

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION
OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee
Seventh Ordinary Session
Florence (Italy), 5-9 December 1983

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Seventh Ordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the invitation of the Government of Italy in the Villa Medicea of Poggio a Caiano, Florence, from 5 to 9 December 1983. It was attended by the following States Members of the World Heritage Committee: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cyprus, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey.

2. Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.

3. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the following States Parties who are not members of the Committee: Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Holy See, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, United States of America. The International Union of Architects (IUA) and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) also sent representatives. The full list of participants can be found in Annex I of this report.

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the session was opened by Mr. J. Gazaneo of Argentina, since the outgoing Chairman, Prof. R. Slatyer, could not attend the meeting. Mr. Gazaneo welcomed the delegates and observers and introduced the opening addresses by the Representative of the Director-General of Unesco, Mr. M. Batisse, and the Italian authorities. Mrs. L. Vlad-Borrelli,

Representative of the Minister of Cultural Properties and Cultural Environment conveyed the greetings of the Minister and recalled that the town of Florence is one of the Italian cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. Welcoming addresses were also given by: the Superintendent of Architectural Properties and the Cultural Environment of Florence and the Region of Pistoia, M. A. Calvani; the Cultural attaché to the Mayor of Florence, Mr. M.G. Morales, the representative of the President of the Regional Authority of Tuscany, Mr. M. Mayer and the Mayor of Poggio a Caiano, Mr. S. Pezzati.

5. The Acting Chairman then requested H.E. the Honourable Mr. G. Whitlam, Australia, to read the message to the Committee from the outgoing Chairman, Prof. R. Slatyer. The full text of this message is reproduced in Annex II to this Report.

6. On behalf of the Committee, the Acting Chairman conveyed his gratitude to Prof. Slatyer for his firm dedication and continuous effort in promoting the World Heritage Convention during the past few years.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. The Committee adopted the agenda for the meeting with the amendment to discuss the difficulties encountered in evaluating nominations of historic towns after point 6 of the agenda.

IV. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND RAPPORTEUR

8. The Committee elected by acclamation Mrs. Vlad-Borrelli (Italy) as Chairman of the Committee and Mr. da Silva Telles (Brazil) as Rapporteur. The following States were elected also by acclamation as Vice-Chairmen: Algeria, Australia, Guinea, Norway and Sri Lanka.

V. REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

9. Mr. Batisse, Assistant Director General (Science Sector) presented the report of the Secretariat and drew attention to the report of the seventh session of the Bureau held on 27-30 June 1983. He noted that since that date, the 4th General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention had taken place on 28 October 1983 during the 22nd session of the Unesco General Conference. As stipulated by the Convention, the mandate of 7 countries expired and the following countries were elected: Algeria, Australia (re-election), Lebanon, Malawi, Norway, Sri Lanka, and Turkey. He indicated that 64 countries were present to elect these new Committee members, which is indicative of a growing interest in the Convention and its work. This interest was also manifested at the General Conference itself. However, although the number of States adhering to the Convention - 78 as of the end of November 1983 - continues to grow, this was, unfortunately, not the case for the financial contributions. Although 18 countries had paid their obligatory contributions since 1 August 1983, there were still delays in the payments of voluntary contributions, some of which represent considerable amounts.

10. He indicated that in view of this financial situation, more effort had been made to launch promotional activities which, at little or no cost to Unesco, could generate income for the World Heritage Fund. One example was the series of books entitled "El Patrimonio de la Humanidad" which is being produced by the Spanish Institute for Wildlife Photography (INCAFO). The first volume of this series, richly illustrated and prefaced by the Director General of Unesco, had already been published.

11. Mr. Batisse then described briefly the many activities supported by the World Heritage Fund undertaken since the previous session as indicated in document SC/83/CONF.009/INF.4. He added, however, that these numerous activities are handled by a Secretariat which must also work on other programmes, such as international campaigns for the cultural heritage and the Man and Biosphere Programme (MAB). The Secretariat also has endeavoured to improve the balance between culture and nature within the Convention and in this connection, it was noted that tentative lists for natural sites had now been received from several countries.

12. Mr. Batisse expressed his appreciation to ICOMOS and IUCN for their contribution towards the implementation of the Convention.

VI. UPDATED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

13. At its seventh session, the Bureau had expressed the wish that the Operational Guidelines (document WHC/2 Revised) be updated to incorporate the decisions taken by the Committee at its fifth and sixth sessions and the recommendations formulated by the Bureau at its seventh session. The Secretariat presented the updated version of the Operational Guidelines (revised as of November 1983) and indicated to the Committee where changes and revisions had been made. The Committee took note of the updated version of the guidelines and in addition accepted the ICOMOS recommendations concerning the documentation which should be submitted in support of all nominations of architectural ensembles or other cultural areas. The Committee asked the Secretariat to insert a description of this documentation into paragraph 41 of the revised Guidelines.

