



Distribution limited

WHC-95/CONF.204/8
Paris, 22 November 1995
Original : English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, 2 - 3 November 1995
Room XII**

SUMMARY RECORD

1. The Tenth General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural heritage was held in Paris at UNESCO Headquarters, on 2 and 3 November 1995, during the 28th session of the General Conference.
2. One hundred and nineteen States Parties to the Convention were represented at the meeting.
3. Representatives of two non-governmental organizations and the European Communities Commission attended the meeting as observers. Several other observers were also present.

Opening of the session

4. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre provided the Secretariat for the Assembly.
5. In his opening address, the Deputy Director-General, representing the Director-General, evoked the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention to which 143 States Parties now adhered; since the eighteenth session of the Committee, 440 properties situated in 100 States Parties were now inscribed on the World Heritage List.

He emphasized that the desire to preserve the diversity of cultural and natural heritage has made it possible to accomplish noteworthy actions and to strengthen the feeling of belonging to a world community working towards greater tolerance, solidarity and peace.

17 JAN. 1996

He informed the General Assembly that the Director-General of UNESCO had signed several Green Notes concerning the role of the World Heritage Centre and its relations with other units within the Secretariat, in order to rationalise its procedures and to increase its field of action.

He also requested the States Parties to make an effort to settle outstanding dues to the World Heritage Fund, now amounting to a total of more than two million US dollars.

Election of the President, Vice-Presidents and Rapporteur

6. The General Assembly elected by acclamation Mr S. Kronfol (Lebanon) as President. The General Assembly also elected unanimously representatives of Brazil, Niger and Japan as Vice-Presidents, and Mr J. Jelen (Hungary) as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda

7. After having moved to item 9 of the draft agenda the examination of new monitoring activities and to item 10 elections to the World Heritage Committee, the General Assembly adopted its draft agenda.

8. Following a point of order on the part of Slovenia, which recalled a resolution of the UN Security Council and a decision of the UNESCO General Conference, and after having heard the advice of the Legal Advisor, the General Assembly decided that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not participate in this tenth session.

Report by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee

9. In accordance with the recommendation made by the World Heritage Committee at its eighteenth session, the Chairman of the Committee, Dr Adul Wichiencharoen (Thailand) presented to the General Assembly the report which the Committee was submitting to the UNESCO General Conference. The text of Dr. Wichiencharoen's presentation, as well as the Committee's Report to the General Conference, is presented in Annex I to this document. The General Assembly took note of this report.

Examination of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund

10. The General Assembly examined the Document WHC-95/CONF.204/3 concerning the budgetary situation of the World Heritage Fund, in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the Fund. The situation concerning contributions up to 28 October 1995, replacing Document WHC-95/CONF.204/3 Add., was also distributed during the session. The Assembly was further informed that the following contributions had been received since 28 October 1995:

State Party	Amount (US \$)	Year of contribution
Algeria	10,768	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Argentina	129	balance 1995
Guyana	301	part of 1994
India	9,979	1995
Jordan	180	balance 1995
Mozambique	658	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Nigeria	19,089	balance 1993, 1994 and 1995
Pakistan	1,878	balance 1994/part of 1995

11. The General Assembly then took note of the statement of accounts of the World Heritage Fund for the financial period ending on 31 December 1993, the interim statement of accounts for the period 1994-1995, as at 31 August 1995, and the summary contributions received from States Parties as at 31 August 1995. The Assembly also took note of information provided by the Secretariat regarding contributions received since 28 October 1995.

During examination of the accounts, the General Assembly requested the Secretariat to work towards improving the presentation of the budget and the accounts in order to provide greater transparency and clarity, especially with regard to the special voluntary contributions to the Fund and their use. The General Assembly also requested that in the future the accounts up to 31 December carry the visa of the Director of the Centre and the Financial Comptroller.

