

Limited distribution

WHC-92/CONF.003/2
Paris, 10 July 1992
Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL
AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Sixteenth Session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 6-10 July 1992

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR



I. INTRODUCTION

1. The sixteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 6 to 10 July 1992. All the Bureau members attended: Mr. Azedine Beschaouch (Tunisia), Chairperson; Mr. Diaz Berrio (Mexico), Rapporteur; and representatives of Brazil, France, Senegal, Thailand, United States of America as Vice-Chairpersons.

2. Representatives of the following States to the Convention attended the meeting of the Bureau as observers: Australia, Canada, China, Cyprus, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Philippines, Syrian Arab Republic, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Turkey.

3. Representatives of the Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants appears in Annex I.

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. The Deputy Director-General for Programmes, Mr. Portella, welcomed participants on behalf of the Director-General. He commended the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and highlighted the challenges ahead which have to be met at a time of rapid global change.

He made reference to several of the events taking place this year at UNESCO Headquarters and in the States Parties, to commemorate twenty years of successful work under the World Heritage Convention. He informed the Bureau members of the decision taken by the Director-General to establish the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in order to strengthen the UNESCO World Heritage Secretariat by bringing together experts from the cultural and natural heritage realms. He congratulated Mr. B. von Droste on his appointment as Director of the Centre and wished his young team success in its future work. He expressed the hope that the Centre would effectively help States Parties in their endeavour to protect humankind's priceless heritage which must be passed on to future generations.

He concluded by emphasizing the importance of the work related to strategic planning for the future implementation of the Convention which the Bureau will guide during its current session, thus providing direction to all partners of the World Heritage system for the future.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Bureau decided to consider the monitoring of the state of conservation of natural heritage properties on the World Heritage List before proceeding with the examination of the

monitoring of the state of conservation of cultural properties. With this modification, the Bureau then adopted the agenda as it had been set out in document CLT-92/CONF.003/1

IV. REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

6. The Secretary of the World Heritage Committee, Mr. B. von Droste, reported on the activities undertaken since the fifteenth session of the Committee held in Carthage, Tunisia, in December 1991. He began by informing the delegates that the Convention has been ratified or accepted by four new States Parties : Republic of Lithuania, Solomon Islands, Japan and the Republic of Croatia. The total number of States Parties to the Convention was now 127.

7. Mr. B. von Droste provided an overview of the events which will take place during the next three months at UNESCO Headquarters to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention and thanked the States Parties which have contributed to the organization of exhibits, conferences and cultural events.

8. He outlined priorities of work for the World Heritage Centre this year and gave details of the different steps which would be followed in the launching of the strategy for the implementation of the Convention for the next ten years. This strategy will be finalized and adopted at the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee at Santa Fe, USA, in December 1992. Furthermore, he pointed out that the systematic monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List would be an important concern for joint work with States Parties and advisory bodies. In this connection he gave detailed information on the devastation caused by the on-going armed conflict in the Republic of Croatia resulting in the large-scale destruction of the Old City of Dubrovnik and endangering the integrity of the Plitvice Lake National Park. He also gave details on the present situation at Mt. Nimba (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea), the conservation of which has been an important concern of the Committee at its last session, particularly in relation to minimizing threats posed by an iron-ore mining project. He also informed the delegates of initial steps that had been taken in co-operation with Cambodia for the inscription of Angkor on the World Heritage List.

9. He concluded by highlighting the special significance of the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee which, thanks to the kind invitation of the United States of America, will be convened in Santa Fe, New Mexico from 6-14 December 1992.

10. The Chairperson thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the report and emphasized the task of the Bureau in elaborating a future strategy for implementing the World Heritage Convention.

V. MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES AND RELATED TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

11. The Bureau examined document CLT-92/CONF.003/3 and reviewed progress reports on the state of conservation of fifteen natural and mixed sites. The representatives of IUCN presented another document (in English only) providing supplementary information on these fifteen sites and progress reports on the state of conservation of a number of other natural and mixed sites.

12. The Bureau noted that several States Parties have not responded to letters sent by the Secretariat transmitting the observations and recommendations of the Committee regarding the state of conservation of World Heritage properties within their territories. The Bureau urged the States Parties to respond to the queries of the Committee in order to facilitate the work of the Committee. The Bureau made specific observations and recommendations on the state of conservation of the following sites.

Iguazu National Park (Argentina) and Iguazu National Park (Brazil)

13. The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, had noted that eight helicopters simultaneously overflowed the waterfall area and that local conservation groups opposed the use of the area by helicopters since it contravened legal regulations for air traffic over protected areas. At its last session, the Committee was informed that the Brazilian authorities had established a group to study the matter and had requested the Secretariat to contact the Argentine authorities to obtain information on the steps taken by them. The Brazilian authorities have, by their letter of 5 June 1992, indicated that the Working Group had considered the positive (economic benefits to local people) and negative (noise pollution) aspects of helicopter tourism and had identified potential mechanisms (regulation of number of visits, time-table of visits, maximum level of noise permitted for helicopter traffic in the area, taxing helicopter operators for using the National Park area) for regulation and control. However, the Group had concluded that at present the negative impacts do not override the positive effects and had recommended that the situation be further monitored before any regulatory measures are introduced.

The Argentine authorities, by their letter of 17 June 1992, provided information on the joint efforts of their National Park Administration and Air Force to establish an agreement to regulate use of the air space over the Iguazu National Park by helicopters. Until such time as an agreement will be drafted and finalized, the existing norms for use of air space between surface level and an altitude of 112 km will be strictly enforced. Violation of these regulations by a helicopter operator is punishable by cancellation, for six months, of the permit to use the National Park area.

The Bureau noted the views of, and the steps taken by the two States Parties concerned to regulate helicopter use of the air space over the waterfall area and requested IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to continue to monitor the problem and its management by the authorities responsible for the two National Parks.

Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)

14. The Bureau noted that, as requested by the Committee at the time of the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List in 1988, IUCN had undertaken a mission to the site. The Bureau learnt with satisfaction that despite a slow start, the management of the Wet Tropics area had achieved much progress last year, particularly with respect to:

(a) establishing a headquarters and appointment of staff; (b) drafting of legislation; (c) preparing of management plans and site plans; (d) carrying out a number of policy-relevant studies; (e) setting-up advisory committees and a management authority (f) improving budgetary allocations for site management, and (g) rehabilitating degraded forest areas.

The Bureau commended the Australian authorities for taking these steps for ensuring the adequate management of this site and requested IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to continue to monitor progress.

Srebarna Biosphere Reserve (Bulgaria)

15. The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, recommended that the Bulgarian authorities nominate this site for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger because this small (600 hectare) World Heritage site had lost much of its ecological viability. The Bureau was informed that IUCN had undertaken two missions to Bulgaria since the last session of the Committee and that although the site's importance as a Ramsar site and a Biosphere Reserve, in particular within a European context, could still be retained with the implementation of specific remedial actions, its World Heritage status can no longer be justified because it has deteriorated to a state where it has irretrievably lost many of the characteristics which determined its inclusion on the World Heritage List.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its forthcoming session in December, consider deleting this property from the World Heritage List, and in accordance with paragraph 41(c) of the Operational Guidelines, requested the World Heritage Centre to inform the Bulgarian authorities of its recommendation to the Committee. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to obtain all observations and comments the Bulgarian authorities may wish to make regarding this recommendation to the Committee in time to submit them to the consideration of the Committee, scheduled to meet in December 1992.