VII. TENTATIVE LISTS

14. The Committee noted that tentative lists for natural properties had been submitted by Brazil and Portugal, presented in document SC/83/CONF.009/INF.3.

15. The Committee was greatly interested in the ideas presented by Mr. Parent, President of ICOMOS, in his report given at the seventh session of the Bureau, notably concerning the difficulties currently encountered in applying the cultural criteria to the nominations of historic towns, cultural properties representative of a series and the criterion of authenticity. After discussion, the Committee stated its full agreement with the ideas expressed by Mr. Parent.

16. The Committee recalled that, as early as 1979 it had recommended to States Parties to draw up tentative lists of cultural and natural properties suitable for nomination to the World Heritage List. In conformity with Article 11.1 of the Convention concerning the presentation of inventories, the Committee requested all States Parties that had not already done so to send this tentative list to the Secretariat during the course of 1984.

17. Should any State meet particular difficulties in rapidly preparing a tentative list, it could request help from ICOMOS or IUCN according to the characteristics of the property in question, and if necessary request preparatory assistance under the World Heritage Fund.

18. The nominations of cultural properties by States which had not submitted such a tentative list after this time period could not be examined thereafter by ICOMOS. The submission of tentative lists for natural sites is also requested in order to facilitate the evaluation of nominations by IUCN.

19. The Committee, having requested ICOMOS to examine all the cultural nominations in the light of comparative studies, noted that tentative lists are also desirable for the examination of cultural nominations submitted before 1 January 1984.

20. Tentative lists, as their name implies, do not definitely commit the States nor the Committee. They should therefore be treated in a confidential manner. Their aim is to enable the Committee and the non-governmental organization concerned to carry out comparative and serial studies which are necessary for a methodical approach in building up the World Heritage List.

21. Consequently, each State submitting a tentative list should provide the following information for every property on that list:

- a) reference as to the category of properties defined in the Convention,
- b) reference to the criteria that warrant the nomination:
- c) In the case of cultural properties, a reference can be added to the cultural area or to the type of property implicitly concerned, particularly when the reference to the criteria relates to the representativity of a series.
- d) Finally, whenever a State includes in its tentative list a cultural property with the intention to associate with it an entire series of other properties similar in character and whose cultural value is due to this multiplicity and similarity, the State should specify this intention and should leave open the alternative of retaining eventually only one or a limited number of such properties as representing the series.

22. States having no need of assistance in preparing tentative lists of cultural properties could submit these lists before 1 June 1984. This would permit a first typological sorting before the next meeting of the Bureau. An account thereof would be given by ICOMOS at the next meeting of the Committee.

23. At the same time, the Committee invites ICOMOS to prepare a preliminary typological study, based on all cultural properties already included in the World Heritage List and on a review of the tentative lists already submitted.

24. As far as a certain number of criteria are concerned which raise problems of interpretation pointed out in Mr. Parent's report, ICOMOS will convene small groups of experts who are specialists in specific fields so that they may, on the basis of the information obtained through the nomination documents of sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List and through the tentative lists already deposited, formulate suggestions towards the interpretation of these criteria which will then be submitted to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee and to the next session of the Committee. This would in particular be the case with regard to:

- "historic cities",
- properties representing events, ideas or beliefs, and
- clarifying the notion of authenticity.

25. The representative of IUCN noted that India had not yet submitted nominations of natural properties although this country had a number of sites which possibly could meet World Heritage criteria. The Committee noted that other States Parties had similarly not yet submitted natural nominations and expressed concern that appropriate balance with cultural properties be obtained on the World Heritage List. In the case of India, the Committee encouraged the Indian authorities to submit a tentative list of natural properties.

26. The Committee expressed its gratitude to both ICOMOS and IUCN for their work towards preparing tentative lists of cultural and natural properties respectively.

VIII. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

27. Before the Committee examined the cultural and natural nominations to the World Heritage List, ICOMOS and IUCN respectively presented a series of slides illustrating the cultural and natural features of each proposed property.

28. The Committee noted that the nominations of the Church of St. Elizabeth of Marburg and the Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Federal Republic of Germany), as well as the nomination of the Palais des Papes, the Old Cathedral of Notre-Dame-des-Doms, Pont Saint-Bénézet and ramparts of Avignon (France) had been withdrawn.

