

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND  
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Bureau of the World Heritage Committee  
Tenth Session

Paris, 16-19 June, 1986

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The tenth session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at Unesco Headquarters in Paris from 16 to 19 June, 1986, and was attended by Mr. A.A. Mturi (Tanzania), Chairman, Mr. A.T. Davidson (Canada), Rapporteur, and representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, India, Mexico and Norway, Vice-Chairmen. In addition, nine States Parties to the Convention were represented by observers. 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 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity. The full list of participants appears in Annex I to this report.

2. Mr. Mturi, Chairman of the Committee, opened the meeting and Mr. Lopes, Assistant Director-General for Culture and Communication, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Director-General. Mr. Lopes observed that the number of States Parties to the Convention was now 90 and the Director-General and the Secretariat were making every effort to encourage new ratifications or acceptances. He emphasized certain significant items in the Bureau's work programme, which this year was particularly heavy: the question of tentative lists of cultural and natural properties, not enough of which had yet been received, the examination of a large number of new nominations, guidelines for identification and nomination of mixed cultural/natural properties and rural landscapes, and monitoring of the state of conservation of cultural properties. He observed that the state of the World Heritage Fund, though not totally satisfactory, was better than during certain previous periods, and he indicated that the Fund had received generous contributions from two States not party to the Convention, Austria and Grenada, as well as from the A.G. Leventis Foundation. He observed that the Bureau would consider fundamental questions whose full complexity would be progressively revealed with each new achievement of the Convention.

3. At the Chairman's request, an item concerning guidelines for the evaluation of contemporary architectural structures was added to the agenda. The agenda was adopted by the Bureau as amended.

4. The Secretary reported on activities undertaken since the ninth session of the Committee held in Paris from 2 to 6 December, 1985. After describing the state of implementation of the technical co-operation projects approved and the requests made to the current session, she gave the Bureau a progress report on the matter of tentative lists and stated that the number of nominations to be examined this year was once again large.

## II. TENTATIVE LISTS

5. The Secretariat gave a progress report on the drawing up of tentative lists of cultural and natural properties. To the tentative lists received in time for the ninth session of the World Heritage Committee (Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Turkey, United States of America, for cultural and natural properties; Benin, Cyprus, Guyana, India, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Spain, for cultural properties only) had been added tentative lists of cultural and natural properties from Greece, Mexico, United Kingdom and Yugoslavia, and the tentative list of cultural properties of Hungary. In addition, Switzerland and Lebanon had informed the Secretariat that they had already submitted their priority nominations and did not intend for the moment to make any further nominations of cultural properties.

6. The representative of India stated that the nine nominations of natural properties submitted by her country should be considered as constituting its tentative list. She also observed that very few Asian countries had submitted tentative lists and that this situation might be improved, perhaps with the help of the Regional Co-ordinator in Bangkok. The Secretariat emphasized the usefulness of meetings to harmonize the tentative lists of cultural properties of States in the same region, such as those of the Maghreb countries and the Nordic countries, and indicated that it contemplated holding a meeting of that kind for the Asian States. The Secretariat also pointed out that the States of that region were preparing their own convention concerning the protection of the heritage and that it would contact UNEP to obtain information on the subject.

## II. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

7. The Bureau examined thirty-one nominations, of which twenty-four related essentially to cultural properties and seven to natural properties. Twenty-nine properties were recommended to the Committee for inscription on the World Heritage List, and to this must be added a property proposed as an extension of a site already inscribed: these properties are listed in Section A below. The Bureau recommended deferral of a decision concerning a site included in section B. In the case of four properties appearing in section C, the Bureau considered that the Committee could undertake direct examination of the nominations of these sites when specified information had been collected. Finally, the Bureau examined information about the Delphi archaeological site whose nomination was to be considered in 1987.

A. Properties recommended for inscription in the World Heritage List

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>New South Wales rainforest</u>	368	Australia	N(i)(ii) (iii)

The Bureau noted that this nomination was the first of its kind in proposing seven different clusters of rainforests as one natural property for inscription in the World Heritage List. The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the nomination (a) with the omission of the Mt. Dromedary Flora Reserve and (b) under a more appropriate name, such as 'Australian East Coast Sub-Tropical Rainforest Parks', and that the State Party should be asked to agree to (a) and (b) before the Committee met to consider the recommendation. The Bureau also recommended that the Australian authorities should be asked to consider the desirability of extending the property to include contiguous rainforests in the state of Queensland. The Bureau supported IUCN's recommendations of the New South Wales Government's efforts to protect these remaining rainforest habitats and to complete management plans for all units included in the nomination.

<u>Iguaçu National Park</u>	355	Brazil	N(iii)(iv)
-----------------------------	-----	--------	------------

The examination of this property had been postponed at the request of the Brazilian authorities. Following note No. 74 addressed by the Permanent Delegation of Brazil to the Director-General of Unesco, dated 12 June, the Bureau was invited to re-examine the nomination. The Bureau recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List, as proposed by Brazil. In the light of the above note, the Bureau acknowledged the wish of the Brazilian authorities to list Iguaçu National Park situated in Brazil without any link to the concept of transfrontier site or any other similar concept in force or that might be accepted in the deliberations of the Committee.

The Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Unesco Permanent Delegations of the two States Parties concerned to seek advice on the future listing of this property.

<u>Monuments of Trier</u>	367	Germany (Fed. Republic of)	C(i)(iii) (iv)(vi)
---------------------------	-----	----------------------------------	-----------------------

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Temple of Apollo Epicurius at Bassae</u>	392	Greece	C(i)(ii) (iii)
<p>The Bureau recommended that the Greek authorities extend the perimeter of protection of this property in order to prevent new tourist developments from spoiling the beauty of the surrounding landscape.</p>			
<u>Churches and monasteries of Goa</u>	234	India	C(ii)(iv) (vi)
<p>The Bureau noted that, because of the materials of which they were constructed, the monuments of Goa were exposed to a variety of dangers (rain, destructive insects, variations in humidity) and that vigorous preservation efforts, possibly even inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, would therefore be justified.</p>			
<u>Khajuraho group of monuments</u>	240	India	C(i)(iii)
<p>The Bureau encouraged the Indian authorities to continue their efforts for the preservation of this site by giving the monuments in the Southern and Eastern zones of the site the same overall protection as those in the Western zone.</p>			
<u>Group of monuments at Hampi</u>	241	India	C(i)(iii) (iv)
<p>The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on condition that the Indian authorities provide, before the next session of the Committee, a plan setting out the precise zones to be protected, determined in co-operation with ICOMOS.</p>			
<u>Jerash</u>	324	Jordan	C(i)(ii) (iii)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this site of undeniable universal value, but emphasized the seriousness of the dangers threatening it. It endorsed the conclusions of the consultant sent by the Committee in 1986, and urged the adoption of the following measures for the protection of this site:

1. Delimitation. The proposals contained in the letter of the Jordanian Government dated 13 February, 1986, are inadequate. It is necessary:

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
-------------------------	---------------------------	--	-----------------

- to considerably enlarge the construction-free zones of 10 metres extra muros proposed in the letter;
- to protect the areas of the Necropolis and the ancient Birketain reservoir and its approaches;
- to take account of the existence of the ancient structures covered by the modern city to the East of the Amman-Irbid route.

2. Restorations. The unscientific anastyloses undertaken on the site contrary to the Venice Charter by Mr. H. Kalayan should be stopped immediately.

3. Management. A management plan should be adopted by the Jordanian Government after consultation with COMOS and Unesco to control:

- the proliferation of building works in the North, South and Western zones;
- highway building and tourist infrastructure projects;
- the fate of ancient remains in the urbanized area; in this regard, a systematic policy of surveys carried out when construction work is to be undertaken seems advisable if protection measures are not feasible.

The adoption of the first two of these measures would however be sufficient for the purposes of inscription of this site at the 10th meeting of the Committee.

<u>Old Town of Ghadamès</u>	362	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C(v)
-----------------------------	-----	---------------------------	------

The Bureau recommended that Libyan authorities adopt before the Committee meeting a management plan in conformity with the suggestions of the Unesco experts:

- comprising the delimitation of a protection zone around the ancient city;
- ensuring the safeguarding of the traditional skills and knowhow necessary to the conservation of the fabric with its original shapes and materials;
- ensuring supervision of the oasis, and in particular the traditional system of irrigation of the palm grove.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Westland and Mount Cook National Park</u>	375	New Zealand	N(i)(ii) (iii)
<p>The Bureau was satisfied that the negative impacts of aircraft use and their mitigation have been adequately addressed in the management plans available for these two national parks. The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to keep it informed of any changes in the legal status of the recently added lands in Westland National Park.</p>			
<u>Fiordland National Park</u>	376	New Zealand	N(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
<p>The Bureau noted the importance of including the waters of the fiords as an integral part of this national park and expressed concern over the potential impact of a proposal to export fresh water from this area. While noting that this proposal has been currently withdrawn, the Bureau requested that the State Party inform the World Heritage Committee if the water export proposal is to be reconsidered. The Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee welcome initiatives of the State Party to bring the waters of the fiords under the control of the park authorities, endorse the efforts of New Zealand Wildlife Service to rehabilitate takahe habitat and restore population numbers, register that the Waikutu forest, if added to the park, would become an acceptable part of the World Heritage site and encourage the State Party to implement the re-development plan for the Milford area.</p>			
<u>Chan Chan archaeological zone</u>	366	Peru	C(i)(iii)
<p>The Bureau expressed profound concern with regard to the conservation of this property, the materials of which are quickly damaged by natural erosion as they become exposed to the air, and which in any case require continuous restoration efforts and substantial ancillary measures. Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be warranted.</p>			
<u>Historic Centre of Evora</u>	361	Portugal	C(ii)(iv)
<u>Mudéjar Architecture of Teruel</u>	378	Spain	C(iv)
<p>The Bureau noted with satisfaction that the nomination of this property had been extended to include, in particular, the whole of the church of San Pedro, including its apse.</p>			

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Historic City of Toledo</u>	379	Spain	C(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
<u>Old town of Cáceres</u>	384	Spain	C(iii)(iv)
<u>Ancient City of Aleppo</u>	21	Syrian Arab Republic	C(iii)(iv)
<u>Necropolis of Arg al-Ghazwani, Kerkwan</u>	332 Add.	Tunisia	

The Bureau noted that this property was nominated for independent inscription on the World Heritage List but as an addition to the Kerkwan site, to which it would form a very appropriate extension.

