

Limited distribution

~~SC-91/CONF.002/2~~
Paris, 10 July 1991

UNITED NATIONS
EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION
OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Fifteenth session

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 17-21 June 1991

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The fifteenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 17 to 21 June 1991. The following Bureau members attended: Dr. Christina Cameron (Canada), Chairperson; Mrs. Licia Vlad Borrelli (Italy), Rapporteur; and representatives of Bulgaria, Mexico, Thailand, Tunisia and Senegal, Vice-Chairpersons.

2. Representatives of the following States Parties to the Convention attended the meeting of the Bureau as observers: Australia, Bolivia, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Korea (Democratic People's Republic of), Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and the United States of America.

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 representative of the Director-General, Mr. A. Badran, Assistant Director-General for Science, welcomed the members of the Bureau. He emphasized that the implementation of the Convention is a model for intersectoral co-operation and is therefore given the highest priority by UNESCO. He drew the attention of the members to the fact that both the Science and Culture Sectors of UNESCO have assigned a major role to the work of the Convention in their programme priorities for the next biennium (1992-93) which were submitted to the Executive Board of UNESCO during May-June 1991. He acknowledged that the work of the Bureau was becoming technically complex and noted that the current session would last for five instead of four days as had been the case in the past. Mr. Badran then underlined the importance of the outcome of the meeting to the work of the Committee, scheduled to meet for its fifteenth session in Carthage, Tunisia, in December 1991, by highlighting the major issues that needed to be discussed under a selected number of items of the Provisional Agenda. He stressed the importance of the contributions that would be made by ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN to the success of the meeting of the Bureau and reiterated UNESCO's appreciation of the role these organizations played in the implementation of the Convention. Mr. Badran concluded his address by wishing the Bureau a successful session.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

5. The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the wish of the Secretary General of ICOMOS that the examination of nominations of cultural properties to the World Heritage List

and to the List of World Heritage in Danger be postponed to a later time during the meeting. The Bureau decided to examine the nominations of natural properties to the World Heritage List and List of World Heritage in Danger before examining nominations of cultural properties. With this amendment, the Bureau adopted the Agenda.

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

6. The Secretary for the fifteenth session of the Bureau, Mr. Bernd von Droste, reported on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last session of the Committee, held in Banff, Canada, from 7-12 December 1991. He drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that detailed information on such activities was provided in working documents made available to the members of the Bureau. In his presentation he provided the Bureau with information of a general nature and reviewed the work of the Secretariat over the last six months, highlighting the main achievements and problems encountered.

7. Mr. von Droste informed the Bureau that since the last session of the Committee, Bahrain and Kenya had ratified or accepted the Convention, bringing the total number of States Parties to the Convention to 117. He drew the attention of the Bureau to a special event in Japan and promotional activities undertaken by the Secretariat in order to encourage more countries to become States Parties to the Convention. He reported that the Government of Solomon Islands, though not a Member State of UNESCO, had expressed its wish to be invited by the General Conference of UNESCO to become a party to the Convention and another Pacific island nation, namely Tonga, had also contacted the Secretariat to obtain information on the Convention and on procedures for acceptance.

8. The Secretary reported that with the inscription of 17 new sites at the last session of the Committee, the World Heritage List now included 337 properties, of which 245 were cultural, 78 natural and 14 mixed. Mr. von Droste emphasized the fact that as the number of sites inscribed on the List increased the monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites became an increasingly complex and time-consuming task. He stressed that the monitoring of the state of conservation of cultural and natural properties will be an important component of the overall evaluation of the Convention and the formulation of a future policy for the implementation of the Convention. He underlined the fact that such an evaluation will be the most important part of the activities that would be undertaken to commemorate the Twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention. Mr. von Droste also informed the Bureau that a special one-day workshop on the implementation of the Convention would be organized in conjunction with the Fourth World Parks Congress, scheduled to be held during February 1992, in Caracas, Venezuela, with the intention of utilizing the outcome of the workshop in the evaluation of the Convention.

9. Mr. von Droste recalled that the Committee had, during several of its past sessions, requested that the application of criteria to sites illustrating certain themes, such as geological and fossil deposits, and rural landscapes, be reviewed. He informed the Bureau that the Secretariat was proposing a new criteria for incorporating cultural landscapes and revisions to natural heritage criteria, based on the recommendations of a Task Force Meeting of Geologists held at UNESCO Headquarters from 11-13 February 1991. He requested the Bureau to review and approve a Draft Report of the World Heritage Committee to the 26th General Conference of UNESCO scheduled for October-November 1991.

10. The Chairperson thanked the Secretary for the report and noted that his emphasis on monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage Properties and the evaluation of the implementation of the Convention were pertinent.

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

11. The Bureau took cognizance of documents SC-91/CONF.001/2 and SC-91/CONF.001/2 Add, submitted respectively by the Secretariat and the Co-ordinator of the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project on Cultural Heritage and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, and took note of the specific measures initiated by the Secretariat following the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 14th session. The Bureau expressed itself satisfied with the co-operation established between the Secretariat and the Co-ordinator of the network set up by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for the protection of Mediterranean sites under the Barcelona Convention. It was noted that 45 World Heritage sites were included in this network. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to continue preparing data-sheets by country and by site, considering that such a resource had become indispensable to the Secretariat and would greatly facilitate the work of the Committee, notably where the monitoring of the state of preservation of cultural properties was concerned.

12. Adopting the principle that the objective aimed at was the protection of the listed properties and sites, the discussions followed two main lines: the method of monitoring, and how it was to be implemented.

13. The viability of the system of questionnaires entitled *Updating of Information on Cultural Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List* was the subject of a lengthy discussion. One member of the Bureau, recalling his scepticism concerning the questionnaires which he had expressed at the outset, pointed out the workload for both the Secretariat and the States Parties represented by this operation, and he also seriously doubted whether there was any possibility of improving the system. While recognizing that in its present form this approach did not enable the Secretariat to perform its task satisfactorily, notably by reason of the marked qualitative differences of the replies (in some cases even

within a given country), two members of the Bureau nevertheless thought that the continuance of the operation could be considered. However, the Bureau decided to propose to the Committee that the operation be suspended with effect from its next session. The Bureau held the view that while the site-by-site diagnosis as at present being made around the periphery of the Mediterranean was a major element in the monitoring process, it would be desirable for States Parties, when submitting their nominations for inscription to provide ICOMOS and the Secretariat with more detailed information on the condition of the sites in question and on available local and national means for monitoring their condition. Such a requirement, bringing site evaluation and management into parallel, should heighten States Parties' awareness of the problem of the conservation of listed sites.

14. The Bureau also considered it desirable to suggest to the Committee that countries submitting applications for international assistance should accompany their request by a diagnosis of the property or site concerned, except in the case of initial or urgent applications.