Dinosaur Provincial Park (Canada)

16. The Bureau was in agreement with the proposal of the Canadian authorities to delete 423 hectares, where petroleum and natural gas exploration will take place, and add 2,133 hectares of significantly higher conservation value to this site. In effect, the proposed modification of the boundaries of the site has resulted in a net gain of about 1,700 hectares in the total area of this Park. The Bureau recommended that the Committee register the report and the map provided by the Canadian authorities describing the revised boundaries of this World Heritage site.

Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada)

17. The Bureau was informed of progress achieved by the Canadian authorities in addressing threats to the conservation of this site. The Bureau congratulated the Canadian authorities for the programme of action they have set in motion for its conservation. However, the Bureau was in agreement with the fact that safeguarding the World Heritage values of this site require continuous action over the long-term and requested the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to monitor the state of conservation of this site to report to the Committee any problems that may arise.

Manovo-Gounda Saint Floris National Park (Central African Republic)

18. The Bureau recalled that when this site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988, several members of the Committee had registered their reservations as to its state of conservation and several threats to its integrity. The Bureau was concerned that despite assurances given to the Committee at the time of its inscription and the US\$27 million EEC project in the region, the deterioration of the property had continued and this site still does not have a management plan. The Bureau took note of the intention of the President of the Central African Republic to transfer the management of the site to a private foundation and of the invitation made to UNESCO to participate, as a scientific body, in the management of the site by this foundation. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to study this proposal, together with IUCN, and undertake a detailed analysis of the implications of the transfer of management of the site to a private foundation. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the State Party to know whether the national authorities would invite an expert mission to review the state of conservation of this Park and assess the proposal to lease its management to a private organization. The Bureau emphasized that such a mission should build upon the recent project audit carried out by the EEC and present recommendations on the future viability and management of this site.

Talamanca-La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica/Panama)

19. The Bureau commended the Panamanian authorities for preventing 59,000 hectares of La Amistad National Park being released for oil exploration.

The Bureau noted that the Costa Rican authorities have not responded to the Secretariat's letter of 6 February 1992, requesting them to consider revising the boundaries of the Talamanca-La Amistad Reserves by deleting four Indian Reserves in the north-eastern Atlantic sector and submit a map showing the new boundaries of the site. Furthermore, the Bureau was also informed by the representative of IUCN that earlier plans to construct a road through the middle of the Talamanca-La Amistad Reserves of Costa Rica were also being revived.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Costa Rican authorities to request, once again, that they consider revising the boundaries of the Reserves and provide a map showing the new boundaries. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to obtain detailed information regarding the proposal for constructing a road through the middle of the Talamanca-La Amistad Reserves, including an assessment of the potential impact of this project on the state of conservation of the site. A report on the situation should be given to the Committee at its forthcoming session.

Plitvice Lake National Park (Republic of Croatia)

20. The Bureau noted that the Croatian authorities have officially informed UNESCO that they will abide by the obligations of the World Heritage Convention and requested that a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission be undertaken to assess the impacts which unrest in the region has had on the state of conservation of Plitvice Lake National Park. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, as requested by the Croatian authorities, inscribe Plitvice Lake National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau also decided to set aside an amount up to US\$30,000 as emergency assistance to enable the organization of a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site, in co-operation with the Croatian authorities as well as the relevant UN bodies responsible for monitoring the conflict in the region, in order to prepare and initiate the implementation of an international assistance project for the rehabilitation of the Plitvice Lake National Park.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

21. The Bureau was satisfied to note that the Sub-Secretario Forestal y Recursos Naturales y Renovables which is responsible for the management of this site has been successful in halting a proposed road construction project in order to bring together the relevant provincial and national agencies to discuss the environmental impact of the project and plan mitigating measures. In this regard, the Bureau commended the Ecuadorean authorities for having obtained official approval for including substantial

areas south of the World Heritage site into the National Park. The Bureau, however, was concerned about the information reported by the representative of IUCN regarding heavy poaching of wildlife, illegal livestock grazing and encroachment in this World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Ecuadorean authorities and suggest that they invite international and/or regional experts to join Ecuadorean specialists to assess impacts of the road construction project and threats to the integrity of this site. The Bureau recommended that on the basis of more information received on the potential impact of the road construction project and threats, the World Heritage Committee, at its forthcoming session in December 1992, decide whether or not this site ought to be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Galapagos National Park (Ecuador)

22. The Bureau was informed that the employees of this World Heritage site recently staged a four-week strike demanding higher salaries and other improvements of their working conditions. The Bureau also noted that a draft tourism and conservation plan for Galapagos is now being finalized and the Master Plan for the management of the Park would have to be revised in the light of the strategies and programme of actions foreseen in the tourism and conservation plan. The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Centre contact the Ecuadorean authorities and request them to consider undertaking all possible measures to improve salaries and working conditions of the Park staff and revise the Master Plan for the management of the site, in order to harmonize its implementation with that of the tourism and conservation plan for Galapagos.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia)

23. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the Ethiopian authorities have submitted a rehabilitation project for this site. This project is now being implemented with US\$50,000 approved by the World Heritage Committee.

Mt. Nimba Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire)

24. The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its last session concluded that the reduction in the size of this site proposed by the Government of Guinea in order to exclude areas that would be impacted by a proposed iron-ore mining project, posed a major threat to its integrity. Taking into account that the site also faced several other threats, the Committee, at its last session recommended that the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea nominate this site for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau noted with satisfaction that experts of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea, together with representatives of UNDP and UNESCO had met, from 29 June to 3 July 1992, at Mt Nimba and, on

the basis of field visits and consultations, have endorsed the conclusions of the Committee and requested the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea to urgently nominate this site for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau noted with concern that the site continues to be under pressure from interest groups which are eager to take advantage of the economic benefits of exploiting the iron-ore deposits in this site. The Bureau, however, noted that so far no iron-ore mining activities have been undertaken and that bi- and multilateral donors have refrained from financing such a project.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the authorities of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea and, once again, urge them to nominate this site to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Centre co-operate with the two States Parties concerned and donor agencies such as the World Bank and UNDP to develop an integrated rural development project to bring socio-economic benefits to people living in the immediate vicinity of this World Heritage site.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

25. The World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau that the damage caused by the invasion of this Sanctuary by militants from the Bodo tribe in Assam, India, was estimated to be about 50 million Indian rupees (about 1.6 million US dollars). Although considerable damage was done to the Park infrastructure, the habitat in the inaccessible parts of the Sanctuary still remained intact. The Bureau, while noting that the conditions for introducing normal management and administration regimes for the site may be improving, was nevertheless concerned that a full assessment of damage had not been made and that the Indian authorities have not yet provided a formal written report on the state of conservation of this Sanctuary, despite repeated requests from the Committee since 1989.

The Bureau reiterated that the World Heritage Centre contact the Indian authorities once again and request a written, up-to-date report on the state of conservation of the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its next session, review the information provided by the Indian authorities in such a report and in consultation with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, determine whether or not this site ought to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Aïr-Ténéré National Nature Reserve (Niger)

26. The Bureau expressed concerns that the region in which this site, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991, is situated has recently been affected by armed unrest. The Bureau was informed that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Niger had requested the Director-General of UNESCO to launch an appeal for the protection of this site. The Bureau recommended

that the World Heritage Centre contact the authorities in Niger and obtain more information on the impact the armed unrest in the region has had on the state of the conservation of the site and request them to nominate it for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Mt. Athos (Greece)

27. The Bureau was informed by the representative of IUCN that the vegetation cover in this mixed site has been destroyed and could have adverse impacts on the landscape in the area. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Greek authorities and obtain verification of this information and to request them to invite a mission to examine the state of conservation of this site.