<u>Hattusas</u>	377	Turkey	C(i)(ii) (iii)(iv)
-----------------	-----	--------	-----------------------

The Bureau would like confirmation that the management plan prepared on the spot by a German archaeological team has the approval of the Turkish authorities and that the creation of a national park suggested in 1971 will become a reality, enabling the soil to be better protected.

<u>The Giant's Causeway and causeway coast</u>	369	United Kingdom	N(i)(iii)
--	-----	----------------	-----------

The Bureau recommended that the steps being taken by the Northern Ireland authorities to declare this property a national nature reserve should be supported. The representative of the United Kingdom noted that the recommendation of inscription of this site on the World Heritage List would help further this process.

<u>Durham Castle and Cathedral</u>	370	United Kingdom	C(ii)(iv) (vi)
<u>Ironbridge Gorge</u>	371	United Kingdom	C(i)(ii) (iv)(vi)
<u>Fountains Abbey and St. Mary's Church, Studley Royal</u>	372	United Kingdom	(to be determined)

The Bureau recommended inscription of this property on condition that the British authorities redraft the proposal in such a way as to include expressly in the

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
definition of this cultural property the Manor House of Fountains Hall and various landscape improvements carried out in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, since the medieval ruins of the abbey and their landscaped surroundings together form a striking whole. The redrafted nomination could be entitled 'Studley Royal Park including the ruins of Fountains Abbey'.			
<u>Stonehenge, Avebury and associated sites</u>	373	United Kingdom	C(i)(ii) (iii)
The Bureau requested the United Kingdom authorities to study possible solution to the problem of the A 344 main road crossing the avenue at Stonehenge (detour, gging of a tunnel, etc.). It would be desirable for the Committee to be informed of the progress of these studies at its next meeting.			
<u>The Castles and Town Walls of King Edward I in Gwynedd</u>	374	United Kingdom	C(i)(iii) (iv)
<u>St. Kilda</u>	387	United Kingdom	N(iii)(iv)
The Bureau noted that though there is a radar-tracking station in St. Kilda, it had remained small in size and under strict lease agreements with the Nature Conservancy Council. The facility, however, had helped in improving protection of the area and in providing services to the management staff of St. Kilda. The Bureau recommended that the authorities of the United Kingdom keep the World Heritage Committee informed of any further extension of the radar-tracking station. The Bureau also recommended that the United Kingdom should consider bringing forward proposals for the inclusion of the waters of St. Kilda archipelago, feeding areas for several of St. Kilda's bird species and the underwater landscape as parts of this natural property. It also noted that St. Kilda, though being recommended for inscription as a natural site in the World Heritage List, also had supportive cultural values as evidence of man's harmonious interaction with nature over time.			
<u>Old city of Sana'a</u>	385	Yemen	C(iv)(v) (vi)
The Bureau took note of the preparation of a new set of municipal regulations which it hopes will soon be adopted, and requested that the Committee be kept informed of the progress of measures for safeguarding this site, which is the subject of an international campaign.			



<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Studenica Monastery</u>	389	Yugoslavia	C(i)(ii) (iv)(vi)
<u>Great Zimbabwe National Monument</u>	364	Zimbabwe	C(i)(iii) (vi)
The Bureau recommended that the archaeological inventory and investigations in progress should be continued and that any tourist development project should be carried out with the greatest prudence.			
<u>Khami Ruins National Monument</u>	365	Zimbabwe	C(iii)(iv)

**B. Nomination to be deferred**

<u>Varajevo</u>	388	Yugoslavia
-----------------	-----	------------

The Bureau recommended that study of this property should be deferred pending a study by ICOMOS, in consultation with the relevant authorities, of the vernacular architecture of the region in the framework of comparative study of the tentative lists.

**C. Other properties which might be examined by the Committee at its 10th session:**

<u>Fatehpur Sikri</u>	255	India
-----------------------	-----	-------

study of this nomination had been deferred at one of its previous sessions, the Bureau considered that should the Indian authorities find it possible to redefine, in agreement with ICOMOS, the boundaries of the proposed site before the next session of the Committee, this nomination could be submitted to it.

<u>Garajonay National Park</u>	380	Spain
--------------------------------	-----	-------

The IUCN evaluation of this site was expected to be completed only after its forthcoming mission to the site in September 1986. The Bureau suggested that the World Heritage Committee should take a decision regarding the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List if the IUCN evaluation is completed before the 10th session of the World Heritage Committee.