29. The Committee examined the nominations to the World Heritage List, taking note of the comments of the representatives of ICOMOS and/or IUCN which had made an evaluation of each property. The Committee decided to enter in the World Heritage List the twenty-nine cultural and natural properties as follows:

.../...

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Fed. Rep. of Germany	271	<u>The Pilgrimage Church of Wies</u>	C (i) (iii)
Brazil	275	<u>The ruins of São Miguel das Missoes</u> It was pointed out that this property belongs to a series of similar properties and that Argentina, on its side, has announced its intention of proposing the Jesuit missions of San Ignacio Mini and Santa Maria la Mayor.	C (iv)
Bulgaria	217	<u>The Ancient City of Nessebar</u>	C (iii) (iv)
Bulgaria	216	<u>Rila Monastery</u> This property was not considered as a testimony of mediaeval civilisation but rather as a symbol of the 19th Century Bulgarian Renaissance which imparted slavie cultural values upon Rila in trying to re-establish an uninterrupted historical continuity. The reconstruction of Rila (1834-1962) thus illustrates cultural criterion (vi) of the Operational Guidelines.	C (vi)
Bulgaria	219	<u>Srebarna Nature Reserve</u>	N (iv)
Bulgaria	225	<u>Pirin National Park</u>	N (i) (ii) (iii)
Canada	256	<u>Wood Buffalo National Park</u> The Committee drew attention to the harmful consequences that the eventual construction of a dam on the Slave River could have on those natural characteristics which make the property of outstanding universal value. It therefore recommended that the Canadian authorities take all possible measures to protect the integrity of the site.	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Costa Rica	205	<u>Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves</u> The Committee reiterated the Bureau's wish that the Panamanian authorities take the initiative of nominating the part of the Friendship (Amistad) Park located in their territory.	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)
Ivory Coast	227	<u>Comoé National Park</u> The Committee recommended that the authorities should consider extending the protected area to include Mts. Gorowi and Kongoli thus enhancing the ecological and touristic value of this property.	N (ii) (iv)
Ecuador	280	<u>Sangay National Park</u>	N (ii) (iii) (iv)
United States of America	259	<u>Great Smoky Mountains National Park</u>	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)
United States of America	266	<u>La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico</u>	C (vi)
France	229	<u>Place Stanislas, Place de la Carrière and Place d'Alliance, Nancy</u>	C (i) (iv)
France	230	<u>Church of Saint-Savin-sur-Gartempe</u> It was noted that this property becomes part of the series of important groups of Romanesque mural paintings.	C (i) (iii)
France	258	<u>Cape Girolata, Cape Porto and Scandola Nature Reserve in Corsica</u>	N (ii) (iii) (iv)

<u>Contracting State</u> <u>having submitted the</u> <u>nomination of the</u> <u>property in accordance</u> <u>with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
India	242	<u>Ajanta Caves</u> The Committee recommended that the authorities take all possible safeguarding measures, especially as concerns constructions on the summit of the cliff which could be detrimental for the site.	C (i) (ii) (iii) (vi)
India	243	<u>Ellora Caves</u> The Committee recommended that the authorities establish a protection zone which would safeguard the surrounding landscape and the cliff, and provide a map indicating the delimitation of this zone.	C (i) (iii) (v)
India	251	<u>Agra Fort</u> The Committee recommended that the authorities create a buffer zone of protection between the Fort and the Taj Mahal so as to safeguard the landscape and the environment between these two quite different monuments.	C (iii)
India	252	<u>Taj Mahal</u>	C (i)
Peru	273	<u>City of Cuzco</u> The Committee recommended that the zone of protection be extended to the surroundings of the city in order to include the Canchas and the old Inca villages.	C (iii) (iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Peru	274	<u>Santuario historico de Machu Picchu</u> The Committee noted that this site is inscribed for both its cultural and natural values, as this property also meets natural criteria (ii) and (iii). The Committee furthermore recommended that to enhance the cultural and natural value of this property, the site should be extended to include the lower courses of the Urubamba River and the sites of Pisac and Ollantaytambo in the "Valley of the Gods".	C (i) (iii) N (ii) (iii)
Portugal	206	<u>Central Zone of the Town of Angra do Heroismo (Azores)</u>	C (iv) (vi)
Portugal	263	<u>The monastery of the Hieronymites and the Tower of Belem (Lisbon)</u>	C (iii) (vi)
Portugal	264	<u>The monastery of Batalha</u>	C (i) (ii)
Portugal	265	<u>The convent of Christ (Tomar)</u>	C (i) (vi)
Seychelles	261	<u>Vallée de Mai Nature Reserve</u> The Committee recommended that the Government of the Seychelles should extend this property to include the whole of Praslin National Park and that the management plan for the park (which encompasses the Vallée de Mai) be fully implemented.	N (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
Switzerland	268	<u>The Convent of St. Gall</u>	C (ii) (iv)
Switzerland	269	<u>The Benedictine Convent of St. John at Mustair</u>	C (iii)
Switzerland	267	<u>The Old City of Berne</u> The Old City of Berne was inscribed on the World Heritage List. While taking account of the significant modifications that have been made since its foundation in the 12th Century; the Committee considered that it constituted a positive example of how a mediaeval urban structure can be adapted to fulfill functions which are incre- singly complex, notably the function of a capital city of a modern State.	C (iii)

