

Distribution limited

SC-91/CONF.002/15

12 December 1991

Original : English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

FIFTEENTH SESSION

(Carthage, 9 - 13 December 1991)

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. The fifteenth ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Carthage, Tunisia, from 9-13 December 1991. It was attended by the following States Parties: Brazil, China, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia and the United States of America.

2. The following States Parties to the Convention who are not members of the Committee were represented by observers: Algeria, Australia, Canada, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Niger, Poland, Portugal, The Holy See, Romania, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

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

**II. OPENING SESSION**

4. The outgoing Chairperson of the Committee, Mrs. Christina Cameron, opened the session by thanking the Tunisian authorities for their generous invitation to host in Carthage the fifteenth session of the World Heritage Committee and wished the Committee every success in its work.

5. The Minister of Culture, Professor Mongi Bousnina, in warmly welcoming the Committee, expressed Tunisia's strong commitment towards realizing the objectives of the

World Heritage Convention. He stressed the importance of the work already undertaken by the Convention, demonstrating how separate sectors of culture and nature can work together in a synergistic way in the protection of humankind's priceless cultural and natural possessions. He continued by pointing out that Tunisia considers cultural heritage protection as part of the task of preserving the national identity within a worldwide context. Safeguarding of the natural heritage is also considered as a top priority and primary responsibility of the Government. He was pleased to inform the delegates that the President of Tunisia, His Excellency The Honourable Mr. Zin El Abidine Ben Ali had recently set up a Ministry for the Environment. The President of Tunisia had also taken a series of measures to enhance the protection of cultural and natural heritage sites. The Minister invited delegates to become acquainted with measures for protecting cultural and natural properties in Tunisia. The Minister concluded his address by wishing the Committee success in its work.

6. The representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, Mr. Henri Lopes, Assistant-Director General for Culture, began his address by expressing UNESCO's grave concern about the human tragedy caused in Yugoslavia by the armed conflict. He expressed UNESCO's dismay about the destruction already caused by this conflict in the Old Town of Dubrovnik and in the Plitvice Lake National Park, both of which have to be safeguarded in conformity with the stipulations of the World Heritage Convention.

7. On behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, he thanked the Tunisian Government and the people of Tunisia for hosting the fifteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Carthage. He highlighted the achievements of the international campaign for the safeguarding of Carthage which was launched twenty years ago by UNESCO. He attributed the success of this campaign to the commitments made by Tunisia and also to the skill and knowledge of eminent experts coming from ten Member Parties.

8. Mr. Lopes informed the Committee that Angola, Bahrain, Cambodia, El Salvador, Ireland, Kenya, Saint Lucia and San Marino became States Parties to the Convention during the last twelve months, bringing the total number of States Parties to 123. He stressed the importance of evaluating the work under the Convention which will be undertaken on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention in 1992 and drew attention to the one-day workshop which will be organized as part of the Fourth World Park's Congress in Caracas, Venezuela, in February 1992. Mr. Lopes also made mention of the setting up of a network of World Heritage Cities as an outcome of the International Colloquium on World Heritage Cities held at Quebec City, Canada, in August 1991.

9. Mr. Lopes indicated that the World Heritage Convention was taken into account in the preparation of the UN Conference on Environment and Development which will be held in Rio de Janeiro, in June 1992, particularly in the drafting of the future legal instrument for the protection of biological diversity and the formulation of the "Agenda 21". Finally, Mr. Lopes informed the Committee of the recent development of safeguarding efforts for the monuments of Angkor, Cambodia.

### **III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

10. The Committee adopted the agenda as it had been set out in Document SC-91/CONF.002/1.

### **IV. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON, RAPPORTEUR AND VICE-CHAIRPERSONS**

11. Mr. Azedine Beschouch (Tunisia) was elected Chairman of the Committee by acclamation. Mr. Diaz Barrio (Mexico) was elected as the Rapporteur, and the following members of the Committee were elected as Vice-Chairpersons: Brazil, France, Senegal, Thailand and the United States of America.

### **V. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARIAT SINCE THE FOURTEENTH SESSION**

12. Mr. Bernd von Droste, Secretary of the Committee, congratulated the Chairman, the Rapporteur and the Vice-Chairpersons on their election and reported on the activities undertaken since the fourteenth session of the Committee.

13. He began by drawing the attention of the Committee to three documents, namely the Report of the Fifteenth session of the Bureau, the Report of the World Heritage Committee to the 26th General Conference of UNESCO and the Report of the 8th session of the General Assembly of the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention which provide detailed information on the progress achieved under the Convention since the fourteenth session. Mr. von Droste also pointed out that the members of the Committee would find additional information in the working and information documents that have been made available to them. He therefore confined his report to major challenges which the work under the Convention poses to all actors, including the States Parties, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat.

14. Within this context Mr. von Droste drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the monitoring of the

state of conservation of World Heritage properties was now becoming a principal activity for ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN and the Secretariat. Consequently, the World Heritage Committee would have to devote more time than during previous sessions to this important question. He emphasized that the evaluation of the Convention was not an end in itself, but was aimed at elaborating a strategy which would help to exploit more fully the potential of the Convention as an effective tool for heritage conservation and international co-operation. He mentioned that modest progress had been achieved with respect to global studies on a selected number of thematic areas. He then underlined the importance of continuing in-depth studies for the revision of cultural and natural heritage criteria.

15. Mr. von Droste highlighted problems of the present procedure for including properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee should give itself the means to act effectively, particularly in the case of threats to the cultural and natural heritage sites faced with armed conflicts. He also stressed the need to redirect the granting of international assistance to ensure an effective follow-up to recommendations for corrective measures as the result of monitoring work carried out under the Convention. Furthermore, he pointed out that at the request of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat had embarked on the overall evaluation of the World Heritage Convention, in all its aspects, with the help of experts and through a series of consultations with main partners involved in the daily work for implementation. An outline for the evaluation of twenty years of work under the Convention would be presented to the Committee during its current session. Mr. von Droste encouraged the States Parties to make their contributions to the World Heritage Fund without delay so that financial constraints do not restrict activities in 1992, when past activities will be reviewed, future plans elaborated and exhibits and seminars organized to mark the 20th anniversary of the Convention.

16. After assuring the Committee that more information pertaining to specific actions taken by the Secretariat would be provided during discussions on the various agenda items of the meeting, Mr. von Droste concluded his report by wishing the Committee success in its work.

#### **VI. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE XVTH SESSION OF THE BUREAU**

17. Ms. Vlad Borelli (Italy), Rapporteur of the fourteenth session of the Committee, presented the results of the fifteenth session of the Bureau held in Paris from 17 to 21 June 1991. She drew the attention of the Committee to the Report of the fifteenth session of the Bureau (Document SC-

91/CONF.002/2) and highlighted important elements from the different sections of the Report. She informed the Committee of the recommendations of the Bureau to suspend the use of questionnaires as a modality to monitor the status of conservation of cultural heritage sites. She recalled that the Bureau was satisfied with the co-operation established between the Secretariat and UNDP and UNEP to monitor the status of conservation of cultural World Heritage properties and that IUCN together with the Secretariat was able to provide information on the status of conservation of 21 natural World Heritage sites. Ms. Vlad Borelli also pointed out to the Committee that initiatives to revise the natural heritage criteria and proposing a new criterion on cultural landscapes had been launched and were expected to progress further during 1992 when the evaluation of the implementation of the Convention would be completed.

**VII. MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL PROPERTIES AND RELATED TECHNICAL PROBLEMS**

18. The monitoring report presented by the Secretariat dealt with the following sites: Xanthos-Letoon (Turkey), the City of Valletta (Malta), Shibam (Yemen), National Historical Park - Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti), Kathmandu Valley (Nepal), Moenjodaro (Pakistan), and the Madara Rider (Bulgaria). Monitoring visits had been made to seventeen sites by an expert who was in charge of co-ordinating action for the preservation of 115 Mediterranean sites within the framework of the UNEP - Barcelona Convention. These visits had yielded a wealth of information and documentation which needed analysis and the establishment of a dialogue with the national authorities before a report could be presented to the Committee. A summary of the findings of this expert concerning two sites was included in the Working Document SC-91/CONF.002/3. Reports on the state of conservation of the other fifteen sites will be presented to the Bureau in June 1992. In addition, the expert who was present at this session was ready to explain to the Committee his approach and to respond to specific questions. An additional monitoring report had been prepared by the Co-ordinator of the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project on Cultural Heritage and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, who was also present at this session.