<u>Name of Property</u>	<u>Identification No.</u>	<u>Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention</u>	<u>Criteria</u>
<u>Skocjan Caves</u>	390	Yugoslavia	

The evaluation of this site was delayed by IUCN in view of its forthcoming visit to the area in July 1986. The Bureau suggested that IUCN evaluation and recommendations on this site be made directly to the World Heritage Committee at its 10th session.

<u>Brioni National Park and Commemorative Sites</u>	391	Yugoslavia	
---	-----	------------	--

The evaluation of this site has been delayed by IUCN in view of its proposed visit to the area in July 1986. The Bureau suggested that the IUCN evaluation and recommendations on this site should therefore be made directly to the World Heritage Committee at its 10th session.

#### D. Nomination of Delphi, to be examined in 1987

The Bureau was informed by ICOMOS of the dangers threatening the site of Delphi, for which the Greek authorities had presented a nomination to be examined in 1987: the construction project for a bauxite processing plant to the West of and upwind from the temple threatens a degree of atmospheric pollution very dangerous for the preservation of the site. The Bureau authorized the Chairman to write to the Greek authorities to draw their attention to this situation and inform them that if the project were to go through it would be difficult for the Bureau to give favourable consideration to this nomination when it came to be examined at the seventh session, in spite of the fact that the property concerned was among the most precious legacies of mankind.

#### IV. ELABORATION OF GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION AND NOMINATION OF MIXED CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES OR RURAL LANDSCAPES

8. At its 9th session, the Committee had taken note of the report of the task force, composed of representatives of IUCN, ICOMOS, IFLA and the Secretariat, which had been established to propose recommendations on the above subject. At this session, the Committee had decided to refer this report to the Bureau for further study of the implications and scope of the task force's recommendations. Consequently, the Bureau examined this report, presented as document CC-86/CONF.001/03.

9. The Bureau agreed with the task force's analysis concerning properties which clearly displayed both outstanding cultural and natural values according to the Convention and for which separate evaluations were usually prepared by both ICOMOS and IUCN. The Bureau recommended that the procedure of preparation and examination of separate evaluations of such properties be continued in the future, with appropriate consultation between ICOMOS and IUCN.

10. The Bureau had reservations on the recommendations of the task force concerning rural landscapes, where the cultural and natural elements are combined and are not separate. Depending on one's perception, such rural landscapes could be considered as natural or cultural heritage, some preferring them to be considered essentially as cultural properties for World Heritage purposes. As concerns the recommendations of the task force, certain members of the Bureau felt that caution should be used when considering 'nature modified by man' for World Heritage listing, that such considerations could indeed open the door to a proliferation of nominations. Others expressed concern over the possibility of change in such landscapes with time, for example due to changing methods of agricultural production. Linked to this concern are the difficulties of protection and management of such rural landscapes, which are rarely protected under national jurisdiction or have a management programme.

11. In conclusion, the Bureau felt that it was premature to recommend any alterations to the operational guidelines to accommodate rural landscapes, especially as no such nomination had yet come forward. It recognised, however, that some practical advice should be given to IUCN and ICOMOS in the event that a rural landscape were nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Bureau therefore recommended that these organisations refer to both the criteria as they stand in the operational guidelines at present and to the criteria as revised by the task force. For this, the Bureau welcomed the proposal of the observer of the United Kingdom to present a draft nomination of a rural landscape for 1987 to enable the Bureau more fully to evaluate the applicability of the present guidelines and their proposed modifications against the criteria set out in the Convention. The Bureau considered that it would be in a better position to make recommendations on any eventual changes to the operational guidelines once it had the experience of one or two such 'draft' nominations as test cases.

#### V. CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURAL STRUCTURES

12. The President of ICOMOS introduced the study carried out on contemporary architectural structures, stating that it would be necessary to set for this class of properties an upper limit (around the beginning of the twentieth century, except for earlier properties which were precursors of twentieth century architecture) and a lower limit (about 1960). Although he agreed that existing criteria were adequate for the evaluation of such properties, he emphasized the difficulties that would arise in this case, such as the fragility of certain modern buildings and the problems of evaluation of urban complexes. In the course of the discussion which followed, several members of the Bureau expressed the fear that an excessive number of nominations relating to such properties would be submitted, and emphasized the need for a particularly strict evaluation of contemporary architectural structures so as to select only the most exceptional. Although the Bureau was of the opinion that it was desirable for properties falling into these categories to appear at some stage on the World Heritage List, it felt that no new specific guidelines were required, but rather a particularly rigorous application of existing criteria in the consideration of such nominations.