Determination of the amount of the contributions to the World Heritage Fund in accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the Convention

12. The General Assembly unanimously decided that the amount of mandatory contributions to the World Heritage Fund for the period 1996-1997, calculated in US dollars, would be maintained at 1 percent of contributions made by States Parties to the Regular Programme of UNESCO, in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention, as had been decided by the nine previous General Assemblies.

Proposed procedural changes for the election to the World Heritage Committee - Proposed amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly

13. The President then explained for which reasons it was proposed to simplify the procedure in force for the election of members to the World Heritage Committee, in order to avoid an excessive number of ballots. This simplification, contained in the proposed amendments to Rules 13.8, 13.9 and 13.10 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (cf. Document WHC-95/CONF.204/5), would comprise four ballots with absolute majority and at the fifth ballot a simple majority, and in the event of two or more candidates obtaining the same number of votes, to proceed by drawing lots.

14. The General Assembly rejected several additional amendments proposed during the session by delegations, comprising:

- in the case of candidates obtaining the same number of votes, deferral of drawing of lots until the sixth ballot;

- replacement of drawing of lots in the case of equality of votes by preference accorded to the State which had not yet been elected to the Committee;

- interdiction of an outgoing Committee member to present its candidature for immediate re-election;

- consideration as invalid the ballot papers where the number of States marked is less than the seats to be filled.

Following these discussions, Rules 13.8, 13.9 and 13.10 as amended in the proposal contained in the Document WHC-95/CONF.204/5 were adopted by consensus, and Rule 13.4 was modified as follows:

"Each delegation shall cast its vote **by encircling** the names of those States for which it... desires.... to vote."

New monitoring activities related to World Heritage sites

15. This agenda item was introduced by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, Dr Adul Wichinchaoen (Thailand), who summarized the contents of his report on this subject as reflected in Working Document WHC-95/CONF.204/7 (see note ¹) and the

¹ The Rapporteur decided, for the sake of clarity, to re-number the proposed draft resolutions and revisions to these resolutions submitted to the General Assembly in their chronological order. All these documents as well as the Report of the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee for this agenda item are included among the official documents of the General Assembly and are included in Annex II. Reference numbers used in this report are the ones attributed to them by the Rapporteur.

proposed resolution that had been prepared by him for this General Assembly (WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1). He recalled that the World Heritage Committee, after a long process of consultations, discussions and practical experiences in several States Parties and regions, particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, decided, at its eighteenth session in December 1994, to introduce a voluntary system of on-site monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties by the States Parties themselves, with a periodic reporting by the States Parties to the World Heritage Committee. With reference to specific provisions in the Articles 4, 6, 7, 8, 11 and the eighth preambular clause of the Convention, the Chairman emphasized that the Committee considered monitoring and reporting to constitute the appropriate modern and scientific means to meet the requirements and responsibilities of the States Parties and the World Heritage Committee as set out in the World Heritage Convention for ensuring the collective protection and conservation of properties on the World Heritage List. Therefore, he concluded, the reporting, i.e. the presentation of periodic state of conservation reports as proposed by the Committee, is a technical instrument for the implementation of the Convention and is of a different order than the reports to the General Conference of UNESCO mentioned in Article 29 of the Convention.

16. The Delegate of India introduced a draft resolution submitted by her country together with Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2 which was replaced by WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2.Corr.1). Another draft resolution was also submitted by India as an amendment to the Chairman's proposed resolution (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3). She proposed to use the terminology 'systematic observation' instead of 'systematic monitoring' in order to avoid any misunderstanding and misinterpretation. She also pointed out that, in her country's view and based upon Article 29 of the Convention, reports from States Parties can only be required by the General Conference of UNESCO and not by a 'select outside body' such as the World Heritage Committee.

17. The UNESCO Legal Adviser replied to some specific questions that were raised in the draft resolution DR.2.corr.1. He clarified that the World Heritage Convention only foresees a reporting by the States Parties to the General Conference of UNESCO and that no legal basis exists for the Committee to demand reports on a mandatory basis. The Committee could, however, request reports as long as this would be done on a voluntary basis.