15. To this end, it was suggested that the Secretariat submit to the Committee, at its next session, an amendment to the section of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* dealing with international assistance.

16. The rôle which ICOMOS and ICCROM should play was referred to at length. The members of the Bureau unanimously considered that these two organizations should play a more prominent role. The resources made available by their networks should help to establish diagnoses of cultural properties and sites and to make the authorities responsible for them more aware of their obligations in regard to the application of the Convention. The Guide to Site Management, prepared by ICCROM, should be finalized as soon as possible, with the help of ICOMOS; the UNESCO Secretariat had suggested the preparation of this manual so that it might be made available to national authorities and facilitate the monitoring of the management of listed sites.

17. The Bureau stressed the importance of what ICCROM and ICOMOS could do where training was concerned, this being an essential component of efficient site management. The Bureau wished the Secretariat to examine, with the officials of those organizations, what forms of joint action could be proposed to the Committee at its 15th session.

18. In the course of the discussion, a member of the Bureau wondered whether it would be opportune to ask States Parties to provide the UNESCO General Conference with the periodical reports referred to in Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat stated that there were generally few responses to requests for reports from States Parties; these reports placed a heavy workload on the Secretariat, and would duplicate information requested by the Committee in connection with the monitoring of site preservation.

19. The Secretariat gave the Bureau basic information on certain sites whose state of preservation had been referred to at the previous session of the Committee.

20. The plan to build a hotel on the Tipasa site had been abandoned by the Algerian authorities and a project to protect the town was being finalized with the help of a UNESCO consultant. With regard to the Plateau of the Pyramids, which had been a subject of concern on the part of the Committee, the Egyptian authorities were currently remaking the roads, replacing the asphalt surfaces with local sand and stones. Along the same lines, the existing lighting arrangements were being replaced by installations which did not clash with the aesthetic aspect of the site. Furthermore, the Egyptian authorities had undertaken studies with a view to preparing a plan for the reorganization of the Plateau. A request for technical co-operation for this purpose was awaited. The Bureau decided to send a message to the Egyptian authorities concerning measures contemplated to halt the extension of buildings in the nearby village. With regard to Mystras, the Greek authorities had approved a project for the restoration of the Byzantine Palace, which was in grave danger of collapsing, the site being located in a zone liable to seismic tremors. The project provided, in particular, for a complete restoration of those parts of the palace containing the throne room and the private apartments of the Palaeologues. This work would include the rebuilding of the missing upper sections of the walls and the laying of roofs. According to the analysis of the specialists who prepared the project, roofing is necessary because it not only provides protection from the weather, but also plays an important part in increasing the stability of the bearing structures in case of seismic tremor. For the other parts of the palace, only the consolidation of the ruins is planned. The work is based on thorough studies and was decided upon to save the throne room in particular, the only surviving Byzantine construction of its kind in Greece. Following the misgivings expressed by the Committee at its 14th session concerning the building of a cultural centre between the Tower of Belem and the Monastery of the Hieronymites in Lisbon, the Portuguese authorities had sent a complete file to the Secretariat, which it had passed on to ICOMOS in order that the latter might inform the Committee of its opinion. The Secretariat confirmed the existence of a small concrete construction on the site of Xanthos-Letoon, and the Committee will receive further information on the condition of this site at its next session.

21. In reply to questions concerning the extension of one of the buildings bordering the Place Stanislas in Nancy and the plan to open a leisure park in the vicinity of the Château de Chambord, the French observer informed the Bureau that the French Ministry of Culture kept a very vigilant eye on measures taken by local authorities which might alter sites on the World Heritage List. Assurances had been given that the cultural activity centre planned at Chambord would be located at a sufficient distance from the Château and its grounds.

22. A member of the Bureau expressed misgivings regarding the effects of the construction of the Gorée-Almadies memorial and the Secretariat made it clear that the memorial would be erected on the Pointe des Almadies and not on the Island of Gorée, where there would be only a small replica of it. This was confirmed by the representative of Senegal.

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

23. The Bureau examined document SC-91/CONF.001/3 and noted specific actions taken by the Secretariat and progress achieved in respect of eleven natural or mixed sites examined by the Committee at its last session. The Bureau was satisfied to note that some States Parties (e.g. Turkey, in the case of Hierapolis-Pamukkale) had taken steps to consolidate the state of conservation of natural/mixed heritage sites. In other cases, the Bureau reconsidered the state of conservation of properties in the light of further information provided by the Secretariat as well as the representatives of IUCN and States Parties.

24. The IUCN representative stressed that the procedure for monitoring the state of conservation, adopted by IUCN in co-operation with the Secretariat had, in many cases, lessened threats to the integrity of the natural or mixed heritage sites. He drew the attention of the Bureau to the example of the intervention of the Committee regarding an irrigation project that would have had negative impacts on the grassland and riverine ecology of the Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal) which is being presently subjected to a comprehensive environmental impact assessment.

25. The representatives of IUCN circulated an information document on the state of conservation of 21 natural or mixed sites of which ten were in Africa, three each in Australia, Eastern Europe and Latin America, respectively, and two in Canada. The information document included six sites on which the Secretariat had also submitted brief progress reports as part of document SC-91/CONF.001/3. The Bureau discussed problems facing the conservation of the following sites, and requested the Secretariat to take a series of follow-up actions in the case of several sites.

Kakadu National Park (Australia)

26. The Bureau was pleased to note that the Australian Cabinet has decided not to allow mining at Coronation Hill, located in an area that is being considered for nomination as an extension to this World Heritage site as part of Stage III of the expansion. The Australian observer informed the Bureau that the proposed Stage III of the extension of Kakadu National Park would add approximately another 6,000 sq.km. to this site and wished to know whether or not the nomination of this extension needed to follow the procedure to submit a new nomination. The Bureau recalled that each of the stages I and

II of the nomination of this site also covered equally large areas. The Bureau informed the Australian observer that since the proposed extension would increase the size of the World Heritage site by a third and that the original nomination of 1981 is now substantially modified, it would be considered as a new nomination.

Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)

27. The Bureau recalled that the Committee, when it inscribed this site on the World Heritage List in 1988, requested IUCN to submit a progress report in 1991 on the implementation of an effective management regime. The Bureau noted that although a management agency has been set up, the Director and staff were only recently appointed and that the management planning process has been delayed and no additional funds for field management activities have been provided. The Bureau was also concerned about the pace of tourism development and a proposal for a hydropower development project which could impact the site. The Bureau requested that the Australian authorities provide further elaboration on these problems to IUCN so as to enable IUCN to report to the Committee at its forthcoming session in December 1991.

