

Distribution limited

**WHC-98/CONF.201/9
Paris, 11 August 1998
Original: English/French**

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

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
Twenty-second session**

UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)

22-27 June 1998

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		LIST OF ANNEXES
I. Opening Session	1		
II. Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable	2	ANNEX I	List of Participants
III. Report of The Secretary on the Activities Undertaken since the Twenty-First Session of the World Heritage Committee	2	ANNEX II	Speech by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Adnan Badran
IV. Methodology and Procedures for Periodic Reporting	3	ANNEX III	Speech by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Ms Lourdes Arizpe
V. State of Conservation of Properties Inscribed on the World Heritage List	4	ANNEX IV	Statement by Australia on Australian World Heritage Sites
VI. Report on the Work of the Consultative Body of the Committee	20	ANNEX V	Statement by Ecuador the Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)
VII. Information on Tentative Lists and Examination of Cultural and Natural Properties to the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger	25	ANNEX VI	Statement by IUCN on Kakadu National Park (Australia)
VIII. Requests for International Assistance	32	ANNEX VII	Statement by the Representative of Australia on Kakadu National park (Australia)
IX. Provisional Agenda of the Twenty-Second Extraordinary Session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (27-28 November 1998)	33	ANNEX VIII	Statement by the Supervising Scientist, Department for the Environment, Australia, on Kakadu National Park (Australia)
X. Provisional Agenda of the Twenty-Second Session of the World Heritage Committee (30 November-5 December 1998)	33	ANNEX IX	Statement by Italy
XI. Other Business	33	ANNEX X	Provisional Agenda of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
XII. Adoption of the Report and Closure of the Session	34	ANNEX XI	Provisional Agenda of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee

1. OPENING SESSION

I.1 The twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 22 to 27 June 1998. The following members of the Bureau attended: Professor Francesco Francioni (Italy), Chairperson, Representatives of Benin, Ecuador, Japan, Morocco and the United States of America as Vice-Presidents and Mr Noel Fattal (Lebanon) as Rapporteur.

I.2 Representatives of the following States Parties attended as observers: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Iran, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Slovak Republic, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zimbabwe.

I.3 Representatives of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and 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 full list of participants is given in Annex I.

I.4 The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Professor Francesco Francioni (Italy) expressed his great pleasure in welcoming participants to the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

I.5 The Deputy Director-General, Mr Adnan Badran, welcomed participants on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO. He began by noting that he had been watching the progress of the work of the Committee and its Bureau, the birth and growth of the World Heritage Centre and of UNESCO's Steering Committee on World Heritage for several years. He commented on the large increase in the number of sites on the World Heritage List with less than 200 in 1990 and now a total of 552. On behalf of the Director-General, he thanked and commended the Committee and the Bureau for their work performed in the service of World Heritage conservation. He commented that the work of States Parties had made the *World Heritage Convention* well known and visible. In addition, he noted that tangible results in the restoration of sites were being achieved. He did however comment that the challenges to conservation are increasing and that there are limited means to address them. He questioned whether the List should continue to grow or whether it is now time to limit growth.

I.6 The Deputy Director-General referred to the multiple economic and social challenges of globalisation which bring more market-oriented policies and less government involvement. He asked how conservation efforts could become more effective in such a context. He stated that it was necessary to monitor and assess, with the most up-to-date information networks, the progress being made in conservation of World Heritage sites. He referred to the need to strike a balance between conservation and development (including tourism) and to invite the public and other partners, to "share and care". With the growing challenges of conservation increased government participation is necessary as is the search for new partners with common goals.

I.7 Mr Badran referred to the extremely important need to ensure and develop complementarity between the Culture and Science Sectors of UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre. He referred to the Centre as the jewel in the crown of UNESCO, which should be safeguarded in terms of its identity and autonomy. With particular reference to the World Heritage Centre, Mr Badran promised to make more office space available. He announced that eight posts had been regularised in

the Centre in accordance with the agreement reached in 1996 between the Director-General and the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Ambassador Winkelmann. Furthermore, he reported that all vacant posts in the Centre have now been filled. Finally, on behalf of the Director-General, Mr Badran wished the Bureau success in its deliberations. (Speech attached as Annex II).