18. In reply to a question posed by the Delegate of India, the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee emphasized that it is the responsibility of the Committee to make detailed provisions for the implementation of the different aspects of the Convention which are subsequently reflected in the 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention'. In this sense, he repeated that monitoring and reporting were conceived by the Committee as a technical means of implementing the Convention and as an effective tool for management and planning remedial actions by the States Parties themselves and for the Committee to undertake the tasks entrusted to it in the Convention. He reiterated that the World Heritage Committee can only undertake its tasks to establish and keep up-to-date the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger as well as to provide international assistance for the safeguarding of World Heritage properties, if it has updated and reliable information on their state of conservation available.

19. In the ensuing debate, the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee and the Chairman's proposed resolution WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1. were fully supported by the Delegates of Cambodia, Argentina, Colombia, Netherlands, Croatia, Mexico, Italy, Sweden, Poland, Cuba, United States of America, Canada, among others, whereas the resolution WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3 tabled by India was favoured or considered suitable for revision by the Delegates of Germany, Greece, France, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Laos, China, Mali, Sudan, among others. The Delegate of Germany, however, expressed reservations about the final part of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution DR.3 and proposed that the text 'on a totally voluntary basis and without any obligation under the Convention to do so' be deleted.

20. The Delegate of Canada then pointed out that it seemed that the main divergence was not on the need for monitoring or reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties in itself, but on the question if reports should be submitted to the World Heritage Committee or to the UNESCO General Conference. Upon her suggestion that reports could be presented to the General Assembly of States Parties, the President of the General Assembly decided to adjourn the session to give the delegates the opportunity to discuss and prepare a consensus resolution. After the recess, a 'revised amendment' was submitted by India (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.1). This document was then distributed to all delegates.

21. The Delegate of Germany expressed his support for this DR.3.Rev.1, whereas the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee expressed his strong opposition towards it. In view of the fact that many delegates wished to consult with their respective governments on this new text, the President of the General Assembly decided to defer the debate until after the elections of the new members of the Committee (item 10 of the agenda).

22. After the conclusion of the elections, the President of the General Assembly stated that he had received a written statement from the Delegates of Sweden, Denmark and Finland which supported the resolution DR.1 proposed by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee and which proposed specific amendments to the DR.3.Rev.1 in case the DR.1 were not accepted by the General Assembly (for the full text of this statement see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.2). A revision to DR.3.Rev.1 was also submitted to the President of the General Assembly in a written statement submitted by the Delegate of Brazil and reproduced in Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.3. The President then proposed to amend DR.3.Rev.1 in the sense that reporting would take place to the 'General Assembly of States Parties as well as to the General Conference of UNESCO'. He also proposed amendments to paragraph 4 of the same document regarding the 'prime responsibility' of the States Parties in the observation of the conditions of World Heritage properties, and paragraph 5 regarding the role of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies in providing expert advice to States Parties (for the full text of this proposal see Document DR.3.Rev.4).

23. The Chairman of the World Heritage Committee intervened to express his disappointment that not all members of the World Heritage Committee openly defended the Committee's decisions. Hereafter, the Delegate of Italy requested that his country's full support to the Committee's decisions be recorded in the report of the session. The Chairman, supported by the Delegates of Italy, Australia and Canada, also raised objections that his

proposed resolution was not taken as the basis for the discussions. The President referred to Rules 12.6 and 12.7 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly to justify his decision to first invite discussions on the draft resolutions submitted by India (DR.3.Rev.1) and himself (DR.3.Rev.4).

24. The discussions then focused on the DR.3.Rev.4 proposed by the President of the General Assembly.

25. The Delegates of Brazil and Italy supported the President's proposal to bring paragraph 4 of DR.3.Rev.1 in line with Article 4 of the World Heritage Convention which stipulates that 'the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage (...) belongs primarily to that State'. As to paragraph 5 of the President's proposal, the Delegate of Brazil, supported by the Delegates of Italy, Madagascar, Australia and the Netherlands, found this too restrictive and proposed to replace its text by the following: "Emphasizes further that with the expressed agreement of the State Party concerned, UNESCO, through the World Heritage Centre and/or the advisory bodies mentioned in Art. 13.7, may provide expert advice on" (see Document WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3.Rev.3). The Delegate of Italy questioned the meaning of paragraph 9 of DR3.Rev.3 and DR.3.Rev.4 inviting the World Heritage Committee to explore the possibility of activating the reporting procedure mentioned in Article 29.

