending or changing the current definition of Xochimilco as a cultural site into a cultural landscape by incorporating the *chinampas* (floating gardens) and canal areas.

The report requested by the World Heritage Committee in 2003 on the progress made on the design, adoption and implementation of the management plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico and Xochimilco was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre on 24 March 2006. In addition, the World Heritage Centre received a comprehensive CD-Rom entitled *Xochimilco: un proceso de Gestion Participativa* on the progress of the Proyecto UNESCO Xochimilco (PUX), through the UNESCO office in Mexico in March 2006.

The participatory rehabilitation programme of the Historic Centre of Mexico City focuses on promoting repopulation in four main central districts (*delegaciones centrales*) by improving their infrastructure and living conditions through waste management, public lighting, and transport. The facades of historic buildings have been restored and those beyond repair have been demolished for security of the inhabitants. However, the rehabilitation plan did not mention the water table issue, which was one of the reasons for the inscription of the site on the 2006 World Monuments Fund Watch List of the 100 Most Endangered sites.

As per Xochimilco, the PUX was initiated in 2002, during the First Seminar on the *Full Recovery of Xochimilco World Heritage*, organized under the auspices of the UNESCO

and FAO offices in Mexico, with the objective of involving international institutions, the Federal Government and the Federal District's Government in the preparation of a management plan for the Rehabilitation of Xochimilco; obtaining legal provisions and funds from the Government; establishing mechanisms for community participation in the design and implementation of this management plan.

At present the second phase of the PUX has successfully reached its three main objectives. These are:

- a) To obtain political support for the elaboration of a management plan. Consensus among the various actors involved in the process was reached thanks to an inter-institutional and inter-disciplinary approach and also thanks to the SIRCHAL seminars, which contributed to the identification of a long term strategy with respect to the water management problems of Xochimilco; involving not only local institutions but also the international network of *humedales* (humid areas, such as the Parc Naturel Regional des Caps de Marais d'Opale);
- b) To officially create a *Comisión Interdependencial* (involving several institutional bodies);
- c) To identify (on the basis of an inventory of the *chinampas* and surrounding areas) new boundaries of the site and a long term management plan with a strong participatory focus, which encompasses the preservation of both natural and cultural aspects of the site.

The constant effort to involve not only political and administrative bodies, but also the local population, which has always expressed interest and commitment, was of major importance in this process. The role played by the UNESCO Office in Mexico as facilitator of negotiations among the various stakeholders has been catalytic to the harmonious momentum and the agreement reached.

Building on these first successes, the participative approach of the management plan will continue and will focus on the following six main items by establishing technical working committees, in which experts, decision makers and civil society will be equally represented: (i) water management; (ii) historic centre and integral heritage; (iii) *chinampas*; (iv) productive activities related to heritage; (v) illegal occupation of public spaces; (vi) communication, promotion and education.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.96

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,
2. Recalling the results of the November 2002 ICOMOS mission findings and Decisions 27 COM 7B.95 and 29 COM 7B.103 adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively;
3. Congratulates the State Party for the results reached to present in regards to the Xochimilco project;

4. *Reminds the State Party that it is absolutely necessary to follow-up on these achievements (completion and implementation of the management plan and creation of a management unit). An inconclusive process would put the site in danger and jeopardize the participatory commitment to the site;*
5. *Requests the State Party and ICOMOS to consult with IUCN on the conservation and effective management of Natural Areas and Ecological Zones in order to ensure the protection of the natural environment of the heritage site;*
6. *Further requests that the State Party submit a detailed and specific report to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, on the measures to be taken with respect to the lowering of the water table beneath the World Heritage property and the implementation of the management plan for examination by the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.*

97. Archaeological Site of Chavín (Peru) (C 330)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994

Criteria:

C (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.104

29 COM 7B. 95

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,550 for Emergency Assistance, Preparatory Assistance and Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Monitoring Mission in 1999

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Intense temperature fluctuation ;
- b) Rain and winds ;
- c) Growth of native vegetation (Pinkuyo), the roots of which destabilize the foundations ;
- d) Water erosion and destabilization of one of the main structures ;
- e) Lack of a management plan.