Niokola-Koba National Park (Senegal)

28. The Bureau recalled that an environmental impact study had found that the construction of a road through this National Park was preferable to the alternative of routing the road along the periphery of the Park because the route inside the Park could be better patrolled by Park staff. The Bureau noted that although the construction of the road had begun, work on the road has been temporarily suspended due to the beginning of the rainy season. The Delegate of Senegal informed the Bureau that the National Park Service had established several points, including one at Niokolo-Koba, to monitor traffic currently using the cotton route outside of the northern periphery of the Park, and that the Government of Senegal has prepared a plan to mitigate the impacts of the road construction project and draw up eco-management regimes for areas outside the periphery of the Park. The Bureau wished that a summary of the Plan be translated into English and presented to the members of the Committee during its sixteenth session scheduled to be held in December 1992.

Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)

29. The Bureau was pleased to note that the English version of the "Preservation and Management Plan" for this mixed site, prepared with financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund, has been published. The observer from Turkey informed the Bureau that the implementation of the Plan has begun and a project to remove some of the hotels and associated infrastructure which were threatening the integrity and authenticity of the site will soon commence and that the Turkish authorities hope to request international assistance from the World Heritage Fund to meet part of the costs of implementing the project.

Durmitor National Park (Montenegro, Yugoslavia)

30. The Bureau noted that the authorities responsible for the management of this site had submitted to the Secretariat several reports on the potential impacts of the proposed hydroelectric

dam construction on the Tara River and the pollution of that river by a large asphalt plant situated upstream along the river. The Bureau was informed by the representative of IUCN that the Yugoslav authorities maintained that the two problems mentioned above had minimal impacts on the conservation of Durmitor and that necessary measures to mitigate those impacts were being taken. However, the Bureau requested that the World Heritage Centre contact the Yugoslav authorities to know whether they would invite a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission and provide an on-site briefing on the status of the proposal to construct a hydroelectric dam on the Tara River and pollution caused to the same river by the asphalt plant.

Garamba National Park (Zaire)

31. The Bureau was happy to note that the rhinoceros population in the Park has now increased to 32 individuals due to an increase in the budget and personnel and that the state of conservation of the site continues to be stable. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee, in accordance with the request made by the State Party by letter of 26 February 1991, delete this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)

32. The Bureau noted that a proposal to construct a dam across the Batoka Gorge could flood some parts of this transfrontier World Heritage site and that the World Heritage Centre has informed the group of consultancy engineers who are undertaking an environmental impact assessment of the dam construction project of potential threats to the integrity of this site. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the States Parties concerned and obtain more information on the proposed dam construction project for submission to the Committee in December 1992.

33. The Bureau took note of information provided by IUCN that a workshop on the Conservation of the Subantarctic Islands was being jointly organized by IUCN and the Scientific Research Council for Antarctica (SCAR) to develop recommendations for the application of the World Heritage Convention in the Antarctic region. The Bureau also noted the summary report of the Workshop on the World Heritage Convention held within the framework of the Fourth World Congress on National Parks, convened in Caracas, Venezuela, in February 1992.

VI. MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF CULTURAL WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES, AND RELATED TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES IN MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES

34. The Bureau examined the document CLT-92/CONF.003/02 presented jointly by the World Heritage Centre and the Coordinator of "100 Mediterranean Sites" of the Mediterranean

Action Plan of the United Nations Environment Programme. The Bureau took note of the specific measures taken by the Secretariat as a follow-up to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its fifteenth session.

35. The Bureau was happy to learn that the restoration work on the monuments at Arles (France) was continuing, thanks to participation of the Ministry of Culture, and also with important contributions from the municipal authorities and the World Monuments Fund.

36. The Bureau also noted with satisfaction the continuing efforts of the persons responsible for the conservation of the archaeological site of Kerkouane (Tunisia), to reinforce the cliff which is being eroded by waves.

37. The Bureau took note of the information provided by the World Heritage Centre on the site of the Pont du Gard (France). It appears that the development activities at the site do not endanger its authenticity but seem to help re-establish it, as an existing electricity line will be buried.

38. With regard to the state of conservation of the monuments of Goreme (Turkey), the Bureau noted the willingness of the national authorities to continue the restoration of the site and requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare, in consultation with the responsible Turkish authorities and specialists, a more detailed dossier concerning tourist developments which may be detrimental to the visibility of the monuments.

39. The Co-ordinator of the project on the "100 Mediterranean Sites" presented a brief overview of the principal problems of conservation identified during visits to the sites made at the request of the Secretariat:

Abou Mena (Egypt)

40. The Bureau noted with concern the dangers threatening the conservation of the site because of its fragility and the increasing flow of pilgrims, as well as a possible reconstruction of the church over the saint's tomb. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to draw the attention of the competent national authorities to these matters and request their assurances to take all action necessary for conserving this site.

Delos (Greece)

41. The Bureau noted that the restoration work was continuing and that the archaeological activities were limited to excavation connected with the installation of an electric line. The Bureau was concerned that the means and human resources to ensure the protection of the site was not yet in place.

Delphes (Greece)

42. The Bureau was satisfied with the positive assessment of the state of conservation of the monuments and expressed its wish that the national authorities take measures to strengthen the protection of this site.

El Jem (Tunisia)

43. Despite the fact that it was aware of the efforts of specialists and the Tunisian authorities for conserving this site, the Bureau was, however, concerned about the modifications which affected the environment of the site and requested the competent authorities to take urgent measures necessary to re-establish the harmony of the site and its surroundings, halt all new constructions in the immediate environs and demolish the shopping arcade constructed on one side of the amphitheatre. If it is not possible to demolish the arcade, then it would be desirable to conceal it with a hedge. Insofar as the organization of spectacles inside the amphitheatre does not imply irreversible developments, the Bureau considered that the recreational activities do not constitute a threat to the conservation of the site.

Istanbul (Turkey)

44. The Bureau took note with satisfaction that the urban development plan of the town had been modified and wished to obtain more information regarding the new plan from the competent Turkish authorities.

Gantija (Malta)

45. The Bureau expressed its concern regarding the protection of Megalithic temples and requested the World Heritage Centre to draw the attention of the competent Maltese authorities to the necessity of establishing a larger buffer zone with better legal protection. A report on the information received will be submitted to the Committee at its next session, particularly in the light of a proposal for extension of this site presented by the Maltese authorities this year.

Vatican City (Holy See/Italy)

46. The Bureau was concerned by the construction project inside the Vatican City of a concrete building of several floors in the place of the old Hospice de Santa Marta, the demolition of which was undertaken on 1 June 1992.

The breach in the Leonin Wall that appeared during this work constitutes a danger to the integrity of this fortified ensemble. Moreover, because of its co-visibility with the dome of Saint-Pierre, the height of the planned building would cause irreparable damage to the urban landscape of Rome, as well as to the Vatican City.

The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Centre contact the Observer of the Holy See to UNESCO in order to do all that is possible to revise this building project which will be extremely damaging to two emblematic and closely-linked properties listed on the World Heritage List, the City of Rome and the City of the Vatican.

47. The World Heritage Centre informed the Bureau of UNESCO's activities with regard to the safeguarding of a site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the **Old City of Dubrovnik** (Republic of Croatia) and a famous site for which inscription will be examined this year - **Angkor**.

Dubrovnik (Republic of Croatia)

48. The Bureau took note of document CLT-92/CONF.003/02 and commended the efforts of the Director-General of UNESCO for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Dubrovnik, particularly:

- his joint appeal together with the United Nations Secretary General for a return to peace and the protection of cultural heritage;
- his appeal to the various UNESCO missions to the different parties involved in the conflict with the aim of enforcing the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Heritage in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954) and the World Heritage Convention;
- the despatch of UNESCO observers to Dubrovnik in December 1991 followed, as of February 1992, by technical missions;
- his decision to allocate a special amount of US\$200,000 for preliminary operations for urgent restoration of monuments, and
- the preparation, with the competent authorities, of a plan of action for the restoration of the damaged monuments.