Iguazu National Park (Argentina) Iguacu National Park (Brazil)

28. The Bureau recalled that these two sites cover the same waterfall area which extends across the two countries. The Bureau was concerned that, for tourist purposes, eight helicopters now simultaneously overfly the falls causing serious acoustic disturbance in an otherwise natural setting, and that more than 7,000 visitors have registered complaints. The Bureau also noted that local non-governmental organizations are opposing the use of helicopters as an inappropriate activity that contravenes legal air traffic regulations for flights over protected areas. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to convey these concerns to the authorities of Argentina and Brazil and suggest that they cooperate in devising management strategies to control helicopter tourism of the area.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)

29. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that a major expansion of this site, to include a large area of the Rhodope Mountains, is now under consideration by the Bulgarian authorities. The Bureau wished to encourage the Bulgarian authorities to proceed with the extension of Pirin and to consider submitting a revised nomination of the expanded site. The Bureau also noted the comment of the IUCN representative to the effect that there was great potential for establishing a transborder site with Greece by including areas adjacent to Pirin in Greece. If established this transborder park could be one of the most outstanding natural areas of Europe.

Dinosaur Provincial Park (Canada)

30. The Bureau noted that in order to accommodate the exploitation of some of the gas deposits under this site which are privately owned, the boundaries of this site have been modified to excise 1,415 acres and add 1,478 acres of higher geological value. Although the Bureau was satisfied with the fact that this swap met the approval of the Provincial Parks Branch of Alberta and the slanted drilling technology to be employed will not have adverse impacts on the integrity of the site, the Bureau observed that drilling of any wells inside the Park would cause greater concern. The Delegate of Canada assured the Bureau that impacts of drilling on the integrity of the Park will be closely monitored by representatives of governmental and non-governmental organizations and the Bureau and Committee would be alerted if any threat arose. A revised map of the new boundaries of the site is now awaited.

Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada)

31. The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, expressed serious concerns regarding the infection of the remaining 3,200 bison in this Park by brucellosis and tuberculosis, as well as with logging operations. The Bureau was informed of a longer term threat to the integrity of the site caused by activities upstream along the Peace/Athabasca Rivers, which include the expansion of pulp mills, logging operations and dam construction resulting in water pollution and loss of water quality, changes in the flooding regime and the gradual drying-up of the Athabasca delta. The Bureau noted that a large surface area is no longer an adequate basis to ensure the long-term integrity of the Wood Buffalo National Park, and similar World Heritage sites such as Yellowstone (USA), Serengeti (Tanzania) and Banc d'Arguin (Mauritania), and that an ecosystem management approach taking into account activities outside of the Park would be required.

32. The Delegate of Canada informed the Bureau that the Canadian Government, in consultation with interested parties, has reviewed options for a management programme, which will be announced shortly, for diseased bison of the Wood Buffalo National Park. This programme has already ruled out large-scale slaughter of bison as a management option and is likely to rely on a combination of techniques, including quarantine and treatment and, in some cases, removal of bison from the Park. The launching of the Bison Management Programme will probably include a statement acknowledging the principle of preserving the ecological/environmental integrity of the Park. The Delegate of Canada also informed the Bureau that the Canadian Government is now strictly enforcing forestry regulations and is negotiating with logging companies which have permits to seasonally log in the Park, in order to terminate logging operations well before the year 2002 - date at which all logging permits expire. The cessation of logging operations may remove resources now being used by pulp mills in the area.

33. The Delegate of Canada acknowledged the need to monitor activities outside the Park which may negatively impact the Park. The Delegate also informed the Bureau that a number of technological approaches have been developed and implemented to monitor water quality in the Peace and Athabasca Rivers and minimize the threat of the drying-out of the Athabasca Delta. A three to five year study, costing about 10 million dollars is underway to examine the Peace-Athabasca basin and the activities in that basin which affect water quality. The study is a part of Canada's Green Plan for the Environment.

34. The Bureau noted that a number of Canadian non-governmental organizations had suggested that the Wood Buffalo National Park merited consideration for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, the Bureau acknowledged that the Canadian Government was taking appropriate measures to preserve the integrity of this Park. The Bureau requested the Canadian authorities to make special efforts both within the Park and throughout its entire drainage basin in order to retain and restore the integrity of this Park and provide information on the types and nature of technologies which are currently used for mitigating negative impacts on the Peace and Athabasca Rivers due to development activities. The Bureau agreed with the IUCN report that the Wood Buffalo National Park will, in many ways, be a test case for conservation of large, remote reserves and could provide lessons applicable elsewhere.

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

35. The Bureau noted with concern that despite a large-scale EEC project, this Park still had no management plan; it continued to be poached intensively, though there had been an appreciable reduction of poaching, particularly of elephants. The loss of six wardens, killed by poachers early in the year, was a regrettable occurrence; the Bureau wished to offer its condolences to the victims' families. The Bureau also recommended that a management plan be elaborated and that this aspect of the EEC project be implemented as soon as possible. Activities connected with tourism should be integrated into this management plan.

La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica and Panama)

36. The Bureau was pleased to note that as requested by the Committee at its last session, the Panamanian authorities have agreed to the inscription of this transborder national park as a single site on the World Heritage List. The Bureau urged the Costa Rican authorities to clarify their position to the Secretariat on this matter. The Bureau recalled that during its last session in Banff, the Committee also requested the Costa Rican authorities to revise the boundaries of the La Amistad National Park within their country in accordance with the recommendations made by IUCN. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the Costa Rican authorities have submitted preliminary proposals for new boundaries and that IUCN had reviewed them and suggested modifications to excise three of

the Indian reserves and add one wildlife refuge. The Bureau requested the Secretariat and IUCN to continue communications with the Costa Rican authorities in order to finalize the new boundaries of the La Amistad National Park of Costa Rica and submit them to the consideration of the Committee at its forthcoming session.

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

37. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that a plan to develop the infrastructures of this Park, funded by the World Bank in the amount of 500 million CFA Francs, was under way. In particular, it should make it possible to improve surveillance and combat local poaching. The Bureau also noted that the Côte d'Ivoire wished to set up a research station for the purpose of studying the ecosystems of the Park and helping to monitor the management of the site; the Bureau recommended that the Secretariat seek bilateral and multilateral funding to this end and that this effort to promote research should primarily benefit national scientists.

Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire)

38. The Bureau noted with satisfaction that this Park benefitted from strong support of German and WWF co-operation for research and conservation of the site, and in the future, incorporation of its peripheral zones in an integrated development plan. But the site was under threat from poachers and from the arrival in the area of refugees from Liberia. Consequently the Bureau wished to encourage the Côte d'Ivoire's partners to back up the existing project by making use of the work already done by the Tai research station in the context of UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere project (MAB).