Current conservation issues:

According to the State of Conservation Report received by the World Heritage Centre from the State Party in January 2006, several actions devoted to the preservation of the site were carried out during 2005. These actions included emergency maintenance and protection works as well as capacity building campaigns, which were carried out jointly by the INC (National Institute of Culture) and the Ministry of Exterior Commerce and Tourism. The report also mentions protection actions for La Banda zone, based on discussions and coordination with the owners of land parcels in La Banda. At the same time, the definitive delimitation of the archeological zone was completed and illegal constructions were stopped.

Investigation works in collaboration with Stanford University were continued in Chavín and La Banda. A project for the construction of a site Museum in Chavín, with the collaboration of the Japanese Government, is in the planning phase. The World Heritage Centre has not yet received information concerning the archeological surveys to be carried out at La Banda, to identify a possible alternative route for the road which presently crosses the site.

The World Heritage Committee, at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), urged the State Party to develop a management plan for the property of Chavín and La Banda, which should include statutory provisions for an archaeological impact assessment of all areas in and around the World Heritage property before any type of intervention. The report received from the State Party included, in annex, a work-plan for the elaboration of the management plan (dated June 2004).

The State Party also supplied a report of the Expert Meeting held in March 2005, in which this work-plan was outlined. The first phase of the project proposes the identification and general understanding of the site, along with documentation on its physical and historical evolution. The National Institute of Culture, working with Stanford University, INDERCHARP (Chavín Regional Development Institute) and with a renowned international consultant have nearly completed this phase.

The second phase will be devoted to the analysis of the cultural significance of Chavín and of its historical and cultural context and physical condition. The third and final phase will involve the definition of the relevant conservation principles and criteria, the formulation of objectives and methods, final delineation of boundaries, and the development of work-plans for the implementation of the plan. It is estimated that the entire process will be completed by the end of 2006.

ICOMOS welcomes the actions taken by the State Party and the professional approach to the preparation of the management plan for a complex site.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.97

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B. 98, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),

3. *Commends* the State Party for the actions taken to protect and preserve the World Heritage site of Chavin;
4. *Urges* the State Party to finalize the management plan for the property;
5. *Requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, a progress report and a draft management plan for examination by the Committee at its 31th session in 2007.

98. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

2000

Criteria:

C (i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

28 COM 15B.121

29 COM 7B.97

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,550 for Emergency Assistance, Preparatory Assistance and Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

Monitoring Mission in 1999; ICOMOS Expert Mission 2000

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Frequent seismic activity in the region and flooding during the rainy season;
- b) Demolition of certain houses in the historical centre and the restoration of San Agustin Church.

Current conservation issues:

The World Heritage Centre received a State of Conservation Report by the State Party in January 2006. The report described the works carried out by the regional, local, foreign and private institutions concerned with the conservation of the site. The works included the restoration of a number of public spaces and historical buildings in collaboration with the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (AECI), as established in the work calendar presented last year. Other projects mentioned in the report included the restoration of facades, underground cabling for the public lighting of the historical centre, the inventory of the historical centre and the inauguration of a restoration school. According to the report, some of these projects are still in the conception stage, while others are being implemented and due to be completed in the following months.

Concerning the demolition of historic houses in the historical centre of Arequipa, the report explained that these houses were not listed as Historic Monuments and did not form part of any monumental urban context. Nevertheless, the National Cultural Institute (INC) of Lima is dealing with the question and sanctions will be imposed on the owners for having demolished the houses without the required authorization.

Regarding the Committee's request for information on the tower of the San Agustín Church, the State Party has reported that this has now been restored, by the Regional Government, according to its original style and the church has today resumed its normal activities.