I.8 Ms Lourdes Arizpe, Assistant Director-General for Culture, took the floor and expressed the wish to see, with the closing of the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the Convention, and following the important decisions taken by the eleventh General Assembly of States Parties of the Convention, and by the twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO, an improvement in the functioning of the World Heritage Centre, and the implementation of the Convention itself. She evoked the main issues which came up regularly on the agenda of World Heritage meetings:

1. The conclusions to be drawn from the financial and management audits concerning the functioning of the principal components of the Convention – in particular the World Heritage Fund and questions linked to the promotion of the Convention. Better communication should be established between the World Heritage Centre and the Sectors of Culture and Sciences leading to increased efficiency and improved conservation of the sites;
2. With regard to monitoring of the state of conservation of sites, whilst working towards systematic monitoring, a 'pre-diagnostic' method should be introduced so that preventive measures may be undertaken;
3. International assistance should be granted to provide more preventive action than at present;
4. Given the rapidly increasing number of properties inscribed on the List, in particular cultural sites, fundamental reflection on the very notion of World Heritage should be undertaken to ensure the credibility of the List.

I.9 After twenty-five years of the Convention, Ms Arizpe underlined the need to engage upon an in-depth reflection on the concept of World Heritage, expressing the desire that the Convention remains one of the exemplary models of the unity and solidarity of humankind.

I.10 In acknowledging the onset of globalisation, Ms Arizpe referred to the need for individuals in all sectors of society to participate in conservation, to foster their relationship with the environment and to ensure maintenance of a feeling for the past. She commented that it is essential to understand cultural heritage as a process and that with World Heritage designation the connotations of heritage may change. She observed that World Heritage work has concentrated more on veneration than connotations. She referred to the increasing incidence and interpretation of culture as a matter of contestation. She noted that a knowledge-based debate on the safeguarding of heritage is required especially given the growing incidence of ethnically-based use of sites.

I.11 In conclusion, Ms Arizpe reflected that in implementing the *World Heritage Convention* the appreciation and participation by different sectors of society should be broadened. The imagination and creativity, particularly of young people, should be mobilised as part of this effort and heritage should become part of new forms of cultural production. Ms Arizpe suggested that World Heritage conservation should emphasise co-operation rather than competition to include sites

on the List. She also said that UNESCO must assist States Parties in addressing the paradox of the world's most valorised sites being the most vulnerable. Finally, Ms Arizpe informed the Bureau that she would soon be leaving UNESCO. She said that it had been an honour for her to serve the world community through her work on cultural heritage at UNESCO. (Speech attached as Annex III).

I.12 The Chairperson thanked Mr Badran and Ms Arizpe for their thoughtful words that had stressed the dynamics of the current situation in implementing the *World Heritage Convention*. He commented that the mission of World Heritage remained elusive. He reflected that if we are to meet the stated challenges we should try to make use of solidarity and unity to prepare a common mission. He noted that the steep increase in the number of sites inscribed in the World Heritage List was being lamented and that there is the need in the future to strive to create a more meaningful distribution of funds and resources in favour of the disadvantaged.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE

II.1 Before proceeding with the adoption of the agenda, the Chairperson referred to the need for the Consultative Body to meet to adopt the Report of the Rapporteur of its last meeting held on 29 and 30 April 1998. It was agreed that the Consultative Body would meet later in the day.

II.2 The Chairperson informed the Bureau that a number of written requests to attend the meeting as observers had been received from non-governmental organisations. Following the detailed discussion that ensued it was decided that the Traditional Owners from Kakadu National Park, Australia, (from the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation) could attend the meeting as observers. The representative of the Wilderness Society, Australia was also given the status of an observer.

II.3 The Delegate of Japan expressed his agreement with the decision of the Bureau but asked that the record reflect his concern that this decision should not constitute a precedent. He suggested that every time a request for observer status is made, that it be considered on the basis of relevance to the topics under discussion. He called for the successful reconciliation between efficiency and openness. The Chairperson replied to these comments by stressing that the decision of the Bureau would not constitute a binding precedent as the *Rules of Procedure* clearly allow the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau to decide on the participation at each meeting.