19. The Committee was also informed of the type of continuous monitoring which the Secretariat pursued with regard to projects which were the subject of international campaigns or supported by UNDP. A recently published brochure on the work carried out in Sana'a, as well as the report on the mission to Bulgaria which was annexed to the Document SC-91/CONF.002/3, showed that the most efficient

monitoring could be done through technical assistance missions. Unfortunately, the financial and personnel resources of the Secretariat were far too small compared with the many World Heritage sites to be monitored.

20. In the opinion of the Secretariat, a monitoring action should be carried out in the form of a continuous dialogue with the State Party which should begin even before the inscription of the site, in order to inform local competent authorities (politicians and technicians) about the values to be maintained and the principles and methods of conservation to be applied. In particular, the implementation of the management plan requested at the time of the proposal for inscription should be verified by means of a monitoring exercise.

21. The representative of ICOMOS brought to the attention of the Committee alarming news about the deterioration of certain parts of monuments of Khizi Pogost (USSR). He stressed the fact that his organization was interested in sending a mission on the spot to evaluate the state of conservation of the site. With reference to the cultural centre in the process of being built between the Tower of Belem and the Monastery of the Hieronymites (Portugal), he underlined that the work was almost completed and that a comprehensive file submitted by the government showed that the rules of the competition had taken account of the fact that the site was classified as a World Heritage property. Part of the existing building replaced industrial constructions and this represented an improvement. This case proved that it was necessary to determine a future strategy to guide architects in charge of the development of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Portuguese observer remarked that the project of integrating this cultural centre was part of a plan for safeguarding of the zone with a view to reasserting the value of the site. The Committee took note of the report of ICOMOS and, in the light of this example, emphasized that States Parties should attach the greatest attention to maintaining the values of World Heritage properties, when elaborating development projects, new constructions or major restorations. They should equally inform the Committee, through UNESCO's Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize projects in an area protected under the Convention before any irreversible decisions were taken. The need for close collaboration between the Secretariat and the local competent authorities was stressed during the debate. The Committee took note that ICOMOS, in co-operation with ICCROM, was preparing a guide on the management of sites for authorities responsible for World Heritage.

22. The Co-ordinator of the UNDP/UNESCO Regional Project on Cultural Heritage and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean introduced the method which had been used in

the detailed analysis of six sites in the region. The documents presented only reflect work already achieved within the framework of a wider project concerning sixteen sites in all, the evaluation of which will be carried out up until 1993 and will cost the World Heritage Fund US\$40,000.

23. The Committee took note of this report. While considering that the method was interesting, it judged that it would not be necessarily applicable to all regions.

24. The Co-ordinator of a network set up by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) for the protection of Mediterranean sites under the Barcelona Convention introduced in his turn his working method on monitoring. During visits to seventeen sites around the Mediterranean, he evaluated, in collaboration with local experts, the different problems raised by the conservation of the sites concerned. Following his visits he kept in touch with the competent authorities with a view to assisting them in their task with technical advice and documentation.

25. Regarding the management of sites, a member of the Committee questioned the limits to the possibility of intervention by the Committee and the Secretariat. The Secretariat explained that national authorities, whose collaboration was obviously indispensable, were always informed.

26. The possibility of intervention by the private sector in activities of safeguarding and development of World Heritage was raised. A delegate considered that progress in this field remained far below desirable levels. For instance, various difficulties encountered by a high visiting capacity of the sites could be solved through co-operation with private associations.

27. Special attention was given by the Committee to the dangers threatening the World Heritage sites during armed conflict. The Secretariat informed the Committee of the situation of the historical City of Dubrovnik. It also announced the decision of the Director-General to launch an international campaign for the restoration of Dubrovnik.

28. Aware of the fact that it represents 123 States, including Yugoslavia, which are signatories of the Convention, the Committee expressed deep concern about the armed conflict, devastating a region that comprises several sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, in particular the Old City of Dubrovnik. It decided to urge the parties in conflict to do their best so that a ceasefire which allows as soon as possible for the repair of the damage already caused in the fighting area, in particular in Dubrovnik, in response to the appeal by the Director-General of UNESCO for international solidarity.

29. Recalling that the repeated requests of UNESCO to observe the obligations of the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage have so far not been heeded, and noting the state of exceptional emergency caused by the armed conflict, the Committee decided, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Convention, to inscribe Dubrovnik on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to publicize this entry immediately.

30. Several delegates pointed out that the decision of the Committee should not be interpreted as an act of accusation but as the affirmation that all States Parties to the Convention are involved in this situation where a World Heritage city was seriously damaged by an armed conflict. The observer from Yugoslavia requested that the Committee should be cautious in this action, and stressed that in view of the importance of the situation, it is advisable to refer to all the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, following the request of Yugoslavia.

31. Two other observers drew the attention of the Committee to the situation of the cultural heritage in Iraq. One of them requested UNESCO to send a mission to Iraq in order to evaluate the restoration work required on the sites damaged by war. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Director-General of UNESCO was ready to send an intersectoral mission to Iraq as soon as he receives the agreement of the United Nations Security Council.

32. The Secretariat announced that following a Resolution of the General Conference, a report would be prepared concerning the possibilities for strengthening UNESCO's action in the protection and preservation of World Heritage. This report, which will take into account the evaluation of the implementation of the Convention, will be submitted to the Executive Board at its 140th session.

33. While deciding to abandon the use of questionnaires which had not yielded the results anticipated, the Committee requested the Secretariat to carry on the monitoring of cultural heritage properties.

#### **VIII. MONITORING OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE NATURAL PROPERTIES AND RELATED TECHNICAL PROBLEMS**

34. The Committee was satisfied with the joint efforts of the Secretariat and IUCN to provide information on the status of conservation of an increasing number of natural and mixed World Heritage sites. The Committee was informed of the co-operation between UNESCO, UNEP and the World



Tourism Organization (WTO) in organizing an international workshop on the sustainable development of tourism in the World Heritage site of Mount Huangshan, China, in October 1991, and of plans for extending this co-operation in 1992-93 to develop guidelines for tourism development for managers of World Heritage Sites.

35. The Committee examined documents SC-91/CONF.002/4 and SC-91/CONF.002/4Add and noted reports on the status of conservation of 14 natural and mixed World Heritage properties. IUCN reported on the status of conservation of 25 sites, including the sites described in the above-mentioned documents.

#### **Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)**

When this site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1988, the Committee requested IUCN to provide a report on the status of conservation in 1991. The Committee noted that IUCN had gathered some information but, as requested by the representative of IUCN, deferred the submission of this monitoring report until 1992, to accommodate the findings of a proposed field visit to this site next year.

#### **Iguazu National Park (Argentina) and Iguaçu National Park (Brazil)**

The Committee noted that eight helicopters simultaneously overfly these adjacent sites which cover the same waterfall area. Over 7,000 visitors had registered complaints and local conservation groups are opposed to the use of helicopters in the area because it contravenes legal regulations for air traffic over protected areas. The Brazilian Delegate informed the Committee that a working group had been established to study the matter with a view to introducing more stringent regulatory measures for helicopter tourism. The Committee requested the Secretariat to contact the authorities of Argentina in order to request information on steps taken by them.

#### **Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)**

The Committee noted that the Bulgarian authorities were considering a major expansion of this site to include the area of the Rhodope Mountains and recognized the potential for establishing a transfrontier site with Greece that could be one of the most outstanding sites of Europe. The Committee encouraged the Bulgarian authorities to proceed with the extension of Pirin National Park and submit a nomination for the extension of the site. The Committee also requested the Secretariat to contact the Greek authorities to obtain their views on the possibilities for establishing a transfrontier site.