Simien National Park (Ethiopia)

39. The Bureau recalled that this site was one of the first natural areas to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It was abandoned by the staff of the Wildlife Conservation Organization in 1985 due to civil unrest in the area. Since then there are no reliable reports of its condition. A new government is now being formed and hence the Bureau requested that the Secretariat contact the Permanent Delegation for Ethiopia in UNESCO in order to develop mechanisms to obtain an assessment of the present status of this site.

Mont Saint Michel and its Bay (France)

40. The Secretariat had indicated that it had received, and passed on to the French authorities, another letter from a French association for the protection of the environment drawing attention to potential dangers to this site arising from two projects: the construction of an industrial pig farm and the opening of a leisure park. In reply, the French observer assured the Bureau that neither of these two projects had been authorized, and that the extension and protection of the Mont Saint Michel site was under way at the national

level. The Bureau took note of these assurances with satisfaction.

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

41. The Bureau took cognizance of the IUCN report on the plan to exploit an iron ore deposit which, though situated outside the Nature Reserve proper, nevertheless lay within the site inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981. The Bureau also noted the remark of a Guinean observer who recalled the commitments contained in the new management plan of the Mont Nimba Biosphere Reserve which the Guinean authorities had recently sent to the Secretariat, and the efforts made by those authorities to reconcile development problems with the conservation requirements of the area. The Bureau recalled that it had been consulted in writing by the Secretariat regarding the timeliness of redefining the boundaries of the site inscribed on the World Heritage List; to this end, the Bureau confirmed that the Guinean authorities should submit an official request to the Secretariat accompanied by a map clearly showing the confines of the Strict Nature Reserve and requesting the revision of the boundaries of the site inscribed on the World Heritage List. This request should be submitted to IUCN, which would examine the question of whether it was a simple modification of boundaries or whether a new evaluation of the property should be made in order to justify its retention - or not, as the case may be - on the World Heritage List. The Bureau therefore instructed the Secretariat to urge the Guinean authorities to submit as soon as possible a new file stating the boundaries of the property receiving adequate protection, and the long term guarantees for that protection.

Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

42. The Bureau recalled that the Honduran authorities had requested the Committee, at its last session, to include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee had suggested at that time that the Honduran authorities submit a request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau noted that such a request had not yet been received and urged the Secretariat and IUCN to work through national MAB and IUCN networks in order to bring forward a request for the consideration of the Committee at its forthcoming session.

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

43. The Bureau noted with concern that the integrity of this site continues to be threatened by the invasion of a resistance movement which has burnt buildings, destroyed bridges, killed a number of park guards, looted most Park facilities, poached numerous rhinos, elephants, tigers and other wildlife, removed valuable trees and depleted fish stocks in the Manas River. The Bureau recalled that the Indian authorities were requested by the Committee, in 1989 and in 1990, to nominate this site to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Although the Bureau acknowledged that the

survey of the villages around this Park that is being undertaken by WWF could lead to a more co-operative approach to management of the Sanctuary in the future, the Bureau was of the view that in the meantime the site has been seriously degraded. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Director-General of UNESCO write to the Indian authorities requesting them to nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Djoudj National Park (Senegal)

44. Since this site was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1988, IUCN, in co-operation with the Direction des Parcs Nationaux du Senegal (DPN) and the Netherlands Research Institute of Nature Management, has prepared an up-date of actions on the management plan with special emphasis on the interactions between the Park and the surrounding communities. IUCN's Regional Office in Dakar, Senegal, organized a Wetland Management Training Course, from 4-15 March 1991, for twelve students from Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali and Senegal, as part of IUCN's Wetland Programme activities, and with financial support from the Government of Netherlands. As a result of the training course a wetland training manual will be published. The Bureau recommended that the Committee take note of these positive actions in furthering the recovery of the Djoudj National Park.

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)

45. The Bureau noted that its recommended study of the ecological and socio-economic impacts of the traces of the two roads -across or around the Park - had been successfully carried out by an independent team which had reached the following conclusions: though both roads would adversely affect the integrity of the Park, the road across it would be less damaging in the long term, provided that a number of accompanying measures (specified in detail) were taken before, during and after the work. The Bureau expressed its concern regarding the potential consequences on the integrity of the site of the construction of a road across the Park; consequently it recommended the adoption of a system of particularly vigilant monitoring of the state of conservation of this property. It also noted that experience of road management within a site on the World Heritage List acquired in other countries, such as Canada, could be usefully made available to the Senegalese authorities. With regard to the accompanying measures recommended by the study, the Bureau nevertheless noted with satisfaction the commitment of the Senegalese authorities to earmark 2.5 million CFA Francs for this purpose; a commitment which had been indicated in principle by the President of Senegal in a letter addressed to the Director-General of UNESCO on 22 May 1991. Consequently, the Bureau took note of this commitment in principle, and requested the Senegalese authorities to send the Secretariat details of schedules and technical modalities for the implementation of these measures, as recommended by the study.

Selous Game Reserve (Tanzania)

46. The Bureau recalled that the integrity of this site was threatened by intensive poaching of its elephant and rhino populations during the 1980s. The Bureau was concerned by a proposed plan of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development to open a route through this reserve to drive cattle from the north to the south of Tanzania. Livestock from northern Tanzania carry several bacterial and viral diseases which are easily transmitted to wildlife. The Bureau noted that IUCN's specialist veterinary group have outlined a number of conservation risks of opening the proposed route, and that the Director-General of IUCN has offered the Tanzanian authorities support to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The Bureau recommended that the Chairperson send a letter to the Tanzanian authorities requesting clarification of proposed plans for the cattle route and that caution be exercised before launching the project, particularly without carrying out an EIA.

Durmitor National Park (Yugoslavia)

47. The Bureau was informed that this site was threatened by a proposed hydropower project which would affect water quality in the Tara River and flood a portion of the Tara Canyon, which is one of this site's World Heritage values. The Bureau was also concerned that the Government of Montenegro, who have authority over the Park, is constructing a large asphalt plant upstream beside the Tara River which is already causing some water pollution. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Yugoslav authorities in order to clarify the current status of plans for the development of the hydropower project and the asphalt plant. At its next session, if the Committee finds, on the basis of information provided by Yugoslav authorities that the integrity of this site is seriously threatened, then it may request the Yugoslav authorities to nominate this site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Plitvice Lake National Park (Yugoslavia)

48. The Bureau was concerned that this Park has been abandoned by the staff due to the civil unrest in the region and that destruction of forests and park facilities, hunting of bears and dynamite fishing were occurring due to lack of any supervision of the Park. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to convey its concern to the Yugoslav authorities and urge them to seek a speedy solution to the problem. The Bureau also suggested that if the situation in the region improved in the immediate future, then the Yugoslavian authorities be requested to invite a joint IUCN/UNESCO mission to assess the state of conservation of this Park. The findings of the joint consultancy mission, if it is undertaken before the forthcoming session of the Committee should be reported to the Committee.