26. The Delegate of Australia expressed the view that the Assembly did not seem to be close to a consensus on the matter of monitoring and reporting. In response to the fear he felt among some of the delegates for excessive bureaucracy and an intrusion on the sovereignty of the States Parties, the Delegate stated that the World Heritage Committee's decisions on monitoring and reporting indeed strengthen the role of the Convention and the Committee but that these are in no way intrusive. Given the fact that the Convention as such, of course, cannot reflect the experiences gained since 1972, he felt that there is an important role to play for UNESCO in setting standards in this field. He concluded that he would not concur with the President's proposal DR.3.Rev.4.

27. Adding to this, the Delegate of Canada referred to specific articles in the World Heritage Convention, particularly Article 6, to illustrate the delicate balance between the sovereignty of the States Parties and the responsibility of the international community to cooperate in the conservation of the World Heritage properties, and to the importance of paragraph 5 (a) of the proposed resolution DR.1. She concluded that both DR.3.Rev.1 and DR.3.Rev.4 would imply a step back as compared to the Convention.

28. In response to the President's draft resolution (DR.3.Rev.4), the UNESCO Legal Adviser remarked that this proposal would encounter the same legal difficulties as the one proposing reporting to the Committee. He again recalled that, according to Article 29 of the Convention, it is to the General Conference of UNESCO to determine the dates and the manner in which the States Parties to the Convention shall give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, together with details of the experience required in this field. He stressed that Article 29 could be used in a flexible way and that 'the manner'

of the reporting could very well be, if the General Conference would so decide, through the General Assembly or the World Heritage Committee.

29. During the debate, the Delegate of Zimbabwe observed that the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee address the concerns of, what he called, the practitioners and that monitoring is crucial for their work and that he therefore supported the Committee's position. He also proposed to mandate the Committee to look again into this matter. The Delegates of Australia and Austria equally stressed the need to develop, on the basis of the past experiences, standards for management and monitoring of World Heritage properties including a format for periodic state of conservation reports and the important role the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO, in collaboration with the advisory bodies ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN, should play in this matter.

30. The Delegates of Algeria and Morocco remarked that the positions defended by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee and the Delegate of India differed fundamentally from each other and that more reflection was needed on this matter. They proposed to defer the discussion and decision-making to the next General Assembly in 1997. This was supported by the Delegates of Australia, Canada, Sweden, Malta and Pakistan. As the discussion continued on various related matters, the Delegate of Sweden requested the President to bring the proposal to defer the debate to a vote. The President did so and the proposal was adopted by forty-one votes in favour. Ten delegates voted for the continuation of the debate and five abstentions were recorded.

31. As a conclusion, the General Assembly decided to continue the debate on the systematic monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties at the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties that will be held in 1997. The General Assembly requested the World Heritage Committee to prepare a report and a proposed resolution for the eleventh session of the General Assembly of States Parties taking into account the discussions and experiences gained over the past years as well as the documents that had been presented to the Tenth General Assembly and the discussions thereon.

32. The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Assembly that the report of the session will be finalized by the Rapporteur and will be distributed, in English and French, to all States Parties before the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee (4-9 December 1995). Furthermore, he indicated that the item 'the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural and natural properties' figured already on the provisional agenda of the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee and that the Committee would certainly examine this matter in the light of the debate at the Tenth General Assembly very seriously. He furthermore informed that the Committee will decide whether financial support will be given to States Parties upon their request, for monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and for training of site managers in this field. He also indicated that guidelines were being prepared jointly with ICCROM for on-site recording and documentation.