### **Srebarna Biosphere Reserve (Bulgaria)**

The Committee was concerned to note that the water quality and balance in this small World Heritage site (600 ha) has deteriorated to such an extent that the site is no longer ecologically viable; large colonies of water birds, except for the Dalmation Pelican, are absent, and many of the passerine species have emigrated or occur only in low numbers. The Committee recognized that most problems were attributable to the slow drying of the lake bed, exacerbated by upstream development projects, impacts of nearby pig farms and a rise in the wild boar population. The Committee, while awaiting the results of a joint Ramsar/World Heritage field mission to assess whether the site still meets criterion (iv), recommended that the Secretariat request the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment to nominate this site to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Dinosaur Provincial Park (Canada)**

The Committee noted that IUCN agreed, in principle, to deleting 1,415 acres of privately owned land comprising natural gas deposits from this site and including 1,478 acres of higher geological value as compensation. The Committee noted that the technology used to drill gas wells had low impacts but pointed out that it would be concerned if the drilling extends to sites within the World Heritage property. The Canadian Delegate informed the Committee that the maps of the area clearly showed that the sites which will be drilled are outside the Park boundaries. The Committee requested that IUCN evaluate the maps recently submitted by Canada, showing the locations of the drilling sites.

### **Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada)**

The Committee recalled that logging was permitted within this site and that as many as 3,200 of the Park's bison population were affected by brucellosis and tuberculosis. The Committee was satisfied to note that forestry regulations are now more strictly enforced by the Canadian Park Service personnel and that negotiations are underway to terminate logging rights before their official expiry in the year 2002. The Committee recognized that the large size of a site is no longer a guarantee for the conservation of this site and development activities in upstream areas of the Peace/Athabasca Rivers threaten the integrity of this Park. The Committee noted that a river basin assessment study was now underway with support from Canada's Green Plan and the Alberta Provincial Government. The Committee urged the Canadian authorities to make special efforts, both within the Park and throughout its entire drainage basin, in order to retain and restore the site's integrity. The Committee

acknowledged that the conservation of Wood Buffalo National Park is, in many ways, a test case for conservation of large remote reserves, such as the World Heritage sites of Yellowstone (USA), Banc D'Arguin (Mauritania) and Serengeti (Tanzania), and had the potential to demonstrate lessons that will be applicable elsewhere.

#### **Talamanca-La Amistad (Costa Rica/Panama)**

The Committee was pleased to note that in accordance with its request the authorities of Costa Rica and Panama had agreed to a single listing of this site. The Committee was satisfied that the Costa Rican authorities had agreed to the IUCN recommendation to delete three Indian reserves and add one forest and wildlife refuge. In accordance with another IUCN recommendation, the Committee urged the Costa Rican authorities to delete four additional Indian reserves in the north-eastern Atlantic sector and provide to the Secretariat a map showing the new boundaries of the Talamanca-La Amistad Reserves of Costa Rica.

The Committee was deeply concerned that 59,000 ha of the La Amistad National Park of Panama has been given to Texaco for oil exploitation without consulting the Panamanian conservation authorities and in contravention to the law creating the Park. The Committee instructed the Secretariat to contact the Panamanian authorities and express its concern over the prospect of oil exploration inside the Park and suggest that they nominate the site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee also suggested that a high-level mission to Panama be undertaken on the occasion of the World Park's Congress, to be held in Caracas, Venezuela, during February 1992, in order to call the attention of the relevant authorities to Panama's obligations under the World Heritage Convention.

#### **Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Committee was satisfied to note that the Secretariat, based upon the information provided by IUCN, had sought clarification on the construction of an eight-kilometre highway through this Park. The Committee was pleased to note that the Sub-Secretariat of Forestry and Natural Resources in Ecuador had been able to halt the construction of this road until environmental impact studies are completed. The Committee complimented the Ecuadorean authorities for taking timely action and requested the Secretariat to remind them of the possibilities for obtaining technical assistance for the Park from the World Heritage Fund

### **Simien National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Committee recalled that this Park was abandoned by its staff in 1985 due to civil unrest in the area. The Committee was happy to note that the site had once again become accessible. On the basis of a report submitted by the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Organization, the Committee was informed that all field stations and other infrastructure of the Park had been destroyed. The Committee recognized the need to begin reconstruction work and noted the possibilities for involving local people in this regard. In the light of the urgency to undertake conservation action, the Committee wished to study the possibilities for setting aside a sum of US\$ 50,000 from the 1992 budget for the rehabilitation of Simien National Park.

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

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its last session requested the Guinean authorities to submit a new file stating the boundaries of the property receiving adequate protection, and the long-term guarantees for that protection. The Committee was glad to note that such a file had been submitted by the Guinean authorities and that IUCN had undertaken a field mission to evaluate the information provided in that file.

The Committee noted that the proposed iron-ore mining site was within the boundaries of the Mt.Nimba Nature Reserve inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981. In the light of the evaluation presented by IUCN, the Committee took cognizance of the fact that the new boundaries proposed by the Guinean authorities, though intended to excise that part of the site where iron-ore mining is expected to take place, will also reduce the Reserve's area by about 30% and seriously endanger the integrity of the values for which Mt.Nimba was originally granted World Heritage status. For instance, the montane and moist forest areas of the Reserve would be reduced by 50% and the area of montane grasslands would be decreased by 30%. The Committee also observed that the site did not have management plans and programmes for ensuring long-term protection. Furthermore, the Committee was informed that an independent environmental impact study of the iron-ore mining project had not been carried out.

In considering the options available to it for ensuring the conservation of this World Heritage property, the Committee was unwilling to accept that option where the organization(s) financing the iron-ore mining project would compensate for the reduction in the size of the area of the Reserve by supporting projects which would strengthen the conservation of this site. The Committee was of the view that the proposed reduction in the size of the Reserve's

area was in itself a major threat to the World Heritage status of the site. The Committee found it likely that some of the features which made this site worthy of World Heritage status were located within the area proposed to be deleted.

The Committee recalled that additional habitats of Mt. Nimba within Côte d'Ivoire were added to this site in 1982 and since then the World Heritage site has been a transborder property of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea. The Committee was concerned that the Government of Côte d'Ivoire had not been consulted in any of the negotiations related to the modification of the boundaries of the site.

While recognizing the legitimate economic aspirations and needs of Guinea, the Committee concluded that the Mt. Nimba Nature Reserve, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981, was seriously at risk from a variety of threats, primarily the proposed iron-ore mining project. Hence, the Committee instructed the Secretariat to contact the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea and request them to nominate this site, in accordance with Article 11 paragraph 4 of the Convention, for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to transmit these recommendations together with the criteria and procedures (as outlined in paragraphs 59-71 of the Operational Guidelines), for nominating the Mt. Nimba Nature Reserve to the World Heritage in Danger List to the authorities in Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea under the signature of the Director-General of UNESCO.

The Delegate of the United States of America recalled that, during its last session, the Committee had requested him to consider the application of Article 6 (3) of the Convention, which imposes obligations on States Parties to the Convention with regard to cultural and natural heritage situated on the territory of other States Parties to the Convention. He continued by informing the Committee that his Government was not involved in the mining project by direct activity or financing. Hence, the Delegate concluded that even if the mining project were to proceed, the United States would not breach its obligations as specified in Article 6 (3).

#### **Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Committee noted that there had been a recent change in the national agency responsible for the management of this site. The Vice-President of Honduras requested the Committee at its last session to include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee was informed that the new management authority would submit to the Secretariat

a request for international assistance in order to enable the Committee to consider including this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Committee recalled that this site had been threatened by the invasion of the Sanctuary by the people of the Bodo tribe in 1989. The Committee was concerned that there had been no response from Indian authorities to its recommendation, made in 1989 and 1990, to nominate this site to the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee noted that a survey undertaken by WWF of the surrounding villages might lead to a more co-operative approach to management in the future and a programme for implementing corrective measures has been suggested by members of IUCN's rhino specialist group. Members of the Committee were unanimous in their view that this site was a prime candidate for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegate from Thailand was of the view that the Committee had the authority, under Article 11, paragraph 4, to include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger without waiting for a formal request. The Committee however, wished that the Secretariat reiterates the Committee's concern to the Indian authorities and find ways and means to obtain response for submission to the Bureau at its next session in mid-1992.

#### **Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

The Committee was pleased to note that the Irrigation Department and the Nepal Planning Commission have formally dropped their plans for a US\$30 million irrigation project to divert the Rapti River which would have seriously threatened the integrity of this Park. A study undertaken by the Government of Nepal and the Asian Development Bank, following the intervention of the Committee, showed the project was environmentally unacceptable and its economic benefits to be doubtful. The Committee commended the Nepalese authorities for taking decisive action for the conservation of this site.

#### **Djoudj National Park (Senegal)**

The Committee recalled that this site was taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1988, and since then had been the location of a training course from 4-15 March 1991 on Wetland Management, jointly organized by the National Parks Service of Senegal, IUCN's Wetland Programme and the Netherlands Research Institute for Nature Management.