II.4 The Chairperson presented the documents relating to the adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable (WHC-98/CONF.201/1A, WHC-98/CONF.201/1B Rev. and WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.2). The Agenda and Timetable were adopted without any changes.

III. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON THE ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

III.1 Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported in his capacity as Secretary of the Committee, on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twenty-first session of the Committee. He referred to Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.4 and made an audio visual presentation which highlighted the main lines of activities undertaken by the Centre in co-operation with States Parties, the

advisory bodies (ICCRUM, ICOMOS and IUCN), other Sectors of UNESCO and other partners.

III.2 The Director began by announcing that the Secretariat had ensured immediate follow-up to the recommendations of the Financial Audit conducted in 1997. He said that concrete actions had been taken to find solutions to all of the External Auditor's recommendations.

III.3 The Director noted that both Suriname and Togo had recently ratified the *Convention* bringing the total number of States Parties to 153. He reported that a total of 41 nominations (7 natural, 1 mixed and 32 cultural) would be examined by the Bureau. In commenting that the majority of these sites were from Europe and North America he expressed the continuing need to redress regional imbalances in the World Heritage List. He mentioned a number of meetings that had been organised by the Centre as part of the implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List. He referred in particular to the World Heritage Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam in March 1998, which had been kindly hosted by the Government of the Netherlands (WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.9). He also referred to the Global Strategy Meeting on the Cultural Heritage of the Caribbean, the World Heritage Convention Meeting in Martinique and the Andean Cultural Landscape Meeting held in Arequipa, Peru.

III.4 The Director of the Centre gave special mention to the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities of China and the European Union held in Suzhou, China in April 1998. He referred to the adoption by the mayors, of the "Suzhou Declaration" concerning preservation of historic urban districts. Mr von Droste expressed his thanks to the French and Chinese authorities who had funded and supported the meeting, to the European Union, and to the L'OREAL Group for their financial contributions.

III.5 In reviewing a number of recent regional and thematic meetings, Mr von Droste referred to his, and the Chairperson's, participation at the Intergovernmental Consultation Conference on the Draft European Landscape Convention held in Florence in April 1998. He also referred to the Workshop on the Role of Local Communities in Natural World Heritage Management held in Thailand in January 1998 and thanked the Japanese Environmental Agency for their financial support of the meeting.

III.6 The Director referred to multilateral co-operative endeavours aimed at increasing the number of States Parties in the Pacific. He made particular mention of increased collaboration with SPREP (the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme), New Zealand and Australia. For Africa, another region under-represented on the World Heritage List, he highlighted the outcome of the Expert Meeting held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire in March 1998, and informed the Bureau of the new Africa 2009 Programme which aims to provide the conditions for sustainable preservation of immovable cultural heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa.

III.7 Mr von Droste referred to an example of a national World Heritage meeting having taken place in Cape Town, South Africa in March 1998. He expressed thanks to the Nordic World Heritage Office for having provided support to this and other activities in Africa. The Director reported that the Centre had participated in the Third Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Hague Convention and would participate in the forthcoming Meeting of Governmental Experts on the draft Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. The Director also referred to the meeting held between the Advisory Bodies and the Centre in early February 1998.

III.8 The Director made reference to the large number of state of conservation reports that would be examined by the Bureau. He also reported on a Workshop on Natural Heritage held in Santa Maria, Colombia in May 1997 from which a synthesis report on the state of conservation of eighteen natural sites in eleven countries is currently being prepared. An Expert Workshop held in Uruguay in March 1998 developed indicators for measuring the state of conservation of historic cities in the region. A national meeting for the Directors of Cultural and Natural Heritage and the managers of all of Peru's World Heritage sites held in Cusco in May 1998, provides a model for other States Parties as to how to proceed at a national level to initiate the process of periodic reporting.

III.9 The Director made brief mention of the threats to the World Heritage sites of Machu Picchu (Peru), Butrinti (Albania), the Kathmandu Valley (Nepal), Donana National Park (Spain) and Anjar (Lebanon). He referred to the adoption of the Special Law for the Galapagos and to a recent meeting with the Ecuadorian Delegation at which time he and the Chairperson had offered their congratulations on this positive action to conserve the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador.