33. Subsequently, upon the proposal made by the Delegate of the United States of America, the General Assembly thanked the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee for the work undertaken by the Committee and for his personal commitment and professional input in the debate at this General Assembly.

Elections to the World Heritage Committee

34. Under item 10 of its agenda, the General Assembly was called upon to elect seven members to the World Heritage Committee, to replace the following seven members whose mandate would expire at the end of the twenty-eighth session of the General Conference: Colombia, Indonesia, Oman, Peru, Senegal, Syrian Arab Republic and Thailand. Following the withdrawal of its candidature by Nigeria, as well as that of Colombia which withdrew in favour of Ecuador, the list of twenty-eight States Parties having submitted their candidature was read to the General Assembly: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Benin, Cambodia, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lithuania, Mali, Malta, Morocco, Mauritania, Mozambique, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

35. On the decision of the President, the elections were held by secret ballot. Mr Li Jiangang (China) and Ms A.K. Endresen (Norway) were appointed tellers.

36. The results of the first ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	28
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	0
Number of votes recorded	114
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	58

Australia, having polled 68 votes, was declared elected by the President.

37. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the second ballot was to be limited to those States which had obtained the greatest number of votes, provided that the number of States did not exceed twice the number of seats remaining to be filled, which was six. The following States obtained the greatest number of votes: Canada, Morocco, Ecuador, India, Benin, Viet Nam, Cuba, Oman, Poland, Lithuania, Zimbabwe, Greece and Malta. These last two candidates having obtained the same number of votes, and in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, an eliminatory ballot between these two States was held.

38. The results of the eliminatory ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	26
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	2
Number of votes recorded	114

Malta, having obtained the greatest number of votes (61) was maintained as candidate for the second ballot.

39. The results of the second ballot were as follows:

	11
Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	33
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	1
Number of votes recorded	108
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	55

States which obtained the required majority of votes were:

Canada	68
Morocco	68
Ecuador	56
Malta	56

The President thus declared the above States elected.

40. Two seats remaining to be filled, the following States, having obtained the greatest number of votes, were maintained as candidates for the third ballot: Benin, Cuba, India and Viet Nam.

41. The results of the third ballot were as follows:

Number of States Parties eligible to vote	142
Number of States absent	29
Number of abstentions	0
Number of invalid ballot papers	1
Number of votes recorded	112
Number of votes constituting the majority required to be elected	57

State having obtained the required majority:

Benin	61
-------	----

The President declared this State elected.

42. At the end of the third ballot, with one seat remaining to be filled, the following States having obtained the greatest number of votes were maintained as candidates for the fourth ballot: Cuba and Viet Nam.

Following Viet Nam's announcement to stand down in favour of Cuba, and applause and expressions of gratitude by the General Assembly, the President declared Cuba elected.

Other business

43. The Representative of Germany informed the General Assembly that the nineteenth session of the World Heritage Committee would be held in his country, in Berlin, and invited all States Parties to attend.

44. The Representative of Mexico and the Representative of Italy both proposed to host in their countries the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee. The General Assembly thanked these two States for their generous invitations and decided that the question would be examined during the nineteenth session of the Committee.

45. No other question having been raised under the item "Other business", the President declared the tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention closed.

REPORT

by

Professor Dr Adul Wichiencharoen
Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

presented to the Tenth General Assembly of States Parties
to the Convention

Paris, 2 and 3 November 1995

Mr President,
Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates,

I have the honour to submit a report on the activities undertaken by the Committee in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention for the two-year period since the ninth General Assembly held in 1993. During this period the number of States Parties has grown from 136 to 143. The Committee has held two meetings, the first at the invitation of the Colombian authorities, from 6 to 11 December 1993, in Cartagena, Colombia, and the second at the invitation of the Royal Thai Government in Phuket, Thailand, from 12 to 17 December 1994. The Bureau of the Committee met twice in 1994. In 1995, the first meeting was held in July and second will be in December.