The Committee had also encouraged the State Party to implement the Disaster Preparedness Plan at the soonest. This Plan, however, is still being finalized and, according to the report, will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in the coming months. No specific timeframe was provided.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.98

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 29 COM 7B.97 adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Urges the State Party to finalise and implement the Disaster Preparedness Plan as soon as possible;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2007, a progress report on the progress made in the implementation of the Disaster Preparedness Plan for examination by the Committee at its 31th session in 2007.*

99. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1994

Criteria:

C (i) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger:

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions:

22 COM XII.6 B2.2.5 p.49

24 EXT BUR IV 78

29 COM 7B. 98

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency measures on the Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: N/A

Previous monitoring missions :

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Damage caused by illegal mining and farming activities;
- b) Continued traffic of vehicles through the geoglyphs;
- c) Lack of systematic monitoring of the site.

Current conservation issues:

In September 2005, the World Heritage Centre requested the comments of the State Party on a report in a press article concerning the settlement of 60 families in La Pascana zone, only a few meters away from the Geoglyphs. In addition, the World Heritage Centre was alerted by the Director of the Aero-archaeological Investigations Institute (Instituto de Investigaciones Aeroarqueológicas) of the damage caused to the site by trucks driving through the Pampas in order to avoid paying the toll fee on the main road.

As for the reported settlement of 60 families, the INC (National Institute of Culture) informed the World Heritage Centre, in December 2005, that this settlement concerned an area located outside the World Heritage property, and that the damages reported by the press referred to incidences 20 to 50 years earlier. Moreover, according to the State Party, the office of the public prosecutor was supposed to take a decision on the matter, about which the World Heritage Centre would be kept informed. At the time of writing the present report (April 2006), the World Heritage Centre has not received any further information.

According to the State of Conservation Report sent by the State Party in January 2006, the measures taken to halt the uncontrolled, continued vehicle traffic through the geoglyphs and the dumping of solid waste are being implemented according to an Emergency Plan elaborated by a Multi-sectorial Commission, integrating several Ministries with mandates in the concerned area, along with the INC and a Congressman. The World heritage Centre has not received any information concerning this plan.

The Commission proposed two complementary measures as part of the Plan for the Conservation and Protection of the Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca. These include the opening of an alternative road, away from the Geoglyphs, and the restoration of the damaged areas, as well as the establishment of two permanent police posts along the Pan-American Highway. According to information sent by the State Party, these works are due to start during the first semester of 2006, pending approval from the national authorities.

Other activities carried out for the preservation of the Lines, in collaboration with the Maria Reiche Foundation, include solid waste removal, which is carried out every three months along the Pan-American Highway; three campaigns were undertaken in 2005. Frequent aerial control monitoring has taken place in order to detect recent damages to the lines.

In August 2005, the World Heritage Centre received press articles concerning the discovery of an impressive earthen ceremonial centre, extending over 24 km², located in the region of Cahuachi. According to the articles this site, presumably constructed by the Nasca culture, might have been the capital and principal ceremonial centre. All materials found to date are kept in the Antonini Museum of Nasca. Moreover, according to the press, 12 previously unknown geoglyphs were discovered after a wind storm in San Javier, La Legua and Changuillo, along the two banks of the Ingenio River. These geoglyphs appear to be earlier than the Nasca lines. The World Heritage Centre has not received further information concerning this discovery.

ICOMOS supports the action being undertaken by the State Party. However, it stresses the need for a comprehensive management plan, which would bring together the various initiatives taken in recent years, for this vast and highly vulnerable site.

Draft Decision: 30 COM 7B.99

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-06/30.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B. 98**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the measures envisaged within the framework of the Plan for the Conservation and Protection of the Lines of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana as well as through the Emergency Plan elaborated by a Multi-sectorial Commission;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to implement such measures as soon as possible with a view to ensure the conservation of the integrity of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Recommends the State Party to develop, in consultation with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, a comprehensive management plan for the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to address the issue of the illegal constructions near the site in order to avoid further impact on the World Heritage property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit a detailed report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2007**, on the progress achieved in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the Committee at its 31th session in 2007.*