III.10 Mr von Droste showed a graph that clearly illustrated the amount of requests approved for each of the five categories of International Assistance (Preparatory Assistance, Technical Co-operation, Training, Promotional Activities and Emergency Assistance). He made particular reference to the small number of requests for Promotional Activities and to the complete spending of the Emergency Assistance budget. He showed specific details of the implementation status of each of the categories of International Assistance and gave examples of recent requests.

III.11 The Director concluded by referring to the recently conducted Expert Group Review of the World Heritage Centre Data and Information Infrastructure for which the Centre was seeking State Party financial support to implement the recommendations. He showed an example of the electronic archive of World Heritage nominations and reported that two issues of the *World Heritage Review* and two issues of the *World Heritage Newsletter* had been produced since the twenty-first session of the Committee. Finally, the Director reported on the continued successful implementation of the UNESCO Young People's World Heritage Education Project, made possible through financial support from the Rhone-Poulenc Foundation and NORAD. He made particular mention of the forthcoming publication of the World Heritage Education Kit for teachers, entitled *World Heritage in Young Hands*. He also mentioned a World Heritage Youth Forum to be held on the Island of Goré in Senegal and to an initiative to organise sub-regional teacher training in World Heritage Education with a financial contribution from NORAD.

III.12 At the request of the Chairperson, the Director of the Cultural Heritage Division presented to the members of the Bureau the results of a certain number of activities undertaken at World Heritage sites during the first half of 1998. A mission organised by the World Heritage Centre following a decision adopted at the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee, enabled the Director to visit Aksum and Lalibela in Ethiopia, together with the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church and the Director of Heritage. The mission had the opportunity to address the programme funded by the European Union for the protection of the rock hewn churches at Lalibela and to explain to the Ethiopian authorities and the European Union Representative the demands of the World Heritage Committee in Naples. In Cambodia, the Director-General was represented at both the meeting of the Quadripartite Committee (end March) and that of the International Co-ordination Committee, co-chaired by France and Japan. These two meetings provided the opportunity to evaluate the progress in the implementation of the projects and to

formulate recommendations to strengthen the authority of the APSARA. A report prepared by the Division of Cultural Heritage on important activities undertaken on World Heritage sites from December 1997 to June 1998, was distributed as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.13.

III.13 In Egypt, the Executive Committee meeting (16-20 May 1998) for the creation of the Nubian Museum at Aswan and the Museum of Egyptian Civilisation in Cairo, recalled the situation of the World Heritage sites at Philae and surrounding Lake Nasser, and the Historic Centre of Cairo, where the future museum will be constructed. In Luxemburg, the Ministry of Culture requested a mission on 11 June 1998 to study the questions raised by the development of the Fortress Museum at Fort Thungen and its links with the future Museum of Modern Art.

III.14 The Chairperson thanked Mr von Droste and Mr Bouchenaki for their presentations. The Delegate of Japan congratulated UNESCO for the ICC meeting on Angkor and offered his congratulations for having overcome the considerable administrative problems at the Phnom Penh Office. With reference to promotional activities he reported that an agreement between the Centre and the Osaka Junior Chamber Inc. was nearing completion and that he hoped that a World Heritage Youth Forum would be held "back to back" with the Committee session in Japan later in the year.

III.15 The Delegate of Benin thanked Mr Badran, Ms Arizpe and the Director of the Centre for their presentations. He congratulated the Centre for progress made in addressing the low numbers of sites on the World Heritage List from Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. He asked when a synthesis of this work would be provided. The Director of the Centre replied that a synthesis of work completed to date on the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List would be provided to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

IV. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REPORTING

IV.1 The twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO requested the World Heritage Committee to «*define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports while respecting the principle of State sovereignty.*» Subsequently, the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session, requested the Bureau to recommend a decision concerning the format of the periodic reporting and the handling, examination and response to these reports.

IV.2 The Secretariat introduced Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/2 containing the format for periodic reports on the application of the World Heritage Convention, as well as attached explanatory notes, and invited the Bureau members to make comments and observations.

IV.3 The Secretariat outlined the proposed structure and content of the periodic report which would consist of two sections: Section I on the application of relevant articles of the World Heritage Convention, and Section II on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties located on the State Party's territory. Furthermore, it presented a possible scenario for the preparation and examination of periodic reports by region on the basis of a six-year cycle.