**Garajonay National Park (Spain)**

The Committee was informed of a road construction project, funded by EEC as part of a large-scale integrated development scheme for the Island of Gomera. If completed, the road would have had serious impacts on the World Heritage site. The Committee was informed that apparently this threat had now been mitigated. Nevertheless, the Committee asked the Secretariat to write to the Spanish authorities and the EEC emphasizing the need for non-interference with the integrity of this or any other World Heritage site in the implementation of such development schemes.

**Selous Game Reserve (Tanzania)**

The Committee was glad to be informed that a proposal to open a route through this Park to drive cattle from the north to the south of the country had been abandoned by the Tanzanian Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development. If implemented, this project would have exposed the wildlife of Selous to bacterial and viral infection from the cattle and resulted in additional problems such as bush fires, dispersion of cattle, increased poaching and vegetation changes. The Committee commended the Tanzanian authorities for having dropped plans to open the route to avoid threats to the integrity of the site.

**Olympic National Park (United States of America)**

The Delegate of the United States of America informed the Committee that on 22 July 1991, a Japanese fishing vessel and a Chinese freighter collided off the Olympic Peninsula resulting in a spill of 70,000 gallons of oil. Coastal areas impacted by the oil spill include those within the National Park. An estimated 40-60% of the beaches were affected by the oil spill with short-term effects seen in the loss of sea birds, sea otters, bald eagles and other beach scavengers. These effects appear to have lessened and have been documented through the emergency response mechanism which was established following a similar, but more damaging oil spill in 1987. Long-term effects of the spill are not precisely known and the Delegate assured the Committee that he will advise the Committee as information becomes available and will also share information on the emergency response mechanism.

**Durmitor National Park (Yugoslavia)**

The Committee was concerned about proposals for the construction of a hydro-electric dam on the Tara River which

would flood the Tara Canyon and affect water quality of the River. A large asphalt plant upstream was already causing pollution of the river. The Committee recommended that the Yugoslavian authorities provide information on their plans to build a dam along the Tara River and the status of the asphalt plant and a description of their environmental impacts.

#### **Plitvice Lake National Park (Yugoslavia)**

The Committee expressed deep regret and concern regarding the effects of the civil unrest in the country on the status of conservation of this site. The Park has been abandoned by staff and there is no control of activities inside the Park. The Committee was appreciative of the various appeals launched by the Director-General of UNESCO for peace in the area and expressed the hope that conditions will return to normal soon to permit a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to review damage and plan rehabilitation programmes.

#### **Garamba National Park (Zaire)**

The Committee was glad to learn that the rhino population in this Park had increased to 31 and the local management capacity and budget have increased substantially. Poaching has also been brought under control. The Minister for Environment and Nature Protection of Zaire, by his letter of 26 February 1991, requested the removal of this site from the list of World Heritage in Danger. Although the Bureau at its last session in June 1991 recommended the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee took note of the fact that in recent months civil order in the country had deteriorated. The Committee was in agreement with IUCN's observation that the rhino population was still small and continuous assistance and political stability are essential for maintaining the success achieved in the last five years. In view of the uncertainties associated with the recent civil unrest in Zaire, the Committee decided to defer taking a decision on the removal of this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger until its next session.

#### **Kahuzi Biega National Park (Zaire)**

The Committee was glad to note that the Government of Zaire and the German Ministry for Co-operation (BMZ) have dropped plans to construct a road through this Park. The Committee commended the Government of Zaire for its decision and encouraged the BMZ to continue its technical co-operation to strengthen protection of the Kahuzi Biega National Park.



## IX. GLOBAL STUDY

36. The Secretariat presented a brief report on the progress made on the global study of cultural properties, thanks in particular to the continued collaboration of two Greek experts who had once again been seconded to the Secretariat for one month by the Ministry of Culture of their country. The two experts outlined a general framework and prepared files with basic documentation for the continuation of this work.
37. Two other consultants worked on a study of Slavic sites of the post-Byzantine period and on a complementary study concerning Eastern Europe from Antiquity to the Modern Age. German, French, Italian and Turkish authorities volunteered their collaboration, as well as a working group on Art Nouveau architecture. Furthermore, a contract will soon be concluded with an expert on Buddhist art. Discussions were pursued with ICOMOS in order to determine its contribution to the drafting of the general framework for the global study (as recommended by the Bureau at its June 1991 meeting). ICOMOS will directly report to the Committee in this respect.
38. The Committee was informed of the difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in the preparation of the global study. Indeed, the tasks of the Secretariat are disproportionate to its financial means and human resources; one of the posts assigned to the Division of Physical Heritage has not yet been filled due to budgetary constraints of the Organization.
39. One delegate emphasized that this study should not result in a rigid list of the cultural values of World Heritage, especially at a time when the very notion of heritage is undergoing rapid changes. This study should be structured by a global reflection, an assessment of the past, and an orientation towards the future. France will contribute a study towards this collective reflection, which will be submitted to the Committee before its next session. Representatives of Brazil and Italy announced a contribution to the global study by experts of their country. A member of the Committee referred to a remark of the Secretariat specifying that the global study should not result in a sort of encyclopaedia of the history of world art, but rather to a reference framework to facilitate the work of the Committee when evaluating sites for inscription on the World Heritage List. Observing with satisfaction that the contribution of Brazilian experts was the first non-European offer, a member of the Committee underlined the importance of collaboration between experts of all States Parties to carry out the global study.

40. Another member remarked that the global study had been discussed by the Committee for quite a while. Time had come to give priority to the practical aspects of the work, the need for which has been established for a long time. It would be useful to gather a group of experts to get definite advice. A further issue would then be to define precisely the tasks of the Secretariat and ICOMOS in carrying out the work in relation to global studies.

41. Remarking that no budgetary provision had been foreseen for the global study, an observer asked whether, on the whole, this work would be continued by ICOMOS and, if so, under what conditions. After having expressed the Committee's appreciation of the two Greek experts' valuable contribution to the global study, the President explained that, exceptionally, budgetary provision has been made for ICOMOS and IUCN to carry out this work in 1992.

#### X. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

42. The Committee noted with satisfaction the various promotional activities undertaken in 1991 and presented in Document SC-91/CONF.002/6. These activities related to the production and dissemination of information material, support to national activities organized by States Parties to the Convention, as well as participation in special events relating to cultural and natural heritage. In particular, the Committee noted that due to co-operation with States Parties, the production of information material in additional languages had been possible, and that the production of new supporting materials, such as illustrated sheets on World Heritage sites for sale by correspondence, were being actively considered. The Committee was also informed that in compliance with its recommendation, the question of the commercial diffusion of video-cassettes co-produced by TRANSTEL Company and UNESCO had been studied by the Secretariat and TRANSTEL, and possible solutions had been identified to ensure this diffusion and to improve the presentation of these films on TV networks.

43. The Committee also noted that, at the request of the Secretariat and with the support of the World Heritage Fund, the first issue of the new bulletin of the UNDP-UNESCO Regional Project for Cultural Heritage and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean would be entirely devoted to a presentation of all the World Heritage sites of the region. This bulletin, mainly destined for decision-makers and donors, would provide up-dated information on the sites on the eve of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention. A draft version of this bulletin was distributed to the Committee, which will be completed by all States of the region before its publication in English, French and Spanish in June 1992.

44. The Committee approved the proposals for 1992 presented by the Secretariat: firstly, to fulfil its general informative mission, it is foreseen to continue to produce, update and disseminate general information material concerning the Convention and on World Heritage sites through different means such as brochures, films, video-disks, publications, etc. For publications, the Committee noted that private initiatives should be encouraged as they are less costly and more flexible than co-edition with UNESCO and the income could be directly granted to the World Heritage Fund. Proposals for 1992 also concern the production of more specialized material so as to contribute towards the efforts of the Committee to ensure better monitoring of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. This material will be targetted on the one hand to populations living in or near inscribed sites and to visitors to the sites, and on the other to site managers.

45. As a first step, the elaboration of guidelines for the management of tourism in World Heritage sites will be carried out from case studies and in co-operation with the competent international organizations.

**XI            PREPARATION OF THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWENTIETH  
ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE  
CONVENTION**

46. The Committee took note of the report of the Secretariat on the progress made in the preparation for the commemoration in 1992 of the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Convention presented in Document SC-91/CONF.002/7, consisting, on the one hand, of an evaluation of the implementation of the Convention and the elaboration of a strategy for the future, and on the other, of the organization of promotional events at UNESCO Headquarters and elsewhere.