Garamba National Park (Zaire)

49. The Bureau was pleased to note that two more rhino calves were born in this site and the rhino population has now risen to 28, almost double that of 1985 when the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau was satisfied that the budget for this site has increased by 400% and that as suggested by the Committee at its last session, the Zairois authorities have requested that this site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau recommended that the Committee recognize that the small rhino population is still vulnerable and therefore continue to cooperate with other donors in supporting requests for rehabilitation. The Bureau also suggested that the Committee remove this site from the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Zaire)

50. Since the last session of the Committee, IUCN has conducted an impact study and recommended that the proposed new road not go through the park but be re-routed around the northern boundaries of the park. The Bureau noted that the study is now being reviewed by the donor financing the road-construction project (KFW and the GTZ of Germany) and that the project also has several implications for the ecology of the region. The Bureau requested IUCN and the Secretariat to follow the progress and submit a report at the next session of the Committee.

Antarctica

51. The Bureau noted that the question of the application of the World Heritage Convention to all or part of this continent had been raised on several occasions, and that IUCN had published a strategy for the conservation of Antarctica which made explicit reference to the value of certain Antarctic sites as part of the World Heritage. While recognizing that the World Heritage Convention was not applicable, as it stood, to a continent outside national sovereignty, the Bureau considered that the World Heritage concept could indeed apply to the conservation of Antarctica. Consequently the Bureau requested the Secretariat to inform the Consultative Parties to the Treaty of Antarctica of the World Heritage concept within the context of their deliberations on the protection of the environment of that continent. In addition, the Bureau requested that the question of the application of the World Heritage Convention to Antarctica, and the amendments which this would require to be made to the Convention, be examined in the context of the evaluation of the Convention scheduled for 1992.

52. At the conclusion of the discussion on the monitoring of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Bureau was informed of the work carried out by the consultant responsible for making, in conjunction with the Secretariat, an overall evaluation of the Convention in 1992. The Bureau noted that this work had primarily concerned

the question of monitoring, and for this purpose the consultant had analysed the contents of the files, examining in particular those cases where the inscription of a property was accompanied by the Committee's recommendations. He had then held consultations with various prominent individuals who had been involved, at one stage or another, in the preparation or the implementation of the Convention. He was now ready to consult members of ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM. The Bureau had instructed the Secretariat to remind States Parties that they were required to contribute to the operation by submitting a report of the results of the application of the Convention at the national level. These reports would be consolidated by the consultant, in liaison with the Secretariat. The Bureau noted that a fuller report on this question would be submitted to the Committee at its next session.

VII. GLOBAL STUDY

53. The Secretariat reported on progress since the Committee's last session. A preliminary partial framework for the study had been devised by two experts made available by the Greek Government, and offers had been received from the German and Turkish participants in the last session of the Committee to contribute a study of Gothic architecture and of Hittite sites. Another member of the Committee had offered to work on the Romanesque period and the Scandinavian countries, on a Finnish initiative, had offered to work on a study of monuments and sites in that area. The Secretariat also carried out a preliminary study on rock art and an assessment of the framework and methodology used by the Canadian Parks system in establishing a framework of existing and potential historic sites in Canada.

54. A number of Members of the Bureau and Observers expressed appreciation of the work done by the Greek experts which had made a great advance in the project and some raised particular points about the framework and the Secretariat welcomed these comments. It was understood that the substantial work involved so far was preliminary and that the framework would have to be adjusted and completed. One Bureau Member felt that one methodology, either chronological, or geographical or art-historical should be used for the sake of consistency, but the Secretariat pointed out that the Committee had decided on a mixed temporal, cultural and thematic approach. An observer stated that Scandinavian countries would prefer a social/cultural to an art/historical approach and suggested using information already collected through the joint study on Art Nouveau architecture which was being pursued by a number of National Commissions and through the Baroque route project launched under the Decade for Cultural Development. The Secretariat pointed out that other UNESCO studies made or proposed, e.g. the history projects, Iron Road (Africa) and Silk Roads projects, as well as those mentioned by the observer, had none of them yielded documentation directly useful for the global study project. The documentation available through these studies had been checked by the Greek experts. The Secretariat intended to seek the help of the Art

Nouveau experts at their next meeting in drawing up an inventory.

55. In reply to a request from a Member of the Bureau it was explained that the incumbent of one new post, currently under recruitment, where there was likely to be an appointment shortly, would work primarily on the global study, thus giving the Secretariat for the first time some additional resources for this purpose. The representative of ICOMOS expressed interest in participating in the global study, in particular in completing the framework and it was agreed that ICOMOS would submit a costed proposal for this work to the next session of the Committee. It would be important to decide which areas of work should then be given priority. Several Members mentioned the desirability of States parties offering their assistance and it was agreed that a circular letter would be prepared soliciting their assistance. The representative of ICCROM announced that the Centre would also be happy to contribute to the global study in collaboration with ICOMOS. Several Bureau Members and Observers emphasized the importance and urgency of the study and one Bureau Member pointed out that the completion of the study would necessarily take time as it required reflection and synthesis.

VIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

56. After having taken cognizance of document SC91/CONF.001/5, the Bureau approved a request for international assistance in the amount of US\$30,000 submitted by Cuba for the purchase of 183 cubic metres of timber for the restoration of the structural frames and panelling of a group of XVIIIth and XIXth century houses situated in the historic centre of Trinidad. The Bureau wished the architects of the Regional Office for Culture for Latin America and the Caribbean, located in Havana and already involved in the international campaign for the preservation of the Plaza Vieja in that city, to be associated with the restoration work which was to be carried out in Trinidad.

La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica): The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, approved US\$50,000 for this site under two conditions, and instructed the Bureau to determine whether these conditions had been met before deciding whether to award an appropriate amount to Costa Rica. The Bureau concluded that neither of the two conditions, i.e. completion of the implementation of projects for which funds had already been provided and the revision of the Park's boundaries in accordance with IUCN recommendations, had been completely met. Hence, the Bureau deferred the decision on awarding any part of the US\$50,000 until the next session of the Committee in December 1991.