#### VI. MONITORING OF THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

13. The President of ICOMOS introduced, as a basis for discussion, the document on monitoring of cultural properties prepared by his organization at the request of the Committee. He stated that by means of the creation of an appropriate internal structure, ICOMOS would be able to report on the conservation status of approximately twenty cultural properties per year and even to collect specific information on properties in immediate peril. This structure would consist essentially of a 'monitoring committee' which would work on the basis of reports from States Parties, information provided by ICOMOS National Committees and information from other sources. The data thus collected could be computerized at ICOMOS Headquarters.

14. Several members of the Bureau, while emphasizing the need for a system for monitoring the conservation status of cultural properties and acknowledging the quality of the services provided by ICOMOS to the Committee, felt that better solutions than those proposed could be found. For example, Unesco or the Committee could be made responsible for monitoring. They wondered whether it was the right moment to create a new body to undertake the monitoring and raised the question of the status of such a 'monitoring committee', as well as the relative importance of the various sources of information and the reports from State Parties. One member of the Bureau also expressed apprehension concerning the dissemination of information collected by a data bank. In addition, the IUCN representative stated that this organization could provide information on the reporting systems set up under various international conventions.

15. The Bureau considered that in the present circumstances it was unable to make recommendations to the Committee on the monitoring of cultural property. It requested the Secretariat to carry out a study on this question, in co-operation with ICOMOS, with a view to setting out the various possible alternatives and their financial implications, and if possible to prepare a document for the next session of the Committee or of the Bureau.

#### CONSERVATION STATUS OF NATURAL WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

16. In accordance with paragraph 34 of the 'Operational Guidelines', the representative of IUCN reported first on the state of conservation of natural World Heritage properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. At the request of the Bureau, a report was also given on other natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

##### **A. Natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

###### (a) Djoudj National Park, Senegal

IUCN informed the Bureau that the situation had remained unchanged since the report presented to the Committee in December 1985. IUCN has coordinated a major review of conservation issues in the Senegal Delta, with special emphasis on the creation of the Diawling Reserve (Mauritania) adjacent to Djouj National Park. IUCN will release the report once it has been cleared by the Mauritanian authorities. IUCN/WWF are currently reviewing a project for assistance which has been received from the Director of National Parks for Senegal.

###### (b) Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania

From 21 to 24 April, 1986, the IUCN representative visited this property, met with the Acting Conservator and was able to review current conditions and assist in formulating a request for support from the World Heritage Fund. The conditions in Ngorongoro Conservation Area were still much the same as described to the Committee at its 7th (1983) and 8th session (1984). There were severe shortages of equipment and supplies and an immediate need for patrol vehicles, spare parts and audio-visual equipment. In this connection, the Bureau was informed that the Chairman had just approved the allocation of \$20,000 under 'emergency assistance' of the World Heritage Fund to enable the purchase of a vehicle and spare parts. Further assistance was currently being sought by the Tanzanian authorities from NORAD (Norway), following a workshop held in December 1985 to study the measures to improve the management of the park.

(c) Garamba National Park, Zaire

Encouraging progress reports which have been received recently from the IUCN officers working with the Zaire Institute for the Conservation of Nature, indicating amongst others that poaching activities had ceased and the northern white rhinoceros population has now risen to 17.

B. Other natural properties(d) Tai National Park, Côte d'Ivoire

The representative of IUCN, on the basis of a recent mission to Abidjan in March, 1986, reported that the threats to this property, described in the World Heritage Committee report, 1984 still prevailed. The Bureau encouraged the Secretariat to continue its contacts with the authorities of Côte d'Ivoire to promote nominating this property for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

(e) Ichkeul National Park, Tunisia

At the 9th session of the Committee, the representative of Tunisia proposed that he would inform the Secretariat of the situation at Ichkeul. His letter of 5 March, 1986 indicated that the Tunisian authorities had opened tenders for the construction of a sluice and barrage that would help to control the water salinity and that longer term solutions were being sought to conserve the park. IUCN also indicated that a wetlands management course had been held in Ichkeul in January, 1986 which had helped to raise the awareness of the local people of the problems faced by the park. The Tunisian representative thanked IUCN for this report and stressed the importance the Tunisian authorities were giving to safeguarding this property.

(f) Iguazu, Argentina

In respect of the information provided to the Bureau regarding the transfer of the administrative authority of this property from the National Parks Service to the Province of Misiones, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to contact the Argentine authorities to be kept informed of proposed developments which could jeopardize the integrity of the Park and the values for which it had been inscribed on the World Heritage List.

(g) Los Glaciares National Park, Argentina

IUCN visited this site in February, 1986. As was indicated to the Committee at its 9th session, the Province of Santa Cruz had started the development of a village settlement in a key area of the park which has had detrimental effects. IUCN reported that there were also plans for dam construction within the park, which has caused great concern to local conservation groups. The Bureau accordingly requested the Secretariat to make further enquiries on the status of this park with the Argentine authorities.

(h) Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Australia

On 27 February, 1986, the Queensland Legislative Assembly put forward a proposal for the revocation of 390 ha on Lindeman Island for the expansion of a holiday resort. The opposition of the public to this proposal was very high and the proposal was withdrawn on 12 March, 1986.