47. With regard to the evaluation, the basis of the work had been prepared during 1991 and an outline submitted to the Committee. A first version of the report would be sent to the members of the Committee during January 1992. The Committee noted that this first version would be completed in the light of national reports which should be received early next year. At the same time, a draft strategy would be prepared by the Secretariat and presented to the Bureau at its next session. Following discussions of the Bureau, it may prove necessary to consult a small group of experts in order to assist the Secretariat to finalize the text of the strategy which will be submitted to the next session of the Committee for adoption.

48. Throughout the session, the members of the Committee indicated that the celebration of the 20th anniversary was the opportunity for an in-depth reflection on the Convention which could even lead, according to one member of the Committee, to the possible revision of its text, as noted in the Resolution of UNESCO's General Conference of 6 November 1991 on this question. According to this Committee member, the most important questions to be studied concerned the restrictions that the Convention imposed on interventions by the Committee, which could be compared to the right of intervention often evoked for questions of human rights and more recently environmental protection. In particular, the Committee was faced with this problem when it wished to inscribe a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger without waiting to receive a formal nomination and a request for technical assistance from the State Party concerned. Such cases recurred several times during the debates of the session of the Committee.

49. More generally, reflection should be given to the ethical dimension of the Convention, particularly taking into account the increase of poverty and the ignorance it engenders, both of which are destructive elements for heritage, and to the universality of heritage and cultural diversity, in order to seek a better balance within the World Heritage Committee, and in the World Heritage List between different regions and cultures of the world. In this respect, the need for a global study on cultural properties was recalled as an important part of the overall reflection to be undertaken in connection with the 20th anniversary.

50. With regard to natural heritage, a revision of criteria, including the incorporation of a criterion for geological sites, should be envisaged, particularly in the light of discussions which will take place during the Fourth World Parks Congress, to be held in Caracas, Venezuela, in February 1992, during a one-day workshop organized on the World Heritage Convention. The question of landscapes will also be raised and discussions on this subject will contribute towards the elaboration of criteria for landscapes. The possibility to bestow a World Heritage value to certain areas of Antarctica which, according to IUCN, deserve to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, should also be evoked taking into account the fact that the Convention at present is not applicable to this continent because of problems related to national sovereignty.

51. The Committee was also of the opinion that the twentieth anniversary should be the occasion to recall to the States Parties their obligations under the Convention, particularly the setting-up of national structures and payment of their contributions to the World Heritage Fund,

and to encourage them to organize events during 1992 to make the Convention better known. The Committee also wished to launch an appeal to major private foundations for contributions to the World Heritage Fund and to study the modalities of organizing a World Heritage Day.

52. Finally, the Committee noted that the events to be organized at UNESCO Headquarters, opening with a Gala Evening on 10 or 11 July and terminating in mid-October, will consist of a large exhibition with the participation of many States Parties, and national days or weeks organized by States Parties with the assistance of the Secretariat.

53. The events taking place elsewhere should be implemented by the States Parties themselves, with national or regional workshops or seminars. For its part, the Secretariat will organize one seminar by region, partly financed by UNESCO's Regular Programme budget and taking place in East Africa, Venice (Italy), Indonesia, Quito and the Galapagos (Ecuador) and Fez (Morocco) respectively. These seminars will be open to the press and the different themes to be evoked will also contribute to the overall reflection on the Convention.

## **XII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

### **A. Technical co-operation**

The Committee approved the following requests:		US\$
<b>1. The Madara Rider (Bulgaria)</b>		
Purchase of equipment for drilling, measurement and urgent cleaning of the monument		35,000
<b>2. Saint-Stephen Church in Nessebar (Bulgaria)</b>		
Restoration of mural paintings of Saint-Stephen Church		15,000
<b>3. Pyramid Plateau at Giza (Egypt)</b>		
Costs for three international experts (an economist, an archaeologist and a landscape designer) in the elaboration of a Master Plan		30,000

4. **International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM)**
- The Committee, in accordance with Article 23 of the Convention, approved this project for supplying technical documentation and equipment and materials 25,000
5. **Machu Picchu Historic Sanctuary (Peru)**
- Contribution for the period April-December 1992 for the preparation of a Master Plan 40,000
6. **Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)**
- Purchase of two all-terrain vehicles 45,000
- Furthermore, the Committee recommended that the Secretariat request the Senegalese authorities to provide details of schedules and technical modalities for the implementation of measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of the road construction project in this Park
7. **Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**
- Consultancy, equipment, design and construction costs for a centre to improve presentation of the Park to visitors 40,000
8. **Garamba National Park (Zaire)**
- Purchase and shipment of three all-terrain motor cycles for patrolling of the Park 15,000
9. **Virunga National Park (Zaire)**
- Purchase of one motor-boat and of spare parts for two boats already purchased and freight charges. 40,000

The Committee deferred its decision on the following requests:

10. **Talamanca-La Amistad Reserves (Costa Rica)**

The Committee recalled that at its last session it approved US \$ 50,000 for this site to be released on the condition that projects financed by funds already approved are completed. The Committee noted the implementation of those projects remained at the same level as reported at its last session. Hence the

Committee instructed the Bureau to re-examine the situation at its next session before deciding to award the US\$ 50,000 approved by the Committee in 1990.

**11. Hal Saflieni Hypogeum (Malta)**

The Committee requested the State Party to submit to the next session of the Bureau a technical report justifying the need for the installation of an air-conditioner in the hypogeum of this site.

**12. Simien National Park (Ethiopia)**

Recognizing that reconstruction work in this Park, which was abandoned by Park staff in 1985, could begin soon, the Committee decided to set aside US\$ 50,000 from the 1992 budget for the re-habilitation of the Simien National Park. The Committee authorized the Chairman to use these funds to support appropriate projects to be developed by the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Organization, in consultation with IUCN and the Secretariat.

**B. Training:**

The Committee, in accordance with Article 23 of the Convention, provided financial assistance to the following international or regional training courses:

1. **International Course on the Preservation and the Restoration of Monuments and Historic Sites (University of Bahia, Brazil)** 60,000  
 The Committee recommended that the funds be used to support the participation of specialists from Latin American and Caribbean States Parties to the Convention and that States Parties which had not received fellowships in the past be given preference during 1992. The Committee also recommended the authorities organizing the course to submit the list of trainees selected for the course for the approval of the Secretariat.
2. **Regional Training Seminar for Francophone Africa on the Management of National Parks, in 'W' National Park of Niger (ENGREF/France and FSA/Niamey, Niger)** 30,000
3. **Mobile Regional Training Course for Protected Area Managers from South-Central Asia (Wildlife Institute of India (WII), Dehra Dun, India)** 30,000

The Committee requested that the Secretariat obtain written approval of the Ministry of Environment and Forests of India for the organization of this course.

The Committee welcomed the offer from the Delegation of USA to make available the equivalent of US\$ 30,000, in Indian Rupees, through the Indo-US Sub-Commission on Science and Technology which is already supporting similar training courses. The Committee recommended that the Secretariat, in co-operation with the USA and Indian authorities, take the necessary steps to use the offer made by the Delegation of USA so that part or whole of the amount approved by the Committee for this course could be saved to support other international assistance projects.

### XIII. SITUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET

54. The Committee examined document SC-91/CONF.002/9 presenting the status of contributions to the World Heritage Fund for the years 1981-85, 1986-87, 1988-89 and 1990-1991. The Committee was pleased to note that several States Parties such as Brazil, Bulgaria, France, Germany and the United States of America had paid their contribution up to 1990-91 and welcomed the offer of the United States of America to provide an additional US\$ 100,000 as a voluntary contribution for the same biennium. The Committee noted with concern that several States Parties have not paid their mandatory contributions to the Fund and urged them to do so as soon as possible in order to minimize the financial constraints to the implementation of the Convention.