Thanks to an emergency assistance of US\$19,000 from the World Heritage Fund, an international expert meeting has already been organized in Dubrovnik and technical training programmes for Croatia specialists are foreseen in France.

The Bureau expressed its concern regarding the resumption of hostilities in the region where no military targets justifying armed intervention are located. It requested the World Heritage Centre to advise the Croatia authorities to create, before the next session of the World Heritage Committee, a buffer zone which would ensure the protection of the ancient fortress and other monuments.

The Bureau was informed that the plan of action mentioned above will be made public and available to funding agencies. In this respect, the Bureau was informed that a tourist agency in the United States of America and another one in Dubrovnik have

shown interest in the safeguarding operations and proposed to collect funds to this end.

The Bureau made an appeal to the parties in conflict for a suspension of hostilities and the protection of cultural heritage. It invited all States Parties to the Convention to participate in the conservation of the site.

49. The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and decided to set aside a sum of US\$30,000 for urgent activities to be undertaken for the restoration of Dubrovnik.

MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES IN LATIN AMERICA

50. A paper on monitoring for Latin America, the Caribbean and Mozambique (1991-1995) was presented by the Regional Co-ordinator and Chief Technical Adviser, UNESCO/UNDP, for the Regional Project for Cultural, Urban and Environmental/Natural Heritage and Development.

51. The Bureau recalled that the task of an experimental monitoring exercise which was entrusted to this Regional Project during the session of the Committee at Banff, Canada, in 1990, had already led to positive and promising results in 1991. In fact, six sites in Quito (Ecuador), Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala), Ouro Preto (Brazil), Cartagena (Colombia), Machu Picchu (Peru) and San Francisco de Lima (Peru), were monitored in 1991 and the findings were reported to the World Heritage Committee meeting in Carthage, Tunisia, in 1991.

52. The Bureau discussed the *raison d'être* of monitoring which cannot be looked upon as a sporadic inspection mechanism but must be a continuous process, undertaken in the field, involving local partners, and on a regional basis. The monitoring exercise includes elements of awareness-building, continuous research, dialogue, documentation and the development of guidelines for project design. The exercise also provides opportunities for training on "site monitoring" for national and local technical/administrative staff, as well as for local non-governmental organizations. Monitoring will also establish closer links between site conservation and existing conservation centres in the States Parties concerned and in the region, and constitutes institution-building, human resource development, utilizing the expertise of those trained by the World Heritage Fund, and the identification of future trainees.

53. As to the institutional framework for the storage of information emanating from monitoring exercises, and the use of this information for future monitoring exercises, the Bureau recommended that information be stored not only at the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM, but also in the countries concerned. Basic information will be made available to co-operating agencies and other interested agencies, e.g.

bilateral sources, UNDP, and The World Bank for follow-up action. This information should be continually up-dated for the purpose of action-oriented projects and fund-raising for conservation.

54. The Bureau took note with satisfaction that these concepts were put into practice in the monitoring proposal presented by the regional project for Latin America. As to the methodology, the Bureau took note that each monitoring cycle will consist of nine steps: (1) development and refinement of methodology; (2) information collection; (3) site visits; (4) progress reports; (5) in-situ consultations; (6) evaluation and assessment of sites; (7) formulation of future projects; (8) international assistance required, and (9) comparative analysis with a built-in evaluation component of the methodology in order to improve the system in the future.

55. The Bureau recommended that the work plan and the modus operandi of the 1991-1995 proposals for monitoring of 39 sites in Latin America, the Caribbean and Mozambique (6 sites in 1991 (already completed), 6 sites in 1992, 10 sites in 1993, 9 sites in 1994, 8 sites in 1995), be approved by the Committee. Lusophone countries in Africa, such as Mozambique and Cap Vert, would be included in the exercise in view of the preparatory work already carried out with Mozambique, in research and training vis-à-vis interregional courses in Bahia, Brazil, financed by the Brazilian authorities, the World Heritage Fund, UNDP and organized in collaboration with ICCROM.

56. The Bureau also recommended that an overall report, in the form of a bulletin, on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in Latin America, be presented to the Committee at its next session in December 1992.

57. The need to carry out such exercises in other regions of the world using existing appropriate regional and interregional structures was emphasized. An exchange of experiences and views between the different parts of the world, with a view to enriching the monitoring concept was encouraged. A special interregional workshop on this theme could be held in 1993-94.

ANGKOR (CAMBODIA)

58. The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the safeguarding activities undertaken by UNESCO for Cambodian heritage. The Organization had already started this work before the signature of the peace treaty. Since then, Cambodia has adhered to the Convention and the Bureau considered it to be its duty to participate actively in the restoration and conservation of Angkor.

A member of the Bureau underlined the fact that the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List was a matter of genuine urgency. In fact, following the war which devastated this country, the protection of the site could no longer be guaranteed. A management plan for the site has to be elaborated,

legislation revised and the necessary personnel for the protection and restoration of the site have to be trained. UNESCO is participating in the elaboration of a management plan in collaboration with UNDP, Sweden and France. Furthermore, a legal expert will shortly be sent by the World Heritage Centre to advise Cambodian jurists. Finally, restoration specialists will be trained with the assistance of Japanese funds.

Following the request of the Cambodian authorities regarding the preparation of a dossier to nominate the site of Angkor on the World Heritage List, a contract will be established with the Ecole française d'Extrême Orient under preparatory assistance. The Bureau requested ICOMOS to evaluate this nomination for inscription and recommend that the Committee consider favourably the possibility of initiating the procedure for inscription.

59. The representative of ICOMOS reported to the Bureau on the cultural sites he had monitored. A more detailed report accompanied by slide projections will be made during the Santa Fé session in December 1992 for all the cases mentioned. The properties in question are: Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation), Monastery of Rila (Bulgaria), Budapest (Hungary) and Stonehenge (United Kingdom). With regard to the site of Stonehenge, the ICOMOS Representative mentioned the problem of tourist pressure and the deviation of the road A-344. A more detailed report will be submitted at the next session of the Committee at Santa Fe.

Quebec Historic Area (Canada)

60. The Bureau was informed of the building proposals in the buffer zone along the Saint-Lawrence River and the impact they would have on the views to and from the River. ICOMOS was critical about the consultation process and the design and specifically of the failure of the many levels of government to work together. The Bureau also learnt that four other prominent persons in Quebec had expressed similar concerns. The Bureau noted with concern the incompatibility between such activities and the aspiration of Quebec City concerning the World Heritage Cities Secretariat. The creation of an interdepartmental committee to coordinate federal government inputs to the issue was considered useful. The Bureau requested the Chairman to write to the three concerned levels of the Canadian government (municipal, provincial and federal) expressing its concerns and requested that ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre obtain a detailed report on the status of the building proposals for submission to the Committee in December 1992.

61. The Bureau was happy to learn of the innovative efforts made by the competent American authorities for the long-lasting conservation of Chaco Canyon.

62. To conclude the debate on the monitoring of the state of conservation of cultural properties, the Bureau felt that it was an activity of utmost importance for the future of the Convention and that it should be carried out in line with the principles mentioned during the examination of the monitoring of Latin

American properties. These principles will be elaborated in the Strategy for the implementation of the Convention which will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its next session in Santa Fe. The Bureau also wished that the presentation of monitoring activities be more rationalized in the future.