30. Following the recommendations of its Bureau, the Committee decided to defer examination of the nominations which are listed below until it receives the necessary information:

Afghanistan	207	<u>The City and Monuments of Herat</u>	
Afghanistan	211	<u>The Minaret of Jam</u>	
Ghana	226	<u>Bia National Park</u>	
Ghana	279	<u>Traditional Mosques of Northern Ghana</u>	
India	234	<u>Churches and Convents of Goa</u>	
Iraq	276	<u>Ancient Samarra</u>	
Sudan	262	<u>Sanganeb Atoll</u>	

31. In addition, the Committee deferred the examination of the following properties since the conditions under which the Bureau had recommended their inscription on the World Heritage List had not yet been fulfilled:

<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Name of Property</u>
Afghanistan	208	<u>The Monuments of Bamiyan Valley</u>
Afghanistan	209	<u>The Archaeological City of Al Khanum</u>
India	240	<u>Khajuraho group of monuments</u>
India	241	<u>Group of monuments at Hampi</u>
Iraq	277	<u>Hatra</u>
Iraq	278	<u>Babylon</u>
Syrian Arab Republic	21	<u>Ancient City of Aleppo</u>

32. The Committee also decided not to include the Ancient City of Plovdiv nominated by Bulgaria on the World Heritage List. The Committee considered that it was difficult at this stage to include urban sites on the list for their vernacular architecture and that the problems concerning the types of towns characteristic of the different regions of the World would first have to be clarified.

IX. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET FOR 1984

33. The Representative of the Director General recalled that the Bureau, at its last session in June 1983 had expressed its concern over the unsatisfactory situation of the World Heritage Fund. At that date, the Bureau had envisaged that the budget for 1984 should not exceed approximately \$500,000. However, he suggested that this working figure could be slightly raised in the light of the fact that 18 States Parties had paid their obligatory contributions during the period 1 August to 30 November 1983, that interest had been accrued and that the Secretariat had made savings on the budget approved for 1983 in accordance with the Bureau's wishes.

../..

34. The Committee accordingly adopted the following budget for the period 1st January - 31 December 1984.

	US \$
I. Preparatory assistance and regional studies	60,000
II. Technical co-operation	
- requests approved by the Committee:	150,000
- "small" requests:	50,000
	<hr/>
	200,000
III. Training	150,000
IV. Emergency assistance	50,000
V. Promotional activities and information	70,000
VI. Advisory services	
- ICOMOS : 65,000	
- IUCN : 35,000	
	<hr/>
	100,000
VII. Temporary assistance to the Secretariat	90,000
	<hr/>
	720,000
3% contingencies	21,600
	<hr/>
Total	<u><u>741,600</u></u>

35. The Committee indicated its grave concern about the situation resulting from delays in payment of obligatory or voluntary contributions. Concerning the voluntary contributions mentioned in Article 16, paragraph 4 of the Convention, the Committee underlined that in the spirit of the Convention, voluntary contributions should not be less than what they would have been if the States Parties concerned had opted for payment of obligatory contributions. The Committee expressed the hope that the discrepancy between resources available to the World Heritage Fund and the growing interest in the Convention would be reduced in the near future and appealed to all States Parties to help in this respect.

X. REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

36. The Secretariat informed the Committee of the new requests received for technical cooperation (presented in document SC/83/CONF.009/4) and of the situation concerning the implementation of projects approved previously. On the basis of the recommendation of a working group set up during the session, the Committee approved the following requests:

Costa Rica	Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserve Request No. 205.1 (Rev.2)	US \$ 25,000
Ivory Coast	Tai National Park Request No. 159.1 (Rev.1)	US \$ 30,000
Haiti	Citadel Henry Natural History Park Request No. 180.1	US \$ 20,000
Honduras	Maya Ruins of Copan Request No. 129.1	US \$ 20,000
Honduras	Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve Request No. 196.1 (Rev.2)	US \$ 20,000
Nepal	Sagarmatha National Park Request No. 120.1(4)	US \$ 10,000
Panama	Darien National Park Request No. 159.1 (Rev.2)	US \$ 25,000

Total concerning cultural and natural
properties US \$ 150,000

Plus 25% reserve for small-scale
projects US \$ 50,000

Total US \$200,000

37. The following requests for training activities which were submitted as part of technical cooperation requests were also approved:

Costa Rica	Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserve Request No. 205.1 (Rev.2)	US \$ 5,000
Honduras	Maya Ruins of Copan Request No. 129.1	US \$ 26,000
Honduras	Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve Request No. 196.1 (Rev.2)	US \$ 6,000

Total of requests in the field of
cultural and natural heritage
conservation US \$ 37,000

38. Concerning the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, the Secretariat informed the Committee of the decision taken by the Executive Board at its 116th session and of the resolution that had been adopted by the General Conference at its recent 22nd session which invited the Committee to continue its efforts for the preservation of this exceptional universal legacy in accordance with the provisions of the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat explained that every effort was being made to implement the technical cooperation request (No. 148.1) for which an amount of \$100,000 had been approved by the Committee at its 6th Session. However, it had not been possible in 1983 to organize the missions of specialists which had been requested. Therefore, this amount was still earmarked for possible utilization in 1984. The Committee took note of this situation and considered that the project could be initiated with the amount of funds kept available. Should additional funds prove necessary in the course of 1984, the request for such funds could be submitted to the Chairman of the Committee and could be met from the reserve for small-scale projects or for emergency assistance.

39. The World Heritage Committee was greatly moved by the declaration of the representative of Lebanon concerning the current tragic situation of the cultural heritage of his country. The Committee unanimously expressed its very grave concern about the immediate dangers threatening a number of sites in Lebanon which could be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Committee appealed to all parties concerned by the events occurring in Lebanon to make every effort to safeguard the rich cultural heritage of this country and to avoid any harmful action in this respect. The Committee requests its Bureau, in cooperation with ICOMOS, to proceed with the utmost expediency in examining the nominations to the World Heritage List deposited by the Lebanese authorities. The Committee also invites the Secretariat to provide the emergency assistance which could be requested by these authorities in the framework of the Convention and to take every possible step to bring its appeal to the attention of international public opinion.

XI. PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF PROPERTIES INCLUDED IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

40. The Committee took note of a background document prepared by IUCN on the question of monitoring natural World Heritage properties.

41. The Committee considered that it was highly desirable to be regularly informed on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, particularly on measures undertaken to protect and manage these properties and on the way in which the funds allocated under the World Heritage Fund are used. However, the Committee preferred not to establish a formal reporting system at the present time and rather encouraged IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM to collect information through their experts. The Committee will continue to seek information from States Parties on an ad hoc basis whenever this is necessary for making its decisions.

42. In this connection, the Committee took note of the information provided by the Government of Australia concerning the Western Tasmania Wilderness National Parks explaining the reasons why the Government of Australia deems it inappropriate to consider this property for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

43. The representative of IUCN informed the Committee of the serious shortcomings in the management of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. The Committee asked the Secretariat to communicate with the Government of Tanzania in order to initiate the procedure for including this property in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

44. Finally, it was recalled that the Committee had suggested at its previous session that the Government of Senegal should propose the Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary for the List of World Heritage in Danger.

XII. REVIEW OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

45. The Committee examined document SC/83/CONF.009/7 concerning activities for the promotion of the World Heritage Convention and expressed its satisfaction on the activities that had been accomplished.

46. The Committee decided that the funds foreseen in the budget for promotional activities should essentially be used, on the one hand, to make World Heritage properties better known to the public and heighten the public's awareness of the need to safeguard them and, on the other hand, to generate income to the World Heritage Fund. In this respect, the Committee approved the proposals for future activities made by the Secretariat and asked in particular that as far as possible, income or profits from the sale of materials relating to World Heritage be deposited in the World Heritage Fund.

47. The Committee asked States Parties concerned to provide the Photothèque of Unesco, if possible, with the highest-quality photographic material available on World Heritage properties located within their territories.

48. The Committee asked the Secretariat to prepare a mock-up of a poster/pamphlet to be examined by the Bureau at its next session.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

49. The Committee noted with gratitude the Government of Argentina's invitation to hold its next session in Buenos Aires. The delegate of Cyprus reiterated the intention of his country to invite the Committee in 1985, on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the creation of the Antiquities Department.