IV.4 In this context, the Secretariat drew particular attention to the support given by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session to a regional approach for the examination of the periodic reports, as already proposed in paragraph 72 of the Operational Guidelines, as a means to promote regional co-operation and to identify specific needs for World Heritage international co-operation. In this sense, the examination of the reports by the Committee would be but a part of a participatory process with, and within, the region concerned. This process would have to be designed by, and for, each region specifically and would have to include matters such as : support to States Parties in the preparation of the periodic reports, if so requested ; the exchange of information among States Parties ; the adequate review of the periodic reports ; the identification of specific needs and the preparation of a synthesis report. The result of this process, a Regional State of the World Heritage Report, would then be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for examination and response.

IV.5 With regard to the format and explanatory notes, discussions focused on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties, particularly on the Statement of Significance. This was considered to be the core of the state of conservation report and the basis for the management of the property. ICOMOS expressed its reservation about the State Party proposing a new or revised Statement of Significance. However, ICCROM and IUCN, as well as several delegates, observed that a re-consideration of the Statement of Significance could be appropriate as a result of new knowledge or interpretation of the values of the property, or the revision of the criteria for World Heritage listing. Specific reference was made to Australia where the systematic re-examination of the values of its World Heritage properties is being undertaken.

IV.6 Concerns were expressed about the logistic implications of the periodic reporting for the States Parties, as well as for the Secretariat and the World Heritage Committee. It was suggested that particular attention be given to this aspect when further exploring different options for the handling, review process, and the preparation and examination of a synthesis report. It was noted that a regional approach would promote collaboration and exchange of experiences among States Parties in a regional context, whereas a chronological approach would focus on those sites that were inscribed on the World Heritage List up to a given date and diminish the workload, particularly during the first reporting cycle. The Bureau noted this preference by ICOMOS which was supported by one State Party and decided there should be further reflection on this idea.

IV.7 The Bureau also drew the attention to the suggestion made at the Committee's twenty-first session to look into the relation between the allocation of international assistance and compliance with the periodic reporting requirements. Paragraph 117 of the Operational Guidelines establishes conditions for the granting of international assistance. The Committee could introduce the compliance with the periodic reporting requirements as a condition to granting international assistance under the World Heritage Fund.

IV.8 In concluding the debate, the Bureau took note with satisfaction of the work done by the World Heritage Centre. It requested the Centre to study in further detail different scenarios for the handling, review process and examination of the periodic reports. It requested the Centre to continue to refine the document in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and on the basis of the comments and observations made by the Bureau for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.

V. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

A. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

NATURAL HERITAGE

V.1 The Bureau reviewed state of conservation reports on thirteen of the fifteen natural World Heritage sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau was informed that no new information was received with regard to the two natural World Heritage sites of the United States of America, namely the Everglades and Yellowstone National Parks, and that up-to-date information on the state of conservation of those two sites, based on reports requested from the State Party by 15 September 1998, and expected to be received by then, will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee to be convened in Kyoto, Japan, during 30 November – 5 December, 1998.

V.2 Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its nineteenth session (Berlin, 1995), had requested the Bulgarian authorities to submit, in 1998, a status report on measures taken to mitigate threats to the integrity of this site. Hence, the Bureau requested the Bulgarian authorities to submit the threat mitigation status report to the Centre before 15 September 1998, and IUCN to review that report and to make recommendations to the twenty-second session of the Committee.

The Bureau suggested that the State Party consider inviting an IUCN mission to the site for verification of the results of the measures undertaken to mitigate threats to the integrity of Srebarna. It authorised the Centre to provide funds for IUCN from the monitoring allocation approved by the Committee for the European Region at its last session (December 1997), in order to enable IUCN to undertake such a mission.

V.3 Manovo-Gounda-St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic (CAR))

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, was seriously concerned about the uncontrolled poaching by armed groups which had resulted in the death of four members of the Park staff in 1997 and the decimation of more than 80% of the Park's wildlife populations. Deteriorating security conditions had brought tourism to a halt. The Committee had welcomed the efforts of the Government of CAR to assign site management responsibilities to a private Foundation and had requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the State Party and the Foundation to prepare a detailed state of conservation report and rehabilitation plan for the site. The Bureau noted that the State Party has not responded to the Centre's letter outlining the Committee's recommendations made at its last session in December 1997.