IX. SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

57. The Bureau took note of document SC-91/CONF.001/6 containing statements of mandatory and voluntary contributions

to the World Heritage Fund, together with the status of implementation of projects approved in 1990 and 1991. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that since 1 June 1991, the date up to which the accounts were drawn up, the mandatory contribution of Jamaica had been received, and that Austria (not a State Party to the Convention) had paid the sum of 299,444.88 Schillings into the Fund (the equivalent of US\$21,645.74). The Bureau expressed concern regarding the non-payment up, to the present, of a considerable number of mandatory contributions for 1990 and 1991, and wished that the Secretariat draw the attention of States Parties to the importance of meeting their obligations to the World Heritage Fund before the Eighth Annual General Assembly to be held during the twenty-sixth session of the UNESCO General Conference. The Bureau also recalled that under the terms of paragraph 5 of Article 16 of the Convention: *"Any State Party to the Convention which is in arrears with the payment of its compulsory or voluntary contribution for the current year and the calendar year immediately preceding it shall not be eligible as a Member of the World Heritage Committee"*. Furthermore, the Bureau recalled the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 13th session in December 1989 that the principle referred to above should apply to States Parties requesting international assistance from the World Heritage Fund, except in the case of requests concerning training. Consequently States Parties in arrears will not be able to obtain international assistance, except in urgent cases.

58. A member of the Bureau wished the Secretariat to examine the possibility of improving the presentation of the statements of contributions to the Fund, in order to make it easier to identify the arrears accumulated by certain States Parties.

59. The Bureau also took note of the status of implementation of various international assistance projects financed by the World Heritage Fund, and of the situation of the budget for 1991 approved by the Committee.

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

60. The Bureau examined 38 nominations of cultural properties, 11 nominations of natural properties, and one nomination of a mixed property to the World Heritage List. It recommended the inscription of ten properties (see Section A below), did not recommend the inscription of three properties (Section B), referred sixteen nominations back to the States Parties concerned and/or to ICOMOS (Section C), and deferred the examination of twenty-one nominations (Section D).

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 of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
------------------	--------------------	---	----------

Old Rauma	582	Finland	C(iv)(v)
-----------	-----	---------	----------

Paris, Banks of the Seine	600	France	C(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)
---------------------------	-----	--------	------------------

The Bureau emphasized the merit of this nomination of a historic area of Paris.

Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Saint-Remi Abbey and Palais de Tau of Reims	601	France	C(i)(ii)(iv)
--	-----	--------	--------------

Komodo National Park	609	Indonesia	N(iii)(iv)
----------------------	-----	-----------	------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the List and that the Indonesian authorities complete the gazetting process for this site and report on the progress before the fifteenth session of the Committee in December 1991. The Bureau also encouraged the Indonesian authorities to conduct research on marine areas in order to incorporate marine concerns in the management of this site.

Ujung Kulon National Park	608	Indonesia	N(iii)(iv)
---------------------------	-----	-----------	------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the List and that the Indonesian authorities a) complete the gazetting process and report on progress made before the forthcoming session of the Committee in December 1991, and b) strengthen the consideration of marine values in the management of the site.

Historic Centre of Morelia	585	Mexico	C(iii)(iv)(vi)
----------------------------	-----	--------	----------------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this site, and requested the Mexican authorities to send it confirmation of the state of preservation of this historic town centre before its special session in December 1991.

Ilha de Moçambique	599	Mozambique	C(iv)(vi)
--------------------	-----	------------	-----------

Air-Ténéré Reserve	573	Niger	N(ii)(iii) (iv)
-----------------------	-----	-------	--------------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List and that the Committee commend and encourage the Government of Niger, particularly the Direction de la Faune, Pêche et Pisciculture, in their efforts to continue to protect and restore the area. The Bureau also requested ICOMOS to report to the Committee on the cultural values of this site.

Poblet Monastery	518 Rev	Spain	C(i)(iv)
------------------	---------	-------	----------

Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary	591	Thailand	N(ii)(iii) (iv)
---	-----	----------	--------------------

The Bureau recommended that this site be inscribed on the List and that the Committee encourage the authorities of Thailand to accelerate efforts to implement management plans for the two Sanctuaries and projects in their buffer zones. The Bureau also suggested that the Committee compliment Thailand for rejecting the proposed construction of the Nam Choan dam and express its concern over any proposal that might affect the integrity of adjacent forests in Myanmar. The Bureau noted that the Government of Myanmar may nominate these adjacent forests for inscription on the World Heritage List when it becomes a State Party to the Convention.

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

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

Amphitheatre of Durrës	571	Albania
------------------------	-----	---------

While recognizing the importance of this property as part of the cultural heritage of Albania, the Bureau considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List as defined for the purposes of the application of the Convention.

Tarutao National Park	589	Thailand
-----------------------	-----	----------

The Bureau urged the authorities of Thailand to strengthen the management of this area possibly by using the marine biosphere reserve approach of UNESCO-MAB which would be most appropriate for addressing marine resources conservation.

Riga 605 USSR

While recognizing the importance of this property as part of the national cultural heritage, the Bureau considered that it did not meet the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List as defined for the purposes of the application of the Convention.

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

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

Butrinti	570	Albania
----------	-----	---------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this archaeological site, subject to receipt of further information concerning its existing protection, the protection of the surrounding landscape, and problems of water seepage. The information requested from the Albanian authorities should reach the Bureau in time for examination at its special session in December 1991.

Algiers Kasbah	565	Algeria
----------------	-----	---------

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this site, provided that the Algerian authorities provide details as to the government's resolve to protect the historic centre of Algiers. Furthermore, the Bureau requested ICOMOS to make a comparative study of the medinas of this cultural area. In the light of this study and of the information received from the Algerian authorities, the nomination could be re-examined by the Bureau at its special session in December 1991.

Shark Bay, Western Australia	578	Australia
---------------------------------	-----	-----------

The Bureau agreed that this site met all four natural heritage criteria but referred the nomination back to the Australian authorities requesting them to respond to the six specific suggestions put forward by IUCN regarding the changes in the boundaries of this site, in order to improve the management of the area for conservation purposes. The Bureau requested that the Australian authorities also provide information, before the next session of the Committee, on a) plans for the speedy implementation of the management agreement between the State of Western Australia and the Commonwealth of Australia; b) long-term plans for the development of the fishing industry in the area and c) plans for increasing the staff employed in the conservation of the site.

Suomenlinna 583 Finland
Fortress

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this site, provided that before its special session in December 1991 the Finnish authorities furnish assurances concerning the existence of a buffer zone to ensure full protection of the site.

Petäjävesi Old Church 584 Finland

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but asked ICOMOS to submit a comparative evaluation of old wooden churches in Northern Europe. In the light of this additional information, the nomination of Petäjävesi would be re-examined by the Bureau at its special session in December 1991.

The Benedictine 515 Rev. Germany
Abbey and Altermünster
of Lorsch

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but asked the German authorities to submit a plan clearly showing the existing relationship between the Abbey and the Altermünster. The nomination could then be examined at the special meeting of the Bureau in December 1991.