50. The representative of the Holy See, as observer, conveyed a cordial greeting to all participants from His Holiness the Pope Jean Paul II and informed the Committee that the buildings and monuments of the Holy See had been recently nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List.

51. Mr. Serangelli, the representative of Mr. Gullotti, Minister of Cultural Properties and Cultural Environment of Italy, conveyed the Minister's regrets on not being able to attend the session and his thanks to all participants for having come to this meeting in Italy. The Minister furthermore informed the Committee that Italy would proceed to nominate other monuments and sites for inscription in the World Heritage List in the near future.

52. The Committee, expressed his thanks to Mrs. Vlad-Borrelli for the efficient and gracious manner in which she had chaired the meeting. It also thanked the Italian authorities for their warm hospitality.

53. After thanking all those who had contributed to the meeting, Mrs. Vlad-Borrelli, as Chairman, declared the meeting closed.

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL/WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Septième session ordinaire/Seventh Ordinary Session

Florence, 5 - 9 décembre 1983

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE/STATES MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

ALGERIE/ALGERIA

M. Sid Ahmed BAGHLI
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

M. Said DAHMANI
Conservateur, Musée d'Hippone/ANNABA

ALLEMAGNE (Rép. féd. d')/GERMANY (Fed. Rep. of)

S. Exc. M. Alfred B. VESTRING
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

Dr. Hans CASPARY
Oberkonservator
Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Rheinland-Pfalz (Mainz)

Dr. Werner BORNHEIM

ARGENTINE/ARGENTINA

M. Jorge GAZANEO
Directeur de l'Institut d'art américain et du
Centre pour la Préservation du patrimoine monumental
Université de Buenos Aires

AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA

H. E. The Honourable E.G. WHITLAM
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Dr. W. NICHOLLS
Acting Director
Australian Heritage Commission

Mr. J.M.C. WATSON
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

BRESIL/BRAZIL

M. le Professeur Marcos Vinicius VILACA
Secrétaire à la Culture, Ministère de l'Education
et de la Culture

M. Augusto Carlos DA SILVA TELLES
Directeur du Service du Classement et de la Conservation
des Monuments Historiques du Secrétariat à la Culture

M. Carlos Alberto LOPES ASFORA
Deuxième secrétaire d'Ambassade, membre de la Délégation
permanente auprès de l'Unesco

CHYPRE/CYPRUS

H. E. Mr. Constantinos LEVENTIS
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. Christos CASSIMATIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

FRANCE

M. André ZAVRIEW
Délégué permanent adjoint auprès de l'Unesco

M. Lucien CHABASON
Chef du Service de l'espace et des sites
Ministère de l'urbanisme et du logement

M. Pierre KALFON
Attaché culturel auprès de l'Ambassade de France en Italie

M. Jean ROZAT
Sous-Directeur
Direction du Patrimoine, Ministère de la Culture

GUINEE/GUINEA

M. Youssouf DIARE
Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

ITALIE/ITALY

Mme Licia VLAD-BORRELLI
Inspecteur central pour l'archéologie

M. Branko S. LOVRECIC
Ministère des affaires étrangères - DGRC/II (Rome)

M. Angelo CALVANI
Soprintendente ai Beni Ambientali e Architettonici di Firenze e Pistoia

M. Gian Franco BORSI
Vice-Président, Comité de la Culture, Commission nationale pour l'Unesco

JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE/LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Dr. Abdullah SHAIBOUB
Director-General, Department of Antiquities
SARY - Al Hamra - Tripoli

JORDANIE/JORDAN

M. Mohammad AL-BATAINEH
Cultural Counsellor
Jordan Embassy, Rome

LIBAN/LEBANON

M. Wagih GHOSOUB
Chargé des affaires culturelles
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

NORVEGE/NORWAY

Mr. Stephan TSCHUDI-MADSEN
Director-General of the Central Office of Historic Monuments
Riksantikvaren, Bygn. 18, Akershus Festning, Oslo, Norway

Miss Oda Helen SLETNES
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

SRI LANKA

S. Exc. M. Nadarajah BALASUBRAMANIAM
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

S. Exc. M. Ch. HUMMEL
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

M. Ernest MARTIN
Architecte SIA/FAS
Membre correspondant de la Commission fédérale
des monuments historiques

TURQUIE/TURKEY

Mme. Vera INAL
Conseiller, Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

Mme. Nusin ASGARI
Director, Istanbul Archaeological Museum

II. ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT AVEC UN STATUT CONSULTATIF/
ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY

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

M. Michel PARENT
Président

M. Léon PRESSOUYRE
Professeur à l'Université de Paris I

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

M. Jeffrey A. Mc EELY
Programme Director

Dr. James W. THORSELL
Executive Officer Designate, CNPPA

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

M. Alejandro ALVA
Coordinateur assistant
Cours de conservation architecturale

III. OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVERS

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

BULGARIE/BULGARIA

Mme. Magdalena STANTSHEVA
Directeur du Musée de l'Histoire (Sofia)

M. le Prof. Simeon NEDIALKOV
Directeur de l'Institut de l'environnement
Académie des Sciences de Bulgarie

CANADA

M. Alex T. DAVIDSON
Assistant Deputy Minister, Parks Canada

COSTA RICA

S. Exc. M. Francisco Antonio PACHECO-FERNANDEZ
Ambassadeur à Rome

DANEMARK/DENMARK

Mme. Lisbeth SAABY
National Agency for the Protection of Nature, Monuments and Sites

EGYPTE/EGYPT

M. Ali EL-KHOULI
Director-General, Egyptian Antiquities Organization

M. Saad DARWISH
Cultural Counsellor, General Egyptian Book Organization

EQUATEUR/ECUADOR

M. Laurato POZO
Deuxième Secrétaire
Ambassade d'Equateur en Italie

ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE/UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mme. Susan RECCE
Staff Assistant to Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks
Department of the Interior

Mme. Pamela BELLAMY
Cultural Attaché, Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Mr. Richard COOK
National Park Service, Department of the Interior

MAROC/MORROCO

M. Driss DKHISSI
Directeur du patrimoine culturel, Rabat

NIGERIA

Mme. J.S. ATTAH
Permanent Delegate to Unesco

PEROU/PERU

S. Exc. M. Luis Felipe ALARCO
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

POLOGNE/POLAND

M. Marian ARSZYNSKI
Professor of the History of Art and protection of monuments
University of Torun

PORTUGAL

M. Alvaro MONJARDINO
Président de l'Assemblée régionale des Açores

M. Manuel LOPES CARDOSO
Conseiller d'Ambassade, Rome

PORTUGAL (suite/cont'd)

M. Luis Antonio GUIZADO DE GOUVEIA DURAO
Architecte, Bureau des affaires culturelles des Açores

M. Luiz dos Santos CASTRO LOBO
Ministère de la Culture

SAINT SIEGE/HOLY SEE

S. Exc. Mgr. Ernesto GALLINA
Secrétariat d'Etat, Section Organisations internationales
Cité du Vatican

B. ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES/INTERNATIONAL
NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

M. Romano VIVIANO
Union internationale des architectes

M. Tommaso RISTORI
Conseiller régional du WWF

IV. SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO/UNESCO SECRETARIAT

M. Michel BATISSE
Sous-Directeur général
(Secteur des Sciences)

M. Bernd VON DROSTE
Division des Sciences écologiques

Mme. Anne RAIDL
Chef, Section des Normes internationales
Division du Patrimoine culturel

Mme. Jane ROBERTSON-VERNHES
Division des Sciences écologiques

M. Richard BILL
Consultant
Division des Sciences écologiques

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE 7TH SESSION

FLORENCE, DECEMBER 1983

ADDRESS BY THE OUTGOING CHAIRMAN OF THE
WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, PROFESSOR RALPH SLATYER

It has been an honour to participate in all but one meeting of this Committee, to have served on the Bureau since 1980 and to have served as Chairman since 1981.

In this farewell message I would first like to thank members of the Committee for the confidence shown in me by my election in 1981 and re-election in 1982. As Chairman, one has the opportunity to work closely with members of the Bureau, members of the Secretariat and with representatives of non-government organizations, particularly ICOMOS and IUCN. I have been greatly stimulated by these contacts and have developed a keen sense of admiration for the dedicated people in each of these groups. Let me take this

2.

opportunity to thank them most warmly for the role they have played and will continue to play in the Committee's important work for the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage.

The World Heritage List now contains 137 properties; more will be added at this Session of the World Heritage Committee. They represent nominations by 40 countries in all continents. As a result I think that we can now say that the World Heritage List is taking its rightful place as the definitive list of the world's most outstanding cultural and natural properties.

However, much remains to be done and I hope you will permit me to identify briefly some of the matters which I hope you will bear in mind at this Session of the Committee and in the years ahead.

In the first place I would hope that you would continue your efforts to encourage additional countries to ratify or accept the Convention. The number of States Parties to the Convention has increased rapidly, from the first, the United States of America in December 1973, to the most recent, a few weeks ago. While this number now reflects representation from all continents there are still significant gaps with the

3.