55. The Committee adopted the budget for 1992 as indicated below.

	US\$
- Preparatory assistance and monitoring	175,000
- Technical co-operation	575,000
- Training	475,000
- Emergency assistance	100,000
- Promotional activities	300,000
- Advisory services	
ICOMOS	250,000
IUCN	195,000
- Temporary assistance to the Secretariat	210,000
- Contingency funds	20,000
TOTAL	2,300,000



**XIV. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

56. The Committee examined Document SC-91/CONF.002/10 and recommended that the Secretariat in co-operation with the International Union for Geological Sciences (IUGS), IUCN, and other experts proceed with the revision of the natural heritage criteria to reflect separately geological, biological, ecological and aesthetic phenomena and modify the requested conditions of integrity accordingly. The Committee requested the Secretariat and IUCN to co-operate in the revision of the natural heritage criteria and the conditions of integrity in order to submit draft proposals for the consideration of the Bureau in mid-1992.
57. The Committee decided to include in the Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention the additional points proposed in Document SC-91/CONF.002/12.
58. As requested by the Committee, the Secretariat drew up a draft criterion for cultural landscapes and presented it to the fifteenth session of the Bureau. The Bureau found this draft criterion interesting and after having suggested a few amendments, asked ICOMOS and the Secretariat to draw up jointly an appropriate version taking into account these amendments. Two meetings permitted an exchange of ideas in this respect. A meeting of a working group on cultural landscapes, organized by United Kingdom's ICOMOS Committee, was held in York last November and another meeting between ICOMOS and the Secretariat was held at the beginning of December. These meetings have suggested that the elaboration of such a criterion seemed premature. As a consequence, the Secretariat entirely agreed with the observation contained in the document presented by ICOMOS submitted to the fifteenth session of the Committee.
59. The Committee asked the two non-governmental organizations to express their points of view on the elaboration of a criterion concerning cultural landscapes.
60. ICOMOS was not completely satisfied with the new version proposed by the UNESCO Secretariat. They considered that first of all a definition of this concept, as well as a philosophy of conservation specific to such a type of site, should be elaborated. ICOMOS intended to pursue its work on this issue in collaboration with the Secretariat.
61. The representative of IUCN recalled his views on the issue. The addition of such a criterion to those determining inscription of World Heritage cultural sites would affect in certain instances the natural sites and, in his view not all States Parties were in agreement with this addition. This would accentuate the already existing

imbalance in favour of cultural sites which at present comprise three-fourths of inscribed sites. The disparity in geographical distribution of World Heritage sites would be further widened leading to a greater over-representation of sites listed in Europe. Nevertheless, he informed the Committee that this issue will be discussed during the next World Parks Congress in February 1992.

62. A member of the Committee pointed out that the elaboration of a definition requires a long-term effort as well as the creation of specific conservation instruments (charters, recommendations and legislations).

63. Referring to certain hesitations on the part of IUCN towards the elaboration of such a criterion, and to the reservations expressed by ICOMOS, a member of the Committee suggested that the Committee might appeal to another organization to solve this problem.

64. Another Committee member indicated that in establishing specific criteria to cultural landscapes, the spirit of the Convention must be faithfully respected (in particular Articles 1 and 2). Other members expressed their interest in the definition of the criterion and said that it must be elaborated as soon as possible, but after profound reflection (particularly with regard to relations between environment and heritage protection), and taking into account the criterion of universality that distinguishes the spirit of the Convention.

65. The Committee decided that, taking into account in particular the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme, the Secretariat (Division of Ecological Sciences and Physical Heritage Division) should continue to work towards finalizing the definition of the criteria specific to cultural landscapes in collaboration with ICOMOS and IUCN and in association with other competent partners in the field, such as the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA).

#### **XV. NOMINATION OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

66. The Committee examined 29 new proposals for inscription as well as a proposal for an extension of a site already inscribed and decided to inscribe 22 properties on the World Heritage List and one property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The inscription of two properties was deferred; inscription processes for two other properties were initiated and the requested extension was approved.

67. The proposals for inscribing the Historical Centre of Boukhara and Historical Monuments of Novgorod and its region

were not considered by the Committee because the Bureau decided to defer their examination.

**A. Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Criteria
Shark Bay, Western Australia	578	Australia	N(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
<p>The Committee urged the Australian authorities to expedite the implementation of the management agreement between the State of Western Australia and the Commonwealth of Australia and to accelerate efforts towards more effective management of the area for conservation purposes. The Committee requested IUCN to submit a report on the implementation of these recommendations in 1993.</p>			
Historic City of Sucre	566	Bolivia	C(iv)
Serra da Capivara National Park	606	Brazil	C(iii)
Old Rauma	582	Finland	C(iv)(v)
Fortress of Suomenlinna	583	Finland	C(iv)
Paris, Banks of Seine	600	France	C(i)(ii) (iv)
Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Saint-Remi Abbey and Palace of Tau of Reims	601	France	C(i)(ii) (vi)
Abbey and Altenmunster of Lorsch	515Rev	Germany	C(iii)(iv)
Borobudur Temple Compounds	592	Indonesia	C(i)(ii) (vi)



inscription on the World Heritage List, so as to constitute a transborder site; and b) to develop agreements for protection with the countries of the Basin, notably within the framework of the UNESCO "Blue Danube" project.

Poblet Monastery	518Rev	Spain	C(i)(iv)
Golden Temple of Dambulla	561	Sri Lanka	C(i)(vi)
Royal Domain of Drottningholm	559	Sweden	C(iv)
Historic City of Ayuttaya and associated historic towns	576	Thailand	C(iii)
Historic Town of Sukhothai and associated historic towns	574	Thailand	C(i)(iii)
Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries	591	Thailand	N(ii)(iii)(iv)

The Committee encouraged the authorities of Thailand to accelerate the implementation of management plans for the two Sanctuaries. The Committee complimented Thailand for rejecting the proposal for the construction of the Nam Choan Dam. The Committee observed that it would be concerned over any proposal that might affect the integrity of adjacent forests in Myanmar. The Committee 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 for which inscription procedures have been initiated**

Name of property	Identification No.	State Party
Casbah of Algiers	565	Algeria

The Committee decided to initiate the procedure for the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List and, to this effect, requested that a conservation plan taking into account the proposals made by the archeologists and historians responsible for the preservation of the Casbah of Algiers be prepared.

The Old Town of Zamousc 564 Poland

The Committee decided to initiate the procedure for the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List and, consequently requested the competent Polish authorities to provide a plan clearly showing the boundaries of the buffer zones.

C. Properties not inscribed on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party
Amphitheatre of Durres	571	Albania

While recognizing the importance of this property as part of the cultural heritage of Albania, the Committee 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 Committee urged the authorities of Thailand to strengthen the management of this area by using the marine biosphere reserve approach of UNESCO-MAB which would be most appropriate for addressing marine resources conservation.

Warrior's Cemetary and Monuments of Freedom of Riga 605 USSR

While recognizing the importance of this property as part of the national cultural heritage, the Committee 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.

**D. Deferred properties**

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party
Petajavesi Church	584	Finland

The Committee deferred the inscription of this property until ICOMOS is able to provide a more exhaustive study on the universal value of this monument.

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

The Committee deferred the inscription of this property until a more convincing documentation concerning the artistic value of this site is provided.

**E. Extension of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party	Criteria
Historic Centre of Lima	500bis	Peru	C(iv)

The Committee decided to inscribe the area protected by national legislation.

**F. Inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

Name of Property	Identification No.	State Party
Old City of Dubrovnik	95	Yugoslavia

Noting the state of exceptional emergency caused by the armed conflict, the Committee decided to inscribe the Old City of Dubrovnik on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Convention.

**XVII. OTHER BUSINESS**

68. The Delegate of the United States referred to the proposals for inscription on the World Heritage List of the two pre-hispanic "pueblos" (one situated in United States of America and the other in Mexico), of which examination had been deferred, and asked whether these proposals would be

submitted to the Committee in 1992. The Secretariat informed that only the site in the United States of America would be examined in 1992 as the Mexican authorities had not made known their wish to resubmit their site. However, the Secretariat had informed the Mexican authorities of the steps taken by the United States to resubmit their site. The Delegate of Mexico expressed surprise at the lack of reaction on behalf of the authorities of his country.

**XIII. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU AND COMMITTEE**

69. The sixteenth session of the Bureau of the Committee will be held in Paris from 6 to 10 July 1992.

70. The Committee accepted with thanks the generous offer of the United States of America to host the sixteenth session of the World Heritage Committee at Santa Fe, New Mexico, from 6-14 December 1992. This session will be extended in order to permit discussion on the evaluation of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and its future strategy.