The Bureau reiterated the Committee's request that the Centre and IUCN contact the State Party and the Foundation to prepare a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for the site and recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V.4 World Heritage Sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Virunga National Park

Garamba National Park

Kahuzi Biega National Park

Okapi Faunal Reserve

The Bureau recalled that the four sites under consideration were declared as World Heritage in Danger by the Committee, during the years between 1994 and 1997, when the country had been affected by war and civil strife. The Bureau after reviewing the report of the Secretariat, based on the reports received through IUCN and other international NGO partners, decided to:

- (i) reiterate the Committee's concerns for the conservation and management of the four sites and recommended that the Committee retain all four sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger; the Bureau however noted that the political situation in the country was stabilising and that the impact of the war-period on some wildlife populations, such as the rhino population in the Garamba National Park, has been less severe than previously expected;
- (ii) request the Secretariat to work with the Permanent Delegation of the State Party to UNESCO regarding the letter sent by the Centre describing the Committee's recommendations, including the fielding of a high level UNESCO mission to be headed by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, made at its last session in Naples, by drawing attention to those recommendations during a meeting between the Permanent Delegation and the UNESCO Secretariat, scheduled for 25 June 1998, in order to obtain formal responses;
- (iii) urge the Centre and IUCN to continue co-operation with NGOs like WWF and WCS (Wildlife Conservation Society) to monitor the state of conservation of the sites and ensure that the two vehicles purchased for Garamba and Kahuzi Biega National Parks, using US\$ 45,000 approved by the Committee in Naples, are safely delivered to the sites as soon as possible;
- (iv) request the Chairperson of the Committee to authorise the Centre, subject to the receipt of evidence of the safe transfer and delivery of one vehicle each to Garamba and Kahuzi Biega, to use an additional US\$ 45,000 for the purchase, transfer and delivery of one vehicle each for Virunga and Okapi in accordance with the recommendation made by the Committee at its last session; and
- (v) decided to consider replenishing the emergency assistance allocation of US\$ 500,000 approved by the Committee for 1998 during its last session in Naples, and which had been already exhausted, during its discussions on international assistance requests (Agenda item 8), so that additional requests submitted by the Democratic Republic of Congo for undertaking scientific studies, in co-operation with international NGOs, to evaluate the impacts of the war on selected indicator species in Kahuzi Biega National Park, could be considered for support by the Chairperson of the Committee.

V.5 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)

The Bureau noted that at its last session, the Committee was informed that colonisation and small-scale mining activities had

been stopped, a new management plan was nearing finalisation and that several conservation projects funded by WWF had begun. The Committee had also urged the Centre, in collaboration with IUCN, agreement with the State Party and possible support from WWF, to plan and organise a site visit to address the problem of the Guamote-Macos road construction project and other threats to the integrity of the site.

The Bureau learnt that IUCN has received considerable information on the site from WWF-and that a site-visit had been considered not necessary at present. The Bureau noted that the on-going construction of the Guamote-Macos road as the main issue facing this Park. The road is being built primarily for strategic purposes and there has not been an EIA despite the Committee's requests. Construction has been slow but very destructive to the environment. Although only a small section of the road is inside the World Heritage site, the remainder of the road forms the Park's southern limit. While the Bureau was concerned with IUCN's view that the completion of the construction of the road is likely to be inevitable, it agreed with the recommendations of IUCN and:

- (i) recommended that the Committee retain Sangay in the List of World Heritage in Danger;
- (ii) strongly encouraged the Government of Ecuador to improve the standards of the construction of the Guamote-Macos Road and undertake mitigation measures for sections of the road where the environment has been adversely impacted;
- (iii) requested the Government to complete the long overdue management plan, particularly with a view to reviewing the expanding presence of livestock in the Park;
- (iv) invited the Government to clarify unconfirmed reports of any oil exploration concession that may have been awarded over a part of the Park; and
- (v) commend the Government of the Netherlands for their efforts to assist the official Ecuadorean agency responsible for the management of the Park, i.e. INEFAN, and to improve protection of the site through co-operation with Fundacion Natura, Ecuador.