Borobudur and 592 Indonesia
Prambanan

The Bureau recommended the inscription of these two properties on condition that each of them be nominated separately. Consequently the Indonesian authorities, if they accept the Bureau's recommendation, will have to submit to the Secretariat a complete nomination for the inscription of the Temple of Prambanan, the details supplied regarding Borobudur being satisfactory as they stand.

Historic Centre 500b Peru
of Lima

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested the Peruvian authorities to submit details of the legal protection and management plan required to safeguard the proposed perimeter which, in actual fact, did not correspond to the concept of a "historic centre". In the light of the information received, which should include an appropriate nomenclature, the Bureau could re-examine the nomination at its special session in December 1991.

National Park of 548 Peru
Rio Abiseo
(already inscribed
in 1990 on
the basis of
natural criteria)

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this site on the basis of natural criteria, but requested the Peruvian

Sukhothai and
associated cities

574

Thailand

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, subject to receipt of details of the perimeter of the area nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. In the light of this additional information, the Bureau would be able to re-examine the nomination at its special session in December 1991.

Historic Centre
of Bukhara

602

USSR

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but asked ICOMOS to submit, as soon as possible, a new and more thorough evaluation. In this connection the Bureau encouraged ICOMOS to send a field mission to update the information contained in the nomination. On the basis of this additional material, the Bureau could re-examine the nomination at its special session in December 1991.

Novgorod

604

USSR

The Bureau recommended the inscription of this property, but requested the Soviet authorities to submit a plan clearly showing the boundaries of the property nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, and also to consider the possibility of naming it "Historic Monuments of Novgorod". In the light of the information received, the nomination could be re-examined by the Bureau at its special session in December 1991.

D. Deferred nominations

Berat and
Gjirokastra

568 & 569

Albania

The Bureau deferred the examination of these nominations, but approved the proposal of ICOMOS to organize a mission to the two sites in order to help the Albanian authorities to redefine the perimeters of protection of Berat and Gjirokastra and to identify the limits and the legal protection of buffer zones, essential for the safeguarding of the two sites.

Heard Island and
McDonald Islands

577

Australia

The Bureau welcomed the initiative of Australia in nominating, for the first time, islands in the Subantarctic. However, the Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred since in its current formulation, its uniqueness in comparison to other islands in the Subantarctic was not clearly established. The Bureau, as a consequence, expressed reservations as to whether or not this site meets the World Heritage criteria. The Bureau also requested the Australian authorities to a) review the legal status for the protection of the islands and indicate whether they are to be given protected area status;

b) explain the rationale behind the proposed boundaries of the site; c) describe the conservation values of the seas surrounding the islands and d) report on the progress in the preparation of a management plan for the islands.

Sucre 566 Bolivia

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination, considering that it should be reformulated by the Bolivian authorities so as to clarify the legal provisions adopted to ensure the management and protection of this site. The Bureau also considered that the buffer zone of the historic centre of the town should be extended in order to provide better protection of the site and its immediate environment.

Tihuanaco 567 Bolivia

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination, considering that a redefinition of the boundaries of the site was necessary. The Bureau wished ICOMOS to organize a mission to Tihuanaco to help the Bolivian authorities to reformulate the nomination.

Sera da Capivara 606 Brazil
National Park
(C + N)

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending receipt from the Brazilian authorities of fuller information on the dating of the rock paintings of Sera da Capivara in relation to the different successive cultures revealed by recent archaeological excavations. The Bureau wished the natural values of this site to be taken into consideration when the nomination was re-examined.

Silent Valley 587 India
National Park

The Bureau acknowledged the importance of this site which has symbolic value for conservation in India. However, the Bureau was of the view that this site is only one part of a larger ecological unit and by itself is not of sufficient size to warrant World Heritage status. The Bureau strongly encouraged the Indian authorities to re-formulate the boundaries of this site to take in a larger area, particularly the adjacent Karimpuzha Valley National Park and the Nilgiri Thar Wildlife Sanctuary and complete the legal processes to establish the proposed Karimpuzha Valley National Park and upgrade the status of the Nilgiri Thar Wildlife Sanctuary.

Lore Lindu 610 Indonesia
National Park

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be deferred until such times as the Indonesian authorities take relevant action in relation to the following problems:

- the low legal status assigned to the site by the central government;
- the lack of adequate information to assess the site's comparative significance vis-à-vis other large reserves in the island;
- inadequate consideration of the archaeological resources in the vicinity of the site and their protection, and
- concerns regarding the integrity of the site due to the presence of two large enclaves of people.

The Bureau encouraged the Indonesian authorities to implement programmes which are consistent with Lore Lindu National Park's current status as a biosphere reserve.

Area of archaeological monuments of Paquime	560	Mexico
--	-----	--------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending the results of a comparative study of property of this type located in Mexico and the United States.

Rohtas Fort	586	Pakistan
-------------	-----	----------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending receipt from the Pakistani authorities of a precise description of all the structures which have been preserved inside the fort and in the village it encloses, together with the results of a comparative examination of properties of this type in the geo-cultural area concerned.

Monastery of Jasna Gora	563	Poland
----------------------------	-----	--------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending receipt from the Polish authorities of a nomination containing arguments enabling the artistic merits of this monastery to be better evaluated.

Biertan	596	Romania
Monastery of Horezu	597	Romania
Churches of Moldavia	598	Romania

The Bureau deferred the examination of these nominations, considering it necessary for these monuments and sites to be afforded satisfactory legal protection, particularly with regard to the proposed protective perimeters. The Bureau also considered it desirable for a mission of experts to these three sites to be organized so that the Romanian authorities could be helped to prepare the necessary protective measures.

Engelsberg Ironworks	556	Sweden
----------------------	-----	--------

The Bureau deferred the examination of this nomination pending the completion of a study by ICOMOS of the industrial heritage which had been requested by the Committee.

the World Heritage List; the Secretariat indicated that the words "over a long period of time" included in the draft text would exclude such a case. Another Bureau member noted that some landscapes in Italy still show the same forms of land use as had been made by Greek immigrants in the years B.C. which now have to be protected against industrialized architecture - the draft criterion as presented would do this.

62. The Secretariat noted that a generally positive response to the paper had been received from English Heritage, that ICOMOS (U.K.) had made some interesting criticisms but had not developed an alternative and had set up a working group on landscapes. The representative of ICOMOS expressed appreciation of the work done and expressed the wish of his organization to participate in the next stage of development. There was general agreement that the wording could be improved and specific suggestions from several members were recorded by the Secretariat.

63. The representative of IUCN felt that the addition of such a criterion to those for cultural sites had a number of implications for natural sites and he felt that the wisdom of adding such a criterion was not accepted by all States. Since three quarters of all sites inscribed were already cultural sites, the balance would be even more uneven. It would widen the disparity in distribution, since the need to accept such sites was not being advanced by any non-European State. Paragraph 33 (A), would mean that almost no sites would be inscribed since the words "traditional life-style" would exclude cars and other features of modern life so that very few places would meet the criterion. Finally he felt that any working group should be international in character, since there was a risk that any national group would design a criterion with its own national sites in mind.