(i) Kakadu National Park, Australia

IUCN reported on a proposal to extend this property to include important wetland areas which should add to the viability of this property. However, due to the interest of those areas for uranium extraction, this proposal had not been put forward. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to ask the Australian authorities for a report on this matter which should be submitted to the Committee at its next session.

(j) Pirin National Park, Bulgaria

IUCN had indicated at the 9th session of the Committee that there were plans for the construction of a hotel and a ski-resort within this Park for which there were possible negative environmental impacts. The report on this situation proposed by the representative of Bulgaria at this session was still under preparation and would soon be submitted to the Secretariat. The Bureau requested that the Committee's attention be drawn to this report at its next session.

(k) Galapagos Islands National Park, Ecuador

Senior officials from the Ecuadorian parks service had visited IUCN headquarters in March, 1986, to discuss the possibility of extending the property by creating a marine reserve surrounding the islands of the Park. This initiative was encouraged by IUCN and a workshop on this topic is going to be held later in 1986.

(l) Mount Nimba Reserve, Guinea/Côte d'Ivoire

IUCN reported that a new railway link to the Liberian side of the mountain was under discussion. IUCN had sent a letter noting that although the forests on the Liberian side have been destroyed, those on the Guinean side still have biological value and protect soil and water resources. The railway construction should take these values into account. IUCN will inform the Committee on the reply to this latter suggestion.

(m) Niokolo-Koba National Park, Senegal

IUCN informed the Bureau of the proposal to build a road across this Park which could open up the Park to further degradations in addition to the current intensive poaching. An alternative route around the Park has been suggested. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to obtain more information from the Senegalese authorities on this development and to submit this to the Committee.

(n) Aldabra Atoll, Republic of Seychelles

IUCN has been informed by the Seychelles Island Foundation of the lack of funds for management of this property and of the possibility of developing tourist facilities there, including an airstrip. IUCN noted that tourism can cause a host of management problems. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to inform the Seychelles Island Foundation of its concern regarding touristic development plans.

(o) Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania

IUCN informed the Bureau that reports have been received of heavy poaching over the past two years in this reserve. The elephant population has declined from 85,000 to 60,000 with 5,000 animals poached in 1985. The decline in black rhinos

was even more pronounced with a drop of some 90% to less than 300 today. An IUCN expert visited the area in April, 1986, and held meetings with the Game Department officials and park wardens. With the assistance of WWF and Frankfurt Zoological Society a census and management review is currently underway and will form the basis of a concerted assistance effort to be prepared in several months time.

CONSERVATION STATUS OF CULTURAL PROPERTY ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

17. The Chairman informed the Bureau that two non-governmental organizations had written to the Director-General and to himself concerning the installation of a Carmelite convent in the Auschwitz concentration camp. The Chairman stated that the Secretariat had brought this information to the attention of the Polish authorities and would be sure to report their response to the Committee in due course.

18. In addition, the Secretary reported to the Bureau on the abandonment of a bridge-building project in a district of Cairo which would have threatened the preservation of Coptic churches situated in the area inscribed on the World Heritage List. She also reported on the progress of the international campaign for the preservation of Shibam.

VII. STATUS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND

19. The Secretary stated that in compliance with the Committee's requests:

- The Secretariat had written to all the States Parties to request payment of their contribution to the World Heritage Fund as early as possible for each calendar year;
- The Chairman had written to the United States of America to ask for an indication of the amount of its contributions and the dates on which payment would be made;
- The Chairman had also written to the other States Parties making voluntary contributions to request them to consider the possibility of withdrawing the declaration whereby they opted for this system of contributions.

The Chairman received the following replies:

Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway declared their intention to maintain the declaration; the United States pledged a contribution of \$239,000 for 1986.

20. The Bureau also noted the level of contributions received and the status of the World Heritage Fund as set out in document CC-86/CONF.001/6.

21. One observer raised the question of the eligibility for membership of the World Heritage Committee of a State making voluntary contributions lower than those it would have had to pay if it were bound by the system of compulsory contributions. The Secretariat said that all the necessary legal information would be supplied if this question were raised at the next General Assembly of State Parties.

22. One delegate suggested that the Committee might consider the advisability of creating in its budget a reserve to be carried over from year to year, and if so, of how much.

VIII. REPORT ON PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

23. The Secretariat introduced document CC-86/CONF.001/08 on promotional activities and drew the attention of the Bureau to the findings of an in-depth study, authorized by the World Heritage Committee at its 9th session, on establishing a promotion plan for the World Heritage Convention in consultation with communication experts. The findings of this study emphasized the preference for encouraging States Parties to develop their own promotional activities over the establishment of centralized long-term, expensive and ambitious promotional campaigns whose effectiveness would be geographically limited. The need to establish national structures in accordance with Article 17 of the Convention, for the promotion of the World Heritage Convention, was emphasized. The availability of a guidebook, posters, badges and an updated folding poster that could be used for promotional activities was brought to the attention of Bureau members and observers. The document also mentioned proposed German and Spanish television productions, the planned production of a film, the plaquing ceremonies organized in Canada, Cyprus and Spain, and a forthcoming publication of the National Geographic Society as notable contributions to the promotion of the World Heritage Convention.