V.6 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

The Bureau recalled that the Regional authorities in Bahir Dar, where Simen National Park is located, had expressed their disagreement with the decision of the Committee, taken at its twentieth session (Merida, 1996), to include Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Bureau noted with satisfaction the efforts undertaken by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks of Ethiopia and the UNESCO Office in Addis Ababa to provide more information to the Bahir Dar authorities on the meaning and implications of the Committee's decision to include Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau encouraged the Centre to co-operate with the Ethiopian authorities and the UNESCO Office in Addis Ababa and continue to urge the Bahir Dar authorities to view the Committee's 1996 decision to include Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger in a positive manner and organise, as quickly as possible, the Stakeholders' Workshop for which the Committee had approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 in 1996. The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain Simen in the List of World Heritage in Danger and authorised the Chairperson to re-allocate US\$ 30,000 from the 1998 budget for Technical Co-operation, in the event the Stakeholders' Workshop could be organised.

V.7 Mount Nimba Nature Reserve (Guinea/Côte d'ivoire)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its last session, had requested the State Party (Guinea) and the Centre to contact the relevant mining companies, which foresee exploiting an iron-ore mine in the vicinity of the Reserve, to learn more details of their interest and willingness to set up an international foundation for the conservation of Mt. Nimba. The Bureau was informed that the Secretariat was intending to participate at a meeting, on 25 June 1998, jointly organised by the "Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique" (CNRS) and a certain number of French Foundations on the subject of the "Role of Foundations and Trusts in the Management of Cultural and Natural Heritage". Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the Centre is implementing a project using the US\$ 20,000 approved by the Chairperson in 1997 to equip the Reserve's hydrological laboratory.

The Bureau requested the Secretariat to report to the twenty-second session of the Committee on the outcome of its participation at the meeting organised by the CNRS and French Foundations and on the feasibility of establishing a foundation for Mt. Nimba. It recommended that the Committee retain Mt. Nimba in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V.8 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee included this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996, and requested the State Party to implement the eleven-point corrective action plan that had been endorsed by the Minister for the Environment of Honduras. The Bureau noted that the elaboration of a management plan is being carried out with a contribution of US\$ 30,000 from the World Heritage Fund, as part of a large scale project for strengthening the conservation of Rio Platano financed by GTZ-KFW (Germany). Furthermore, the Bureau learnt from IUCN that a hydroelectric development project (Patuca II), is proposed for implementation near the Reserve. Terms of reference for a draft environmental impact assessment have been prepared; potential impacts of the project would include opening of new access roads, reduction in downstream water flow and quality, and the loss of scenic and bio-diversity values.

The Bureau urged IUCN and the Centre to obtain more details concerning the hydroelectric development project and to report to the twenty-second session of the Committee. It recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger pending a review of its state of conservation foreseen during 1999.

V.9 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)

The Bureau recalled the fact that the Committee, at its last session, had noted that the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF) of India and the State Government of Assam had begun implementing a 2-3 year rehabilitation plan at a total estimated cost of US\$ 2,135,000 of which US\$ 235,000 had been requested by the State Party as emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Committee was satisfied with the use of the first instalment of US\$ 75,000, approved by the Bureau at its twenty-first session in June 1997. This was used for the purchase of three vehicles, two boats and 55 wireless communication sets. At its last session it approved a second instalment of US\$ 90,000, under emergency assistance, to cover costs of two wooden fibre boats, 400 sets of patrolling gear and construction of buildings to serve as ranger stations and provide for staff housing within the Park. The Bureau noted that the implementation of the rehabilitation plan, despite delays in construction activities caused by an earlier than normal on-set of the monsoons, was