VII. GLOBAL STUDY

63. The Bureau took note of ICOMOS's point of view regarding the continuation of the global study. It appears that the general framework should be revised and that an overall philosophy for the work be defined. The ICOMOS representative proposed a general project framework. The Bureau considered that this document could serve as a basis for discussions and requested the World Heritage Centre to present to the Committee at its next session a dossier containing a document prepared by ICOMOS, another prepared jointly by the Chairman and Professor Léon Pressouyre as well as all other useful contributions submitted by States Parties, particularly the contribution presented by the observer from Greece during the Bureau session.

VIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

64. The Bureau examined document CLT-92/CONF.003/4 and took decisions on requests for international assistance from States Parties:

Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)

65. The Bureau requested that ICOMOS examine the justifications provided by the Maltese authorities for the need to install an air-conditioning system at this World Heritage site and assess the relative merits of different options available for solving problems caused by internal humidity. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its next session, take a decision on this request on the basis of information submitted by the State Party and the report from ICOMOS.

City of Potosi (Bolivia)

66. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Bolivian authorities to obtain information on the links between the World Heritage site of Potosi and the proposed rehabilitation project for the lagoons. The Bureau recommended that the Committee, at its next session, assess, on the basis of the requested information, the importance of the work to rehabilitate the lagoons to the conservation of the World Heritage city and decide whether or not this project qualifies for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

Plitvice Lake National Park (Republic of Croatia)

67. The Bureau decided to set aside US\$ 30,000 as emergency assistance to undertake an expert mission to this site to assess damage caused by armed conflict in Croatia and to prepare and initiate the implementation of an international assistance project for the rehabilitation of this site.

Istanbul (Turkey)

68. The Bureau, while agreeing in principle to providing support for the continuation of the restoration of mosaics of Saint-Sophia in Istanbul, noted that the project approved in 1991 under the World Heritage Fund is expected to be completed by the end of 1992. The Bureau requested that the Committee at its forthcoming session in Santa Fe, review the report of the project which is currently underway and other information from studies that are being undertaken by the Turkish authorities and decide on an appropriate amount to assist in the continuation of the restoration of the mosaics of St. Sophia.

IX. REVISION OF OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

69. The Bureau took note of document CLT-92/CONF.003/7 and expressed its satisfaction with the revisions proposed to natural heritage criteria and the associated conditions of integrity. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to further refine the proposals, in the light of the improvements suggested by the members of the Bureau and the Director of UNESCO's Division of Geological Sciences, and work together with IUCN, to submit a final draft for consideration and adoption by the Committee at its next session.

70. The Bureau considered the revisions to the Guidelines regarding the procedure for the inclusion of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau recommended that an ad hoc group be set up to study all revisions to the Operational Guidelines and proposals be made for adoption by the World Heritage Committee, in December 1992.

X. NOMINATION OF NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

71. The Bureau examined the nominations of eleven natural properties and recommended that five of them be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau did not recommend the other six natural properties for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau also examined proposals for extensions two World Heritage sites and recommended that both sites be extended in accordance with the proposals made by the States Parties.

Name of Property	Identification N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region	630	Australia	N(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the Fraser Island component of the nomination (excluding the Cooloola National Park), which comprises the majority of the World Heritage values of this site, on the World Heritage List. The Bureau also recommended that the Committee commend the Australian and Queensland authorities for including Fraser Island and the Great Sandy Region within their plans for a 'Regional Park' and extend statutory protection to all of Fraser Island.

Belovezhskaya Pushcha State National Park	627	Belarus	N(iii)
-------------------------------------------	-----	---------	--------

The Bureau noted that this site is an extension of the Bialowieza National Park of Poland and requested the Belarus authorities to: (a) confirm that the boundaries of the site only include the core zone; (b) prepare a management plan which would be co-ordinated with the management of the adjacent World Heritage site in Poland; (c) co-ordinate and share management experience with their Polish counterparts, and (d) remove the fence between this site and the Polish site if the management plan determines that such an action would improve viability of the site.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Belarus and Polish authorities to recognize the ecological unity of the two sites and agree to the inscription of the whole area as a single transfrontier property on the World Heritage List.

Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area	640	People's Republic of China	N(iii)
----------------------------------------------	-----	----------------------------	--------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the core zone of this site on the World Heritage List and encouraged the Chinese authorities to manage the buffer zone for conservation objectives and retain the natural characteristics of the site. The Bureau noted that pressure due to tourism is likely to increase and urged the management to be vigilant and protect the integrity of the site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee recommend that the Chinese authorities undertake a census of wildlife in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to study the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criteria (iv) as well.

Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area	637	People's Republic of China	N(iii)
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------	--------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the World Heritage List and expressed concern over the question of growing human impact in the reserve and encouraged the Chinese authorities to take appropriate measures to safeguard this site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee also recommend the State Party to undertake a wildlife census in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to study the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criterion (iv) as well.

Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area	638	People's Republic of China	N(iii)
------------------------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------	--------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the central and second class conservation zones of Huanglong on the World Heritage List, excluding Mouni Gully sub-division in the west, since its condition and natural values have not been adequately investigated. The Bureau also suggested that the authorities undertake a census of wildlife in the area and prepare a species conservation status report in order to investigate the possibility for inscribing this site under natural heritage criterion (iv) as well.

The Bureau recognized that the Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area and the Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area belong to the same ecological unit, despite being under different county administrations. The Bureau recommended that the Committee request the Chinese authorities to initiate a two-phase process as follows: (a) under Phase I, consider to include Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong Areas as a single property on the World Heritage List, and (b) under Phase II, to consider nominating an even larger area including not only Jiuzhaigou Valley and Huanglong Scenic Areas, but also the Wanglang Reserve, for inscription as a single site representing the Minshan range of mountains. The Bureau noted that the Wanglang Reserve was a part of the nomination of the Panda Reserves which was deferred by the Committee in 1987 and 1990.

The Bureau also suggested that the Committee recommend that the Chinese authorities, while implementing such a two-phase process, also consider proposing a new name for the ensemble of Jiuzhaigou, Huanglong and Wanglang areas. The Bureau recommended that the Committee also encourage the authorities of China and the United States to activate an agreement for "twinning" the Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong Areas with the Yosemite National Park of USA and co-operate in strengthening the management and training of personnel.

72. B. Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identifi- cation N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention
------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Berezinsky Biosphere Reserve	628	Belarus
------------------------------	-----	---------

The Bureau noted that this site is recognized as one of UNESCO's Biosphere Reserves but did not meet criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Tatra National Park	656	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic
---------------------	-----	-----------------------------------

The Bureau acknowledged the high national importance of this site, but was of the view that it did not meet any natural heritage criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau, however, encouraged the nomination of this site to UNESCO's International Network of Biosphere Reserves.

Gir Wildlife Sanctuary	615	India
------------------------	-----	-------

The Bureau noted that the conservation of this site will be greatly enhanced if it were included in UNESCO's international network of biosphere reserves. The Bureau was of the opinion that although it is a site of high national value, it did not meet World Heritage criteria.

Lunan Scenic Area of the Stone Forest	639	People's Republic of China
---------------------------------------	-----	----------------------------

The Bureau was of the view that this site did not meet World Heritage criteria.

Huangguoshu Waterfalls Scenic & Historic Area	641	People's Republic of China
-----------------------------------------------	-----	----------------------------

The Bureau was of the view that this site did not meet World Heritage criteria.

Macquarie Island Nature Reserve	629	Australia
---------------------------------	-----	-----------

The Bureau noted that the site had geological value but was of

the view that its characteristics were not of universal significance. However, in the light of the work of the IUCN/SCAR Task Force on Islands of the Southern Ocean, the Bureau noted that this site may be considered at a future date as part of a Southern Ocean Island site of Australia and New Zealand.