24. The Bureau noted that effective promotional campaigns should serve the twin roles of education/information and fund raising. In this regard, the representative of IUCN drew the attention of the Bureau members to several instances where IUCN, together with WWF and several other nature conservation agencies, carried out campaigns and raised funds for the protection of several natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The pursuit of the existing collaboration between Unesco, WWF and IUCN was encouraged by the Bureau.

25. The Bureau recommended that the Secretariat prepare for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee a promotion plan focussing specifically on how States Parties can promote the Convention, both nationally and regionally. It requested that the plan describe the possible methods of collaboration between the Secretariat and the States Parties, and the types of resources available to the States Parties for promoting the Convention. The Bureau also identified some suitable methods of collaboration between the States Parties and the Secretariat, such as encouraging the national low-cost production of existing promotional material and providing some support from the World Heritage Fund to assist States Parties to purchase and distribute available promotional materials.

26. The Bureau also considered the specific problems of promotion and fund-raising in the area of culture. It expressed the desire for more information on the possibilities of collaboration with associations committed to the protection of cultural heritage and for the creation of a specific structure for fund-raising, particularly from patronage. It noted that an in-depth study relating particularly to fund-raising for Unesco's international campaigns had been carried out for the Executive Board. The Bureau requested that the documents relating to this study should be submitted at the next session of the Committee, insofar as this study dealt with questions relevant to the World Heritage Convention.

IX. REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

27. The Secretariat presented document CC-86/CONF.001/7 concerning the requests for technical cooperation received by the Secretariat. The Bureau examined these requests as follows:



Bulgaria

Provision of a photogrammetric camera and two additional items for the photometer already supplied for the surveying of Bulgarian World Heritage properties. The Bureau recommended that the Committee grant \$25,000 under the technical cooperation budget for 1987.

Malawi - Lake Malawi National Park

Purchase of equipment (boat, radios, tents) to strengthen the protection of the park. The Bureau was informed that this request had been reviewed and was to be submitted to the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee as a 'small-scale' technical cooperation request for \$19,800 under the 1986 budget. The Bureau also took note that this amount is added to a national counterpart contribution and to support from IUCN/WWF.

Turkey - Istanbul

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the requests for \$12,000 for training activities in wood and stone conservation and for \$10,000 for the creation of a laboratory for wood conservation. The Bureau requested that the Turkish authorities supply a detailed list of the equipment component with clear indications of priorities.

Yugoslavia - Monuments of Ohrid

The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve the request for \$20,000 for equipment for the control of microclimatic conditions and for the conservation of paintings of the monuments of Ohrid.

ICCROM

The Bureau recommended the allocation of \$24,500 under the 1987 technical co-operation budget as a contribution to the organization of the 7th International Course on the Technology of Stone Conservation, to be held in Venice from 28 April to 27 June 1987. This contribution would in particular enable fellows from developing countries to participate.

Zaire - Garamba National Park

The Bureau recalled that, at its ninth session, the Committee approved a request for US\$20,000 under 'Emergency assistance' for Garamba National Park. It had furthermore authorized the Bureau to approve an additional amount of US\$20,000 under technical cooperation for this property subject to the receipt of an appropriate request. On 28 May, 1986, the Zairian Authorities submitted such a request for the purchase of equipment up to an amount of US\$20,000 for the continuation of this project. The Bureau therefore approved the allocation of \$20,000 under 'small-scale' technical co-operation.

X. WAYS OF ENSURING A BETTER TURNOVER IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

28. The Bureau took note of document CC-86/CONF.001/9 prepared by the Secretariat on this subject, which contained a brief comparison of the duration of the terms of office and of the regulations concerning eligibility for re-election

adopted by the World Heritage Committee with those of six other intergovernmental committees. Some members of the Bureau considered that there was no need for formal modification of the system of eligibility for re-election to the Committee. Others wished to see the system modified, and one of the observers stated that a better turnover could be ensured if the States Member of the Committee could only be re-elected two years after the end of their previous term. The Bureau requested the Secretariat to re-examine this question in the light of the different points of view expressed and to report to the Committee.

XI. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TENTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

29. The Chairman recalled that the Committee had decided to hold its tenth session in November, 1986, but had left it to the Bureau to decide on the exact dates. The Committee had also noted with gratitude the invitation by Brazil to host the tenth session but had felt that in view of Unesco's current situation, it would be preferable to hold the meeting at Unesco Headquarters.