**XIV. CLOSURE OF SESSION**

71. On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman, Mr. Beschouch, thanked the Rapporteur, the Secretariat and the interpreters for their efficiency in carrying out the work. Several delegates thanked the authorities of Tunisia for hosting the fifteenth session of the World Heritage Committee in Carthage. The Chairman then declared the session closed.



**ANNEX TO THE REPORT ON**  
**THE 15TH SESSION OF**  
**THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

The World Heritage Committee representing 122 states including Yugoslavia, which are parties to the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, is deeply concerned by the severe damage caused by the armed conflict to historic areas and natural sites within this country, several of which are protected by the Convention.

The Committee joins in the repeated appeals by UNESCO's Member States and its Director General to the parties in conflict to stop all destruction and to enable the international Community to participate in the the restorations indispensable due to the disaster which has occurred.

Considering the emergency situation of the Old city of Dubrovnik, the Committee felt compelled to inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to encourage special measures to be taken for its preservation.

Distribution limited  
Distribution limitée

SC-91/CONF.002/INF  
Carthage, 13 December 1991

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

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

World Heritage Committee/Comité du patrimoine mondial

Fifteenth session/Quinzième session

Carthage, Tunisia, 9-13 December 1991  
Carthage, Tunisie, 9-13 décembre 1991

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

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

BRAZIL/BRESIL

Mr. Lauro CAVALCANTI  
Director  
Brazilian Institute of Cultural Heritage (IBPC)  
Rua da Imprensa, 16 - B andar  
20030 RIO DE JANEIRO

Ms. Maria Dolores ALMEIDA CUNHA  
Third Secretary  
Embassy of Brazil  
37 Avenue d'Afrique  
El Menzah  
TUNIS

Ms. Niède GUIDON  
Fundacao Museu do Homem americano  
Fr. 1A Q. Abdias Neves 551  
64770 S. RAIMUNDO NONATO PIAUI

**CHINA/CHINE**

Mr. Zhan GUO  
Director of the Administrative Office of the  
State Bureau of Cultural Property  
29 Wu S1 Street  
BEIJING 100009

Mr. Xunyuan QIU  
Deputy Director of UNESCO National Commission  
for China  
37 Damuchenghutong Xidab  
BEIJING

**CYPRUS/CHYPRE**

Mr. Christos CASSIMATIS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Cyprus to UNESCO  
86 Avenue Foch  
75116 PARIS

**EGYPT/EGYPTE**

Professor Gamal MOKHTAR  
Président honoraire de l'Organisation Egyptienne  
des Antiquités  
CAIRO

**FRANCE**

Mr. Léon PRESSOUYRE  
Professeur à l'Université de Paris I  
296 rue St. Jacques  
75005 PARIS

Ms. Françoise BERCE  
Conservateur général du patrimoine  
121 Avenue Philippe Auguste  
75011 PARIS

Mr. Jean-Pierre BOYER  
Conseiller Technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
42 Avenue Raymond Poincaré  
75116 PARIS

Mr. Alain MEGRET  
Directeur Adjoint  
Protection de la nature  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
14 Blvd. du Général Leclerc  
92534 NEUILLY-sur-SEINE

#### GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Mr. Hans CASPARY  
Conservateur des Monuments Historiques  
Bennebergstr. 38  
D-6500 MAINZ-GUNSENHEIM

#### ITALY/ITALIE

Mr. Michelangelo JACOBUCCI  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

Ms Licia VLAD BORELLI  
ex Inspecteur centrale  
Ministère des Biens Culturels  
Via XXIV Maggio 51  
00187 ROME

Mr. Stefano GATTI  
Secretary  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
ROME

#### MEXICO/MEXIQUE

Mr. Salvador DIAZ-BERRIO  
Deputy Director  
Technical Support and Training (INAH)  
Calleson Ojito, 9 Coyoacan  
Cte. SAN F.  
04320 MEXICO D.F.

**OMAN**

Mr. Salem Ben Ahmed EL AMRI  
Assistant Secretary  
Embassy of Oman  
TUNIS

**PERU/PEROU**

Mr. Eduardo ARRARTE  
Patronato de Lima  
P.O. Box 4340  
LIMA

Mr. Enrique ESPINOSA  
President  
Cultural Commission of the Municipality  
of Lima  
Watalio Sanchez 220 of 1202  
LIMA

Mr. Pedro GJURINOVIC  
Director-General  
Instituto Nacional de Cultura  
Av. Amcash 390  
LIMA 1

**PHILIPPINES**

Mr. Augusto VILLALON  
Commissioner for Cultural Heritage  
UNESCO National Commission for the Philippines  
107 Wilson Circle  
SAN JUAN MANILA

Ms Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO  
Attaché  
Philippine Permanent Delegation to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**SENEGAL**

Mr. El H. Mbaye Bassine DIENG  
Director  
Historic and Ethnographic Culture  
B.P. 4001  
DAKAR

**SPAIN/ESPAGNE**

Mr. José Maria NOGUE  
Director General de Bellas Artes y Archivos  
Ministerio de Cultura  
Plaza Rey 1  
MADRID 28004

Mr. José Maria LOSADA  
Subdirector General de Bienes  
Instituto y Restauracion Bienes Culturales  
El Greco 4  
28040 MADRID

Mr. Antonio-José MAG-GUINDAL LAFARGA  
Subdirector General de Monumentos Arqueologia  
Ministerio de Cultura  
MADRID

**THAILAND/THAILANDE**

Mr. Abdul WICHIENTHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee on the Convention for the  
Protection of World Cultural Heritage  
1056/3 Nakoruchaisri Road  
BANGKOK

Mr. Usa KIATCHAIPAT  
Environmental Officer  
Office of the National Environment Board  
60/1 Soi Pibulwattana  
Rama IV Road  
BANGKOK 10400

Mr. Nikom MUSIGAKAMA  
Deputy Director-General  
Fine Arts Department  
Ministry of Education  
BANGKOK

Mr. Sudyit NIMITKUL  
Governor of Uthai Thani Province  
Office of Uthai Thani Province  
Uthai Thani Province

Mr. Payung NOPSUWAN  
Royal Forest Department  
Phaholyothin Road  
Chatuchuk  
BANGKOK 10900

Mr. Poonsup PIYA-ANANT  
Bureau of the Budget  
Rama 6 road  
10400 BANGKOK

Mr. Bunnalert RUCHATAKUL  
Forest Officer  
Royal Forest Department  
Phaholyothin Road  
10900 BANGKOK

Mr. Nath SRIVIHOK  
Ministry of the Interior  
21 Rangnam Road  
Phayathai  
BANGKOK

Mr. Chalernsak WANICHSONBUT  
Office of the National Environment Board  
60/1 Soi Pibul-Watana 7  
Rama 6 road  
BANGKOK

#### TUNISIA/TUNISIE

Mr. Ezzeddine BESCHAOUCH  
Directeur de Recherches  
Institut National d'Archéologie et d'Art  
4 Place du Chateau  
1008 TUNIS

Mr. Abdelaziz DAOULATLI  
Directeur Général de l'Institut National  
d'Archéologie et d'Art  
4 Place du Chateau  
1008 TUNIS

Mme. Saloua DARGOUTH  
Chargée de Recherches et Responsable de la  
Coopération et des relations internationales  
Institut National d'Archéologie et d'Art  
4 Place du Chateau  
1008 TUNIS

Mr. Ali EL HILI  
Président de la Fondation Nationale de la  
Recherche Scientifique  
TUNIS

Mr. Tahar GUELLALI  
Professeur de Sciences Naturelles  
Faculté des Sciences  
TUNIS

Mr. Abdel HENTATI  
Directeur de la Prévention et du Contrôle  
Agence Nationale de Protection de l'Environnement  
TUNIS

Mr. Ammar MAHJOUBI  
Directeur  
Institute d'Histoire du Mouvement National  
TUNIS

Mr. Ahmed MECHAREK  
Professeur d'Histoire  
Directeur du Département d'Histoire  
Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines  
TUNIS

Mr. Tarak NEFZI  
Expert Naturaliste  
Agence Nationale de Protection de  
l'Environnement  
TUNIS

Mr. Ahmed SOUISSI  
Directeur de l'Environnement  
Ministère de l'Agriculture  
30 rue Alain Savary  
TUNIS

Mr. Kadham BACCAR  
Chef de Service  
Direction des Organisations et Conférences  
Internationales  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
41 rue d'Iran  
TUNIS