73. C. Extension to World Heritage sites

Name of Property	Identifi- cation N°	State Party having submitted the nomina- tion of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Kakadu National Park	631	Australia	N(ii)(iii)(iv) C(i)(iii)(iv)
-------------------------	-----	-----------	---------------------------------

The Bureau recommended that the Committee commend the Australian authorities for concluding a 10-year programme to extend this Park, for setting-up an exemplary management regime and nominating the full extent of the Park for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau suggested that the Committee also request the Australian authorities to implement management recommendations made by IUCN in its evaluation report, and consider proposing a new name taking into account the ecosystem rather than the administrative characteristics of the site. The Bureau also suggested that the Committee recommend that IUCN undertakes a monitoring mission to the site within the next five years.

Glacier Bay National Park extension of the Wrangell/St.Elias/ Kluane site of Canada-USA)	72bis Rev	United States of America	N(ii)
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------	-------

The Bureau noted that this extension of the American part of this transfrontier World Heritage site increased the extent of the site by 25% and the comment of the observer from Canada that they support the extension proposed by the authorities of the United States of America. The Bureau recommended that the Committee include this extension as part of the Wrangell/St. Elias/Kluane World Heritage site and request the authorities of the United States of America to (a) eventually incorporate the small area between Glacier Bay and the World Heritage site which has not been included in the proposed extension, and (b) consider a further extension of the World Heritage site to include Yakutat, Cape Suckling and the Admiralty Islands.

The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to contact the Canadian authorities and obtain their written support for the extension prepared by the American authorities to this

transfrontier site. The Bureau suggested that the Committee request the two States Parties concerned to propose a new name for this site reflecting its international character and universal significance. The Bureau was informed that IUCN was undertaking another mission to this site to evaluate the potential threats to the site's integrity due to a proposal to exploit the Windy Craggy mine in Canada. The Bureau noted that IUCN will include its findings from this mission in its evaluation report to the Committee in December 1992.

74. D. Property recommended for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger

Plitvice Lake National Park

Republic of Croatia

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its last session had expressed concerns that this property, which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 at the request of the Government of Yugoslavia, had been abandoned due to armed conflict in the region, and that the Park faced several threats due to lack of supervision. The Bureau noted that since the last session of the Committee the Croatian government has informed the Director-General of UNESCO that it considers itself committed to all international agreements, including the World Heritage Convention, signed and ratified by the previous government of Yugoslavia under the auspices of UNESCO. Thus, in accordance with the request of the Minister of Education, Culture and Sports of the Republic of Croatia, made by his letter of 24 April 1992 to the Secretariat, the Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

XI. NOMINATION OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

75. The Bureau examined the nominations or extensions of twenty-five cultural properties and recommended that eleven of them be inscribed on the World Heritage List (Section A). The Bureau did not recommend three properties (Section B), returned five nominations to the States Parties for additional information (Section C) and deferred the inscription of four properties (Section D). The Bureau recommended the extension of one property (Section E, Part I) and referred the second proposal for extension to the State Party for further information (Section E, Part II).

76. The Bureau also recommended to initiate the procedure for inscription of the monuments of Angkor (Cambodia). During its next session, the Bureau will also examine complementary information on the Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria), property for which the inscription procedure has already been initiated.

77. A . Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identif-ication N°	State Party having submitted the nomination in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Butrinti	570 Rev	Albania	C(iii)
Mines of Rammelsberg and the historic town of Goslar	623	Germany	C(iv)
<p>The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property and requested ICOMOS to reconsider the criteria for inscription. The Bureau wondered whether in this particular case criterion (i) was applicable, or if criteria (ii) or (iii) would be more appropriate. ICOMOS will make a report to the World Heritage Committee at its next session in December 1992.</p>			
Pueblo de Taos	492 Rev	United States of America	C(iv)
Historic Monuments of Novgorod and surroundings	604	Russian Federation	C(ii)(iv)(vi)
Bourges Cathedral	635	France	C(i)
<p>The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested ICOMOS to complete its evaluation with a more detailed justification concerning the exceptional value of this monument with respect to the series of French and European Gothic cathedrals in general.</p>			
Pythagoreion and Heraion of Samos	595	Greece	C(ii)(iii)
<p>Although recommending this property for inscription, the Bureau requested the competent Greek authorities to give assurances regarding the protection of the natural environment of this property.</p>			
El Tajin, Pre-Hispanic City	631	Mexico	C(iii)(iv)

Old City of Zamosc 564 Poland C(iv)

Historic Centre 616 Czech and Slovak C(ii)(iv)
of Prague Federal Republic

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property and took note of the new proposal for the boundaries of the buffer zone, but requested ICOMOS to consider the possibility of applying criterion (vi) for this inscription as well.

Historic Centre 617 Czech and Slovak C(iv)
of Cesky Krumlov Federal Republic

While recommending the inscription of this property, the Bureau requested the competent Czech and Slovak authorities to take all the necessary measures to face pressures due to over-visitation by tourists which threaten this property.

Historic Centre 621 Czech and Slovak C(i)(iv)
of Telc Federal Republic

78. B. Properties which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identifi- cation N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention
------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mir Castle	625	Belarus
------------	-----	---------

While recognizing the architectural value of this property, the Bureau considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List, and more particularly the conditions of authenticity.

Cidade Velha	607	Cap Vert
--------------	-----	----------

The Bureau considered that in spite of its indisputable historic value, the property did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

Karlstejn Castle 619 Czech and Slovak
Federal Republic

The Bureau recognized the great national value of this property, but considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

79. C. Properties for which nominations were referred back to nominating States for further information/documentation

Name of Property	Identifi- cation N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Cultural and natural historic ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands	632	Russian Federation	C(iv)

The Bureau requested the competent Russian authorities to reconsider the title of this property, which could be modified as follows "Cultural and historic ensemble of Solovetsky".

Monuments of Valdimir and Monuments of Suzdal	644 633	Russian Federation	to be defined by ICOMOS
-----------------------------------------------------	------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of these properties on the condition that a new proposal be submitted, bringing together the universal architectural values of the monuments of the ensemble of Vladimir and Suzdal.

Reserve of Popular Architecture of Vlkolinec	622	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic	C(v)
----------------------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------------------	------

The Bureau decided to return the nomination to the competent Czech and Slovak authorities so that additional information may be provided regarding the natural and rural environment of the village and to supply details of the management plan for the ensemble. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to carry out a comparative study among similar properties in Central Europe.

Safranbolu Village	614	Turkey	C(ii)(v)
--------------------	-----	--------	----------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested the competent Turkish authorities to transmit to ICOMOS a

plan clearly showing the boundary of the site proposed for inscription, as well as additional information on the village mosques. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to also take into consideration the possibility of applying criterion (iv) for the inscription of this property.

80. D. Deferred nominations

Name of Property	Identification N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention
------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

City of Bamberg	624	Germany
-----------------	-----	---------

The Bureau deferred the examination of the nomination to allow the competent German authorities to reconsider the proposed boundary, as well as the buffer zone. The new boundary should not include recent constructions.

Architectural, archaeological and natural ensemble of Kolomenskoye	634	Russian Federation
--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	--------------------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination to allow the competent Russian authorities to reformulate the proposal so as to include only the Ascension Church. Furthermore, the Bureau requested that the new nomination comprises detailed documentation concerning the authenticity of the property.

Historic City of Banska Stiavnica and technical installations of the environment	618	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-----------------------------------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this property to allow the competent Czech and Slovak authorities to provide additional background information concerning the concrete existence of an heritage bearing witness to mining activities.

Spissky Hrad and surrounding monuments	620	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic
----------------------------------------	-----	-----------------------------------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this property to allow the competent Czech and Slovak authorities to establish a management plan for this ensemble.