Asia-Pacific region, containing outstanding examples of the world's heritage, being particularly poorly represented. In fact, in eastern and south-east Asia, and in the south-west Pacific there is only one State Party at the present time. Only when all countries become Parties to the Convention will the opportunity exist for the World Heritage List to include all the world's cultural and natural heritage.

The second matter which I wish to raise concerns a convention adopted by the Committee over the past six years which has become important in its work but which is not yet embodied in the Rules of Procedure. It concerns the difficulties which can arise when nomination of a property for inscription on the World Heritage List is made by a country which is a member of the Committee.

From the beginning of the Committee's work it became apparent that such nominations could cause difficulties if the Committee member from the country making the nomination was expected to act as the advocate for the nomination. Such advocacy was seen to place considerable pressure on the Committee to make a favourable decision, thereby giving a distinct advantage to nominations coming from States which were Committee members in comparison to those from States

4.

which were not. It was also felt that the State's representative was placed in an embarrassing position.

In order to minimise these problems the Committee has adopted the procedure whereby Committee members do not speak on behalf of their own nominations. Instead, IUCN or ICOMOS, as appropriate, present each nomination to the Committee and respond to questions about it. The relevant Committee member is asked to respond only to requests for specific technical information if IUCN or ICOMOS do not have the necessary information.

I think this procedure is so desirable that I would encourage the Committee to incorporate it into its formal rules of procedure. Otherwise there is the possibility that it will not be strictly observed, particularly in view of the frequent changes in Chairmanship that characterise the Committee's operations.

Indeed I consider objectivity and freedom of bias so important to the quality and interpreting of the World Heritage List that I would go one step further and ask you to consider the proposition that, whenever a State party is serving on the Committee,

5.

none of its nominations should be dealt with. If you felt able to accept such a provision I believe the World Heritage Convention would be further strengthened. On a lighter note, I could mention another benefit - there would be less competition for places on the Committee at the biennial elections!

A corollary to what I have just said is that, over the years, the role played by IUCN and ICOMOS has become progressively more important. I think this is entirely appropriate and consider that these organizations are serving us well. But I believe that there is scope for them to raise their standards even higher in the evaluations which they make of such nominations and in the presentations which they make to the Committee and the Bureau. Both organizations must act with the highest integrity and objectivity, avoiding favouritism or prejudice. I would hope that they would continually review their procedures with this aim in view.

Finally may I refer to the actual protection of properties on the World Heritage List. This is the basic purpose of the Convention. Over the past years the Bureau and the Committee have set in train two important and closely related matters: to build into the operational guidelines procedures for inscription

6.

of properties on the List of World Heritages in Danger, and to develop procedures for monitoring the condition of properties on the World Heritage List.

On the first matter, the Committee has visualized the List of World Heritage in Danger as being a provisional list for properties under threat. Thus, when a threat exists a property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. If the threat is averted, the property should revert to being simply on the World Heritage List. If the threat becomes a reality, there may be a possible case for de-listing if those characteristics which originally warranted inscription on the World Heritage List no longer exist. I think this concept is valid and its implementation is desirable; to give it extra strength it must now be incorporated in a more straightforward manner into the operational guidelines.

In addition, attention must be given to the wording of the Convention which requires that, for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, various conditions must be met. One of them requires that assistance under the Convention must have been requested. This wording creates a problem since some States parties may not need to request assistance or may not wish to do so. The property could then not be

7.

placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger even though it may be under threat. This creates a situation where the Committee could proceed to remove a damaged property from the World Heritage List without it having been placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

It is difficult to know how to deal with this problem since inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should always be a cooperative process between the Committee and the State party concerned. On the one hand, therefore, it can be argued that if the State party does not wish the property to be listed, then its wishes should be respected. After all, it is only the State party which can guarantee the protection of property, so listing without its consent may not assist protection. On the other hand, unless a threatened property is placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, assistance cannot be provided under the Convention and it is also unlikely that the maximum amount of international assistance can be provided to protect the property.

I hope that the Committee can find a way of solving this problem which is in the best interests of protection of the properties themselves.

8.

With respect to monitoring the condition of properties, the Committee has before it at this Session the Bureau's proposals for monitoring. I commend these to you for adoption. Only by such a monitoring program will the Committee be aware of the condition of properties on the World Heritage List and be in the strongest possible position to assist in their protection.

In conclusion, may I extend my best wishes to the incoming Chairman and all members of the Committee. I have found my association with the World Heritage Convention one of the most rewarding activities I have undertaken and I know that you will have a similar experience in the important work which lies ahead.