64. A member of the Bureau remarked that there was a natural variation in the number of potential world heritage sites in different areas of the world and that it would be artificial to imply targets in this respect. It was noted that some States such as Canada would undoubtedly want to consider aboriginal landscapes in the light of such a criterion and that the views of other parts of the world were important on the draft. It was agreed that the Secretariat, in consultation with ICOMOS, should bring an improved version of the document before the next meeting of the Bureau which could then be presented to the Committee for comment.

65. The Bureau examined document SC-91/CONF.001/9 and acknowledged the need to review natural heritage criteria. The Bureau noted that individual criteria may refer specifically to geological, biological, ecological and aesthetic phenomena. The Bureau recommended that the Committee request a revision of natural heritage criteria as one of the outcomes of the evaluation of the commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention. The Bureau requested the Secretariat and IUCN to co-operate in this regard using information from all available sources, e.g. recommendations of the Task Force of Geologists, IUCN's

Oceanic Islands Study and specialist networks which co-operate with IUCN and UNESCO. The Bureau recommended that the Secretariat and IUCN work together to provide another draft of the revised natural heritage criteria which includes one geological criterion that incorporates all the major features of the three geological criteria proposed by the Task Force of Geologists who met at UNESCO Headquarters in February 1991.

66. The other amendments to the Guidelines as indicated in document SC-91/CONF.001/11, were accepted with slight changes of wordings in the English version in paragraph III(E) and paragraph VI(F). It was noted that the conditions for the granting of technical assistance are now parallel to the conditions for eligibility for the World Heritage Committee as established by Article 16 of the Convention. In reply to an inquiry concerning problems of States which did not have the same fiscal year as the World Heritage Fund, it was explained that the words "following calendar year" in fact allowed a leeway of two years within which payment into the Fund would be seen as sufficient to meet the requirements of the Guidelines.

67. It was noted that the Secretariat had still to develop a Guideline in respect of objects in site museums as requested by the last Bureau meeting.

XII. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

68. The Bureau took note of the Report on Promotional Activities contained in document SC-91/CONF.001/12. It expressed satisfaction at the development of these activities, which were noteworthy not only in respect of the increase in the initiatives taken by the States themselves, but also in respect of the production of informative material in more languages than before, and the diversification of media carrying such material. The Bureau was particularly pleased by the production of a booklet on the Convention in Chinese and Russian, the preparation of a German version of the World Heritage Diary, and current negotiations for the production of an illustrated list of World Heritage sites which, thanks to a mail order sales network, would make the objectives of the Convention and the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List very widely known in France and abroad. The Bureau deeply regretted, however, that the proposed co-publication with UNESCO and the Hachette and INCAFO publishing houses had not been brought to a conclusion, and pointed out the need for the Committee to have its own policy where publications on the Convention were concerned.

69. With regard to the relationships between tourism and the World Heritage, the Bureau discussed two proposals which had been submitted to it; namely a request from a travel organization for permission to use the Heritage logo in its promotional booklet, and the plan submitted by the INCAFO publishing company to produce a tourist guide to the World Heritage. The Bureau recommended that the travel organization be authorized to use the logo on the express condition that

the introductory text to the Convention, referring to the dangers of tourism where certain sites were concerned, be prepared by the Secretariat and that the list of sites contained in the booklet be submitted in advance to the Secretariat. Regarding the proposed guide, the Bureau considered that it would be advisable to wait until the links between tourism and the World Heritage had been studied in greater depth in the context of the evaluation undertaken before making a decision on this matter. In this connection, the Bureau noted that contacts had been established with WTO, which had already worked with IUCN on the preparation of guidelines for tourism and national parks. The Bureau also noted that the joint work of Greece and Italy on cultural tourism could make a contribution to the study.

XIII. PREPARATION OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CONVENTION

70. The Bureau noted the stage of advancement of preparations for the commemoration in 1992 of the anniversary of the adoption of the Convention. With regard to the evaluation of the implementation of the Convention, already referred to in the discussion of the monitoring of the conservation of properties, the Bureau noted that two meetings would be held, in late August and early September, with ICOMOS and ICCROM, and with IUCN, respectively. Furthermore, advantage could be taken of the 4th World Park Congress, organized by IUCN in Venezuela in February, in conjunction with which a workshop on the World Heritage Convention was to be held, which could also contribute to the evaluation. Concerning the preparation of promotional events, the Bureau noted that a circular had been sent to the States Parties asking them to participate in the exhibition and the "national days" to be held at UNESCO Headquarters. Replies were beginning to arrive at the Secretariat, which would submit a report on the stage of progress of these preparations at the next session of the Committee.

XIV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE

71. The Bureau examined document SC-91/CONF.004/14 and congratulated the Secretariat for having condensed the information of nearly two years of activities undertaken to implement the Convention in a short and concise document. The Bureau requested that the Secretariat incorporate the editorial changes and additions suggested by the Delegate for Thailand and the representative of IUCN and submit the revised version of the document to the twenty-sixth session of UNESCO's General Conference scheduled to meet in Paris in October-November 1991.

XV. DATE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE FIFTEENTH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

72. After consulting with the Delegate of Tunisia, the Bureau confirmed that, as decided by the Committee at its last session, the fifteenth session of the Committee would be held in Carthage, Tunisia, from 9-13 December 1991.

XVI. OTHER BUSINESS

73. The Bureau examined the Provisional Agenda (Document SC-91/CONF.001/15) and decided that the Committee would examine nominations of natural properties before nominations of cultural properties.

74. The Delegate of Tunisia informed the Bureau of the preparations the Tunisian authorities were making to host the fifteenth session of the Committee during 9-13 December 1991. The observer from Greece drew the Bureau's attention to the handling of a proposal for inscription made by his country. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that, following the Committee's instructions in the Guidelines to apply the Guidelines strictly, this nomination, with a number of others, had not been passed to ICOMOS as the file was not complete at the date of lodgement. Supplementary information had since been received and the Secretariat assured the Bureau that the complete file would be forwarded to ICOMOS which would be able to make the technical evaluation for 1992.

75. The Chairperson informed the Bureau of the forthcoming international conference on World Heritage Cities scheduled to be held in Quebec, Canada, from 30 June to 4 July 1991, in which more than 70 international experts were expected to participate. The Bureau requested the Chairperson to convey the interest and wishes of the Committee for the success of this Conference.

XVII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

76. The Chairperson thanked the members of the Bureau and all those who had contributed to the success of the session and declared the session closed.