81. E. Extension of Properties on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identification N°	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

I. Properties recommended for inscription

Kakadu National Park	631	Australia	C(i)(iii)(iv) N(ii)(iii)(iv)
----------------------	-----	-----------	---------------------------------

The proposed extension to this property was also recommended due to its natural values (see para. 73).

Potsdam, Park with Sacrow Castle and Sauveur Church	532 bis	Germany	C(i)(ii)(iv)
-----------------------------------------------------	---------	---------	--------------

The Bureau recommended that the Castle and the Parks of Potsdam and Berlin be extended to include Potsdam, the Park with Sacrow Castle and Sauveur Church.

II. Properties returned to national authorities for further information

Megalithic Temples	132 bis	Malta	
--------------------	---------	-------	--

The Bureau, recognizing the exceptional universal value of these monuments, recommended that they be inscribed on the World Heritage List, but returned the nomination dossier to the competent Maltese authorities to allow them, in consultation with ICOMOS, to reformulate the proposal so that all the Megalithic monuments of the Maltese archipelago are included under the same title.

XII. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN TO COMMEMORATE THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

82. The Bureau noted with satisfaction the promotional activities undertaken for the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the World Heritage Convention as presented in Document CLT-92/CONF.003/8.

83. With regard to the activities at Headquarters, the members of the Bureau participated at the inauguration of the three months of

exhibits, conferences, film projections and artistic evenings organized in co-operation with the States Parties to the Convention. These events were launched on 8 July with a press conference, the opening of an exhibition on World Heritage by the Director-General of UNESCO and a gala evening organized with the generous participation of well-known artists.

84. The events to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Convention also include seminars organized in each geographic region of the world: the first of these regional seminars took place in Jakarta; each State Party to the Convention presented a report concerning the implementation of the Convention in its territory and the participants emphasized that priority should be given to the management of sites facing problems such as tourism.

85. The Bureau noted that other seminars would take place throughout 1992 and part of 1993, in order to allow participation of as many countries as possible. In general, the Bureau felt that these activities should be regarded as part of a long-term promotional strategy.

86. The Bureau also noted that other promotional activities had been successfully carried out during the first six months of the year. Amongst these, a prototype video-disc (CD-ROM) has been produced; the Bureau examined the functioning of this prototype and felt that this video-disc project should be continued and, once available, widely diffused.

87. The other project which was presented to the Bureau is Patrimoine 2001, implemented in co-operation with UNESCO, by the Gamma Agency, the Caixa Foundation of Barcelona, Kodak and France Telecom. This photographic data-bank project on heritage will make available both scientific photographic documentation on properties, and renders this documentation immediately accessible, in a numerical form, to a wide public, including teaching and research institutions.

88. The Bureau was satisfied with this ambitious initiative. The Bureau recommended that a presentation be made on the occasion of the Committee meeting in Santa Fe, on the basis of the collection of reports that would be made. This photographic presentation and the possibilities offered by the numbering of images will bring together at Santa Fe important photographers associated with the project and representatives from the media.

XIII. DRAFT REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

89. The Bureau took note of the draft evaluation report prepared in 1992 by Mr. Beschouch. The Bureau did not examine this document, but evoked the principal conclusions during discussions under item 13 of the Agenda concerning the examination of elements for a future strategy (see below).

90. In other respects, the Bureau regretted that, to date, very few States Parties had responded to the Committee's request to supply evaluation reports concerning the implementation of the Convention at a national level, in spite of several reminders from the Secretariat.

XIV. EXAMINATION OF ELEMENTS IN VIEW OF A STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE

91. The Bureau examined the Document CLT-92/CONF.003/10 which presented the principal conclusions and recommendations of a meeting organized by the World Heritage Centre and held in Washington, D.C., from 22 to 24 June 1992, at the generous invitation of the United States of America. Experts from States Parties, ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN and UNESCO participated at this meeting. The preparation of elements for a strategy for the implementation of the Convention in the future was facilitated by the in-depth examination of the evaluation document prepared in 1991 by Mr. Beschouch.

92. The Bureau discussions related to recommendations made by the Washington meeting concerning the following points:

- links of the World Heritage Convention with other conventions and recommendations, notably the Hague Convention;
- strengthening of expertise within the Committee, through the financing of travel for experts from developing countries who are members of the Committee and calling upon outside expertise. Despite past practice over the last two years, a Bureau member felt that the Convention did not allow the use of World Heritage Funds to finance travel of representatives from States Parties members of the Committee. The World Heritage Centre will seek the advice of the legal service of UNESCO on this question;
- the possibility of instituting a biennial cycle for the Committee agenda;
- the improvement of advance information provided to Committee members on nominations of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List;
- strengthening of the role of consultative organs;
- monitoring of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

93. The Bureau requested the World Heritage Centre to convene a second expert meeting at the end of October this year to finalize the strategy to be adopted by the Committee at its sixteenth session at Santa Fe. The Bureau members will also participate at this second meeting as experts. The provisional document containing elements for a future strategy, as elaborated during the first expert meeting in Washington, should be sent to all States Parties to enable them to

submit their contributions. The Bureau also decided that each of its members send written observations on the document to the World Heritage Centre before the end of September so as to allow an optimal preparation of the second meeting.

XV. PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

94. The Bureau examined the provisional agenda of the Committee (Document CLT-92/CONF.003/11) and took note that before the Santa Fe meeting a decision would be taken as to whether it would be necessary to foresee a two-day meeting to finalize the strategy document. An information note about the meeting and the activities foreseen on this occasion will be prepared by the World Heritage Centre very shortly.

XVI. OTHER BUSINESS

95. The Representative of Senegal spoke of the problems involved in the conservation of the Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary which would be the subject of a monitoring report in liaison with IUCN. A file on this question will be sent to the World Heritage Centre by the Senegalese authorities.

96. The Chairman reported to the Bureau on progress achieved regarding the setting-up of the World Heritage Cities Network : a meeting of the Steering Committee had just been held in Tunis and the next meeting was scheduled to take place at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. The statutes of the Network were almost finalized and the Bureau learnt with satisfaction that the Network was gradually becoming operational.

97. The observer from Colombia informed the Bureau of the wish of his country to host the seventeenth session of the World Heritage Committee at Carthagena, in 1993. The Colombian authorities will confirm this invitation which will be submitted to the Committee at its next session in Santa Fe, United States of America, for their decision.

XVII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

98. After having thanked the members of the Bureau and all the participants for their contributions to a particularly fruitful session, within the framework of the launching of events to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Convention and the creation of the World Heritage Centre, the Chairman closed the session.

ANNEX I/ANNEXE I

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION/ORGANISATION DES
NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE/CONVENTION CONCERNANT
LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL CULTUREL ET NATUREL

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee/
Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Sixteenth session/Seizième session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, 6-10 July 1992
Paris, Siège de l'UNESCO, 6-10 juillet 1992

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

BRAZIL/BRESIL

Mrs. Vera PEDROSA
Ministre-conseiller
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Brazil

Mr. Claudio LINS
Deuxième Secrétaire
Permanent Delegation of Brazil

FRANCE

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE
Vice-Président de l'Université Paris I

M. Jean-Louis PONS
Ministère de l'Environnement
DNR - 14, boulevard du Général Leclerc
92524 Neuilly sur Seine - Cedex

Mme Françoise BERCE
Conservateur général du patrimoine
12, rue du Parc Royal
75003 PARIS

Mme Stéphanie MORY
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Dr. Salvador DIAZ-BERRIO
Deputy Director for Technical Assistance
National Institute for Anthropology & History
CORDOBA 45
Mexico 06700 D.F.