Mr. Slaheddine BEL HADJ KACEM  
Directeur de la Conservation des Forêts  
Direction Générale des Forêts  
Ministère d'Agriculture  
30 rue Alain Savary  
1002 TUNIS



Ms Haddah Z. BELKHIR  
Chef de Service  
Direction de l'Environnement  
Ministère d'Agriculture  
30 rue Alain Savary  
1002 TUNIS

Mr. Habib BEN HASSEN  
Responsable des projets et programmes  
INAA  
4 Place du Chateau  
1008 TUNIS

Mr. Abdulhamid KAREM  
Sous Directeur de la Chasse et des Parcs Nationaux  
30 rue Alain Savary  
1002 TUNIS

Mr. Habib ZOUABI  
Chef de Service  
Fondation Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique  
El Mamar I  
TUNIS

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE**

Mr. Knute KNUDSON  
Deputy Chief-of-Staff  
Department of the Interior  
635 A St. N.E.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002

Mr. James CHAMBERLIN  
U.S. Department of State  
(OES/EHC)  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

Mr. Blaine CLIVER  
Chief, Preservation Assistance Division  
National Park Service  
P.O. Box 37127  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013-7127

Mr. John COOK  
Regional Director  
National Park Service  
1100 Old Santa Fé  
SANTA FE, NM 87501

Mr. Richard COOK  
Chief, International Affairs  
P.O. Box 37121  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013-7127

Ms Mary Anne DAVIS  
Administrative Assistant  
U.S. National Park Service  
P.O. Box 31127  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013

Ms Jennifer SALISBURY  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Fish & Wildlife & Parks  
Department of the Interior  
1849C street N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

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

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES/CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL  
DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES

Mr. Roland SILVA  
President  
75 rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

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

Mr. Leo van NISPEN  
Director  
75 rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO  
Chargée de Recherche  
75 rue du Temple  
75003 PARIS

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

Mr. James THORSELL  
Executive Officer  
Avenue du Mont-Blanc  
CH-1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

Mr. J. SAYER  
Tropical Forest Officer  
Avenue du Mont-Blanc  
CH-1196 GLAND  
Switzerland

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

Mr. Andrei TOMASEWSKI  
Director  
Via di S. Michele 13  
00153 ROME

Mr. Jukka JOKILEHTO  
Chief, Architectural Conservation  
Via di S. Michele 13  
00153 ROME

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS/ORGANISATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Mr. Boubakar BECHRAOUI  
Co-ordinator for Regional Programmes  
United Nations Development Programme  
61 Blvd. Bab B'net  
TUNIS, Tunisia

Mr. Sylvio MUTAL  
Project Co-ordinator  
Regional Project for the Preservation of Cultural  
Heritage in Latin America  
UNDP/UNESCO  
Casillo 4480  
LIMA, Peru

Mr. Daniel DROCOURT  
Atelier du Patrimoine mondial de la Ville  
de Marseille  
10ter Square Belsence  
13001 MARSEILLE  
France

Ms Myrienne MOREL-DELLEDALLE  
UNEP/Atelier du Patrimoine mondial de la Ville  
de Marseille  
10ter Square Belsence  
13001 MARSEILLE  
France

### III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS

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

##### ALGERIA/ALGERIE

Mr. A. FLILI  
Vice-President  
Fondation de la Casbah d'Alger  
48 rue Belkaen  
AMANI Hydra

Mr. Houria BOUHIRED  
Association pour la Sauvegarde de la Casbah  
3 rue Melaike  
BENAISSA

Mr. Mohammed LAZIZI  
Fondation de la Casbah d'Alger  
175 Blvd. Bonakoir  
ALGER 16000

Mr. Ahmed BOUHIRED  
Conseiller au Premier Ministère  
Immeuble DTA  
Boujarea  
ALGER

Ms Yahia BENZAGHOU  
Conseiller au Premier Ministère  
50 Avenue du Commandant A. Mira  
ALGER

Mr. Hadj TAIBI  
Directeur  
OFIRAC/Casbah d'Alger  
3 rue Mohamed Bouras  
Place des Martyrs  
ALGER

Mr. A. KHELIFA  
Directeur général de l'Agence National et de  
Protection des Monuments et Sites Historiques  
ALGER

Mr. Sidi Boumediene Abdel EL GHANI  
Directeur du Patrimoine Culturel  
Ministère de le Culture  
ALGER

#### AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Mr. Andy TURNER  
Assistant Secretary  
Nature Conservation Branch  
Department of the Arts, Sport, The Environment,  
Tourism and Territories (DASETT)  
GPO Box 787  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

#### CANADA

Ms Christina CAMERON  
Director-General  
National Historic Sites  
Environment Canada  
10 Wellington Street  
HULL, PQ K1A 0H3

#### FINLAND/FINLANDE

Mr. Pekka KARKI  
Head, Department of Historical Monuments  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O. Box 187  
00171 HELSINKI

**GREECE/GRECE**

Mr. Iuannis TOURATSOLOU  
Musée Numismatique  
Tussitsa 1  
10682 ATHENS

**GUINEA/GUINEE**

Mr. Lancei BAKAYOKO  
Directeur-Général  
MIFER  
B.P. 837  
CONAKRY

Mr. Abd. Cherif COUMBASSA  
Directeur National de l'Environnement  
B.P. 3118  
T443868 CONAKRY

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Mr. Béla KOVACSI  
Conseiller du Ministre  
P.O. Box 351  
H-1394 BUDAPEST

Mr. Zoltan SZILASSY  
Head, Division of Landscape Protection  
Ministry of Environment on Regional Policy  
Kolho 21  
1121 BUDAPEST

**IRAQ/IRAK**

Mr. Muayad BASIM  
Director-General of Antiquities & Heritage  
Directorate General of Antiquities  
BAGHDAD

**NIGER**

S.Exc. Mr. Lambert MESSAN  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Niger to UNESCO  
1 rue Miollis  
75015 PARIS

**POLAND/POLOGNE**

Mr. Michael WITWICKI  
Architect, Membre Groupe d'Experts pour les Affaires  
de Preservation des Villes anciennes et des Ensembles  
Historiques  
Dembowskiego 12/53  
01-784 WARSAW

**PORTUGAL**

Mr. Pedro Maria de ALVIM  
Chef du Cabinet du Sous-Secrétaire d'Etat  
à la Culture  
Palais d'Ajuda  
LISBON

**HOLY SEE/SAINT SIEGE**

S.Exc. Mgr. Edmond FARHAT  
Ambassador to Tunisia  
1 rue d'Aureddin Mekiri-Bologhin  
ALGER

**ROMANIA/ROUMANIE**

Mr. Angheluta VADINEANU  
Secretary of State  
Ministry of Environment  
Libertatu 12  
BUCHAREST

Mr. Serban POPESCU-DOLJ  
Deputy Director-General  
Ministry of Culture  
Piata Pressei Liberte Nr. 1  
BUCHAREST

**SWEDEN/SUEDE**

Ms. Birgitta HOBERG  
Inspector of Monuments  
Central Board of National Antiquities  
P.O. Box 5405  
S-11484 STOCKHOLM

Ms. Christina SANDSTROM  
 Head of Department  
 Central Board of National Antiquities  
 P.O. Box 5405  
 S-11484 STOCKHOLM

YUGOSLAVIA/YOUGOSLAVIE

Mr. Slobodan RAKOVIC  
 Conseiller de l'Ambassade de R.S.F. de  
 Yougoslavie  
 4 rue de liberia  
 TUNIS

A. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/ORGANISATIONS NON  
 GOUVERNMENTALES

Ms Nayla OUERTANI  
 The International Council of Museums  
 Ministry of Culture and Co-operation  
 La Kasbah  
 TUNIS

IV. SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bernd von Droste  
 Director  
 Division of Ecological Sciences

Mrs. Anne RAIDL  
 Director  
 Division of Physical Heritage

Mr. Abdallah DADDAH  
 UNESCO Representative in Tunisia  
 TUNIS

Mr. N. ISHWARAN  
 Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. Mirielle JARDIN  
 Division of Ecological Sciences

Ms. Anna DUMITRESCU  
 Division of Physical Heritage



Mr. M. BOULARES  
Interpretation Division

Ms. F. TRUEL  
Interpretation Division

Ms. Denise ARMAND  
Division of Physical Heritage

Ms. Jane DEGEORGES  
Division of Ecological Sciences