30. The Bureau was informed that Brazil had kindly re-invited the Committee to hold its tenth session in Brasilia if the question of contemporary architecture were on the agenda of the meeting, and had generously offered to cover additional Secretariat expenses. However, in view of the consensus which emerged from the discussion on contemporary architecture that it was premature for the Committee to examine this question at its forthcoming session, the Bureau considered that it would be more appropriate to take up the invitation from Brazil at a later stage when the question of drawing up guidelines on contemporary architecture was studied by the Committee. The Bureau expressed its appreciation to Brazil for its invitation and for its generous offer to meet additional expenditure.

31. Accordingly, the Bureau decided that the tenth ordinary session of the Committee would be held from 24 to 28 November, 1986, at Unesco Headquarters.

XII. PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE 10TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

32. The provisional agenda for the 10th session of the Committee set out in document CC-86/CONF.001/10 was approved by the Bureau after the addition of an item entitled 'Relations between the World Heritage List and the international campaigns for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage'.

XIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

33. The delegates of Algeria and India thanked the Chairman on behalf of the participants for the skill with which he had conducted the meeting. The Chairman thanked all those who had contributed to the smooth running of the meeting and pronounced the session closed.

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

10th Session/10ème Session  
Paris, 16-19 June 1986  
Paris, 16-19 juin 1986

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

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

**ALGERIA / ALGERIE**

M. S.A. BAGHLI Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel

Mme T. DJELLOULI  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

**BULGARIA / BULGARIE**

Mme M. STANTSHEVA Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président  
Professeur adjoint, Université de Sofia

Dr. I. VLADIMIROV  
Chef du Service des Organisations  
internationales auprès du  
Ministère de la Culture

**CANADA**

Mr. A.T. DAVIDSON Rapporteur

**INDIA / INDE**

H. E. Miss Arundhati GHOSE Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. H.V. SHRINGLA  
Permanent Delegation to Unesco

Mr. HASAN  
Head, Cultural Heritage Division  
Department of Culture

**MEXICO / MEXIQUE**

Mme S. LOMBARDO  
Directrice des Monuments historiques

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président

Mme G. UGARTE de BERNARD  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

**NORWAY / NORVEGE**

Mr. S. TSCHUDI-MADSEN  
Director-General of the Central Office  
of Historic Monuments

Vice-Chairman/VicePrésident

Mrs. O. H. SLETNES  
Deputy-Permanent Delegate to Unesco

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA / REPUBLIQUE UNIE DE TANZANIE**

Mr. A.A. MTURI  
Director, Antiquities Division

Chairman/Président

II. **OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS**

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

**AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIE**

H. E. Mr. G. WHITLAM  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

Mr. D. MACINTYRE  
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

**HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

M. B. KOVACSI  
Ministère de la Construction

**BRAZIL / BRESIL**

S. E. M. Josué de SOUZA MONTELLO  
Ambassadeur, Délégué permanent auprès de l'Unesco

Mme I. RIBEIRO de ANDRADE  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

**SPAIN / ESPAGNE**

M. A. ALMAGRO  
Institut de conservation et de  
restauration des biens culturels  
Ministère de la Culture

CANADA

H. E. Mr. I. C. CLARK  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate to Unesco

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

M. C. CASSIMATIS  
Deputy Permanent Delegate to Unesco

FRANCE

M. L. CHABASON  
Chef du service de la recherche  
Ministère de l'Environnement

GREECE / GRECE

Mme S. COSTOPOULOS  
Délégation permanente auprès de l'Unesco

TUNISA / TUNISIE

Ms. S. ZAUCHE  
Délégation permanente auprès  
de l'Unesco

TURKEY / TURQUIE

Dr. A.E. OBA  
Délégation permanente auprès  
de l'Unesco

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

Mr. J.W.M. ROGERS  
Department of the Environment

YUGOSLAVIA/YOUGOSLAVIE

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

B. INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION/  
ORGANISATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALE

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS (IFLA)/  
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHITECTES PAYSAGISTES (FIAP)

Mme I. BOURNE

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

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

M. C. ERDER  
Directeur

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

**M. M. PARENT**  
*Président*

**M. L. PRESSOUYRE**  
*Professeur à l'Université de Paris I*

**Mme D. LAPEYRE**  
*Directrice du Secrétariat*

**Mme F. PORTELETTE**  
*Centre de documentation UNESCO/ICOMOS*

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

**Mr. J. THORSELL**  
*Executive Officer, IUCN's Commission on  
National Parks and Protected Areas*

**Mr. J. D. HARRISON**  
*Head of Protected Areas Data Unit*

**IV. SECRETARIAT**

**Mr. H. LOPES**  
*Assistant Director-General for Culture and Communication*

**Mr. B. von DROSTE**  
*Director, Division of Ecological Sciences*

**Mr. A. RAIDL**  
*Director a.i., Division of Cultural Heritage*

**Mrs. M. van VLIET**  
*International Standards Section, Division of Cultural Heritage*

**Mrs. J. ROBERTSON**  
*Division of Ecological Sciences*

**Mr. F. B. HUYGHE**  
*International Standards Section, Division of Cultural Heritage*

**Ms. P. C. BENEDICT**  
*International Standards Section, Division of Cultural Heritage*