SENEGAL

Mr. Seydina Issa SYLLA
Directeur des Parcs Nationaux
BP 5135 DAKAR-FANN
Sénégal

Mr. El Hadj M'Baye Bassine DIENG
Directeur du Patrimoine Historique et
Ethnographique
BP 4001 DAKAR
Sénégal

Mr. Amadou DEME
Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

THAILAND/THAILANDE

Professor Dr. Adul WICHIENTHAROEN
Chairman
National Committee of World Heritage
1056/3 Nakornchaisri Rd.
BANGKOK 10300
Thailand

Mr. Bunnalert RUSHATKUL
Deputy Director General
Royal Forest Department, Phahon Yothin Rd.
BANGKOK 10900
Thailand

Mr. Payung NOPSUWAN
Director
National Park Division
Royal Forest Department, Phahon Yothin Rd.
BANGKOK
Thailand

Mr. Watana KAEOKAMNERD
Director
Wildlife Conservation Division
Royal Forest Department
Chatujak
BANGKOK 10900
Thailand

Mr. Prachote SANGKHANUKIT
Director
Archaeology Division
Fine Arts Department
BANGKOK 10200
Thailand

Ms Pinida LEWCHALERMWONG
Budget Analyst - Bureau of the Budget
Aresampan - Rama 6
BANGKOK (Thailand)

Mrs. Srinoi POVATONG
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Thailand to UNESCO

Mr. Manit SIRIWAN
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
60/1 Soi Phibun Wattana 7
Rama VI Rd
BANGKOK 10400
Thailand

Mrs. Srianong KUNGKAYA
Secretariat Officer
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
60/1 Soi Pibun Wattana 7
Rama VI Rd
BANGKOK 10400
Thailand

TUNISIA/TUNISIE

M. Azedine BESCHAOUCH
Directeur de Recherches
Institut National d'Archéologie et d'Art
4, place du Château
TUNIS
Tunisie

Mme Mounira BACCAR
Délégation permanente auprès l'UNESCO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mrs. Jennifer SALISBURY
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Parks Department of the Interior
1849 C 57 NW Room 3153
WASHINGTON DC 20240
USA

Mr. Blaine CLIVER
Chief
Preservation Assistance Division
P.O. Box 37127
WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127
USA

Mr. Richard COOK
Office of International Affairs
National Park Service
P.O. Box 37127
WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127
USA

Mr. William P. GREGG
Ecologist
National Park Service (490)
P.O. Box 37127
WASHINGTON DC 20013-7127
USA

**II. ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY/
ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF**

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES/CONSEIL
INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)**

Mr. Herb STOVEL
Secretary-General
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

Mr. Henry CLEERE
World Heritage Co-ordinator
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

M. Leo van Nispen
Directeur
Secrétariat international
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

Ms. Regina DURIGHELLO
Assistant Co-ordinator for the Convention
75, rue du Temple
75003 PARIS

**THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)/UNION MONDIALE POUR LA
NATURE (UICN)**

Mr. Genady GOLUBEV
Assistant Director General
Avenue du Mont Blanc
Gland CH-1196
Switzerland

Mr. James W. Thorsell
Senior Advisor - Natural Heritage
Avenue du Mont-Blanc
1196 GLAND
Switzerland

M. Gérard SOURNIA
Délégué aux Affaires francophones
4, rue de Bel Air
37400 AMBOISE
France

Mr. Jeremy HARRISON
World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219c Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE
United Kingdom

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

M. Marc LAENEN
Director
via San Michele, 13
00153 ROME
Italy

Mr. Jukka JOKILEHTO
Chief
Architectural Conservation Programme
via San Michele, 13
00153 ROME
Italy

III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

ALGERIA/ALGERIE

M. Mohamed BOUKLI-HACENE
Sous-Directeur des monuments et sites historiques,
des musées et des parcs nationaux
Ministère de la culture et de la communication
Palais de la Culture
Plateaux des Annassers
ALGER
Algérie

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Mr. Andrew TURNER
Assistant Secretary
Nature Conservation Branch
Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment
and Territories
G.P.O Box 787
CANBERRA A.C-T, 2601
Australia

BELARUS

M. Evgueni IOUCHKEVITCH
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

CANADA

Mme Gisèle CANTIN
Chef Affaires Inter.
Service Canadien des Parcs
25, rue Eddy Hull (P. QUEBEC)
Canada KIA 0H3

CHINA/CHINE

Mr. Xunyan QIU
Directeur adjoint de la Division de
la Commission Nationale chinoise pour l'UNESCO
100816 PEKIN
China

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Ms. Isabel VERNAZA
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

COSTA RICA

Ms. Iris LEIVA-BILLAULT
Advisor
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

CUBA

Ms. Marta ARJONA
Directeur du Patrimoine culturel
Ministère de la culture
CUBA

CYPRUS/CHYPRE

Mr. Christos CASSIMATIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

CZECHOSLOVAKIA/TCHÉCOSLOVAQUIE

Mr. Alés VOSAHLIK
Travailleur Scientifique
Institut d'Etat pour la protection des
Monuments Historiques
11000 PRAGUE 1
Revolucni 17
Tchécoslovaquie

Mr. Michel BENES
Vice Secrétaire général de la Commission Nationale
tchécoslovaque pour l'UNESCO
Hradcanske Nam 5
11000 PRAGUE 1
Tchécoslovaquie

EL SALVADOR

M. René HERRERA
Secrétaire du Délégué
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

GREECE/GRECE

Dr. Marilena CASSIMATIS
Advisor for Cultural Affairs
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

GUINEA/GUINEE

M. Fodé CISSE
Conseiller
Délégation permanente auprès de l'UNESCO

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

Mr. Béla KOVACSI
Ministère de l'Environnement et
de l'Aménagement Régional
Conseiller du Ministère
H-1394 BUDAPEST
P.O. 351
Hongrie

ITALY/ITALIE

Mr. Michelangelo JACOBUCCI
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

Mrs. Marina MISITANO
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

JAPAN/JAPON

Ms Michiko KARA
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

PHILIPPINES

Mrs. Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO
Attaché
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

RUSSIA/RUSSIE

Mr. Igor DANILOV
Director, Cultural Department
UNESCO High Commission
Vozdzizenlia - MOSCOW
Russia

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE

Mr. A. E. SAOUD
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

TURKEY/TURQUIE

Mr. Pulat TACAR
Ambassador Plenipotentiary and Extraordinary
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

Mr. Engin TURKER
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation to UNESCO

**IV. WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE / SECRETARIAT/
CENTRE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL / SECRETARIAT**

M. Bernd von DROSTE
Directeur
Centre du patrimoine mondial

M. Saïd ZULFICAR
Directeur adjoint
Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mr. Mounir BOUCHENAKI
Directeur a.i.
Division du patrimoine culturel

M. Abdelkader Brahim ERRAHMANI
Chef de la promotion, Division du patrimoine culturel
Directeur de PATRICOM

M. David KABALA
Spécialiste du Programme
Division des Sciences écologiques

Mme Mireille JARDIN
Centre du patrimoine mondial

M. Natarajan ISHWARAN
Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mlle Ana DUMITRESCU
Centre du patrimoine mondial

Mme Mechtild Rössler
Centre du patrimoine mondial

M. Gérard BOLLA
Consultant

M. Sylvio Mutal
Regional Coordinator
for Latin America and the Caribbean
UNDP/UNESCO

Mme Gisèle HYVERT
Consultant

Mr. Daniel DROCOURT
Consultant

Mr. Peter LOWREY
UNESCO Press

Jane DEGEORGES
Centre du patrimoine mondial

Joanna LEWIS
Centre du patrimoine mondial

David MARTEL
Centre du patrimoine mondial

Marianne RAABE
Centre du patrimoine mondial