On the basis of nominations put forward by States Parties, the Committee has, since the last General Assembly, decided to add 62 new inscriptions. The total number of inscriptions on the World Heritage List is now 440, distributed as follows: 326 cultural properties or sites; 97 natural sites and 17 mixed sites. In drawing up the World Heritage List, the Committee has been guided by the need to ensure, as far as possible, the representative nature of the List for all cultural and natural properties which meet the requirements of outstanding universal value stipulated by the Convention, and also satisfy the criteria adopted by the Committee for the evaluation of cultural and natural properties.

The increase in the number of nominations from States Parties has made it more than ever desirable to draw up tentative lists of properties which may be nominated for inclusion on the World Heritage List, as provided for in Article 11 of the Convention.

At its eighteenth session in December 1994, the World Heritage Committee adopted the 'Global Strategy' proposed by a group of experts convened by the Centre and ICOMOS in June 1994, to define a certain number of measures to be undertaken to improve the representative nature of the World Heritage List. In this context, several thematic and regional meetings were organized in 1994 and 1995 by the Centre, in cooperation with the advisory bodies and the States Parties.

Thus, a regional thematic study meeting on 'Asia Rice Culture and its Terraced Landscapes' was held in the Philippines from 28 March to 4 April 1995, and an expert group met in Australia from 26 to 28 April 1995 to identify and assess World Heritage cultural landscapes (associated landscapes). Furthermore, two thematic studies were carried out in 1994: one being the 'Heritage Part of our Cultural Heritage', convened in Spain. In addition, an international expert meeting on 'Authenticity in relation to the World Heritage Convention' was held in Nara, Japan, in November 1994, anteceded by a preparatory workshop held in Bergen, Norway, in early 1994. A first meeting on African cultural heritage was held in autumn 1995. Furthermore, studies on twentieth century architecture and industrial heritage by ICOMOS continue.

The World Heritage Committee, in reviewing the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary in 1992, recognized monitoring and reporting on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List as essential functions. The Committee adopted in December 1994 a text on monitoring and reporting for the 'Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention'. In so doing, the Committee believed that the conditions and circumstances that constitute serious dangers

threatening World Heritage properties as to require inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger, under paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Convention, can be rescued from such an eventuality if the earlier trends have been monitored and remedial measures have been taken in time to prevent the deterioration. Furthermore, the Committee feels that in order to perform its function effectively in accordance with the provisions in paragraphs 1 and 4 of Article 13, specifically to study requests for international assistance formulated by States Parties and, bearing in mind the urgency of the work to be done, to determine an order of priorities of its operations, the Committee needs to know the varying conditions of the state of conservation of all the properties under consideration. Thus, systematic monitoring and reporting is indispensable for international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve World Heritage properties situated in their territories.

Documents regarding item 9 of the agenda: New monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites

Contents*

WHC-95/CONF.204/7	Report of the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee to the 10th General Assembly on the new monitoring activities related to the World Heritage sites
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.1	Proposed resolution on monitoring and reporting submitted by the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee, dated 18 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2	Draft resolution, presented by India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea, dated 26 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.2/Corr.1	Explanatory note and draft resolution presented by India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Oman and the Republic of Korea, dated 28 October 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3	Draft resolution submitted as amendment to DR.1 by India, and distributed at the beginning of the session on 2 November 1995
WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.1	Revised draft resolution submitted by India and distributed during the evening session on 2 November 1995

*

Note : The rapporteur decided, for the sake of clarity, to re-number the proposed resolution, draft resolutions and amendments to these resolutions submitted to the General Assembly in their chronological order. Reference numbers used in the report of the tenth session of the General Assembly of States Parties are the ones attributed to them by the Rapporteur.

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.2

Proposed revision of DR.3/Rev.1 by Sweden, Denmark and Finland submitted to the President of the General Assembly on 2 November 1995

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.3

Proposed revision of DR.3/Rev.1 by Brazil submitted to the President of the General Assembly on 3 November 1995

WHC-95/CONF.204/DR.3/Rev.4

Proposed revision of DR.3 by the President of the General Assembly as read out on 3 November 1995