proceeding satisfactorily and conditions for the conservation and management of the site were improving.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to continue to monitor the implementation of the rehabilitation plan and submit a progress report to the twenty-second session of the Committee in November-December 1998, on the use of US\$ 90,000 approved by the Committee at its last session in Naples. It recommended that the Committee retain this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V. 10 Air et Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twentieth (Merida, 1996) and twenty-first (Naples, 1997) sessions approved a mission to this site to: evaluate the state of conservation of the site; determine the significance of prevailing threats to the site; compare data and information on the Reserve before and after its inclusion in the List of the World Heritage in Danger (1992); prepare a long-term action plan for the protection of the site with the assistance of the IUCN field project staff; and prepare a detailed report for the twenty-second session of the Committee. Although a contract, for an amount of US\$ 22,000, was established with the Ministry for Hydraulics and the Environment for the organisation of this mission during February-March 1998, the mission had to be postponed due to the lack of security clearance from the UN Resident Co-ordinator's Office in Niamey. The Bureau however learnt that the UN Resident Co-ordinator has finally granted the security clearance needed in mid-June 1998 and that the proposed mission could now proceed without any further delays.

The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN co-operate to field a mission to the site and prepare a detailed state of conservation report and a long term action plan for the site, including recommendations. These recommendations should address whether or not the Committee should retain the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger, for the consideration of the twenty-second session of the Committee.

V. 11 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee inscribed Ichkeul on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996 and requested the Tunisian authorities to provide a programme of corrective measures to reverse the degradation of the site. It alerted them to the possibility of the deletion of Ichkeul from the World Heritage List, if rehabilitation of the site were not possible. Following discussions on a "Report on the action programme for the safeguarding of Ichkeul National Park", submitted by the "Ministère de l'environnement et de l'aménagement du territoire", which had been critically reviewed by IUCN and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, the Committee, at its last session, urged the State Party to implement the recommendations of a Ramsar mission undertaken earlier in 1997 and submit a threat-mitigation status report to the twenty-third session of the Committee, in 1999.

The Bureau received a report from IUCN, which provided technical data to indicate that the salinity of the water in the lake may have reached excessively high proportions and that the chances for the recovery of the World Heritage values of the site may be fast receding. IUCN expressed its concern at the pace and the effectiveness of the implementation of the rehabilitation programme by the State Party.

The Bureau was informed by the Observer of Tunisia of several measures undertaken by his Government to retain freshwater in the lakes on a year-round basis and thereby reduce salinity of the lake. In particular, he spoke in detail of the repairs done to sluice gates controlling the entry of fresh water into the lake, and the

supply of fresh water from a newly constructed reservoir to the lake to strengthen the lake's conservation, as well as providing irrigation and water supply needs of people, and several economic incentives to reduce the dependence of the people on the resources of the nearby mountain which constitutes part of an area from where the waters drain into the lake. The Observer of Tunisia also pointed out that his Government was closely monitoring the number of migratory birds arriving at Ichkeul during the European winter in order to assess the extent to which Ichkeul continues to retain its value as a site of international importance for migratory birds. The Observer also disagreed with some of the data presented by IUCN to the Bureau.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and expressed its concerns regarding the feasibility of effectively rehabilitating this site. The Bureau urged the State Party to take all necessary measures to ensure rapid and effective implementation of the programme for rehabilitating Ichkeul. The Bureau recommended that the Committee allow time for the implementation of the programme and reiterated its recommendation that the State Party submit a comprehensive report on the results of the implementation of the rehabilitation programme to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the State Party to field an expert mission to the site, similar to the one organised to the Galapagos in 1995, to undertake a thorough review of the state of conservation of the site. The Bureau noted the observation made by one of its members that the original nomination of Ichkeul, submitted in 1979, lacked adequate baseline data for evaluating the outcome of the programme of rehabilitation currently underway. The Bureau therefore recommended that the expert mission establish the necessary baseline data and information, and prepare a report on the adequacy of conservation measures undertaken and propose additional measures that may be needed for the conservation of the site. It also recommended the preparation of a statement of significance on the World Heritage values of the site, which could provide a framework for an objective evaluation of the success or failure of the rehabilitation programme currently being implemented by the State Party. In the event it is determined that the rehabilitation programme has failed to restore Ichkeul's World Heritage values, steps for the eventual deletion of Ichkeul from the World Heritage List should be set in motion, as per paragraphs 89(iii) and 50(d) of the Operational Guidelines. However, the Bureau's intention in suggesting an expert mission was based on the intention to give equal consideration to the possibility for developing an improved rehabilitation programme for Ichkeul and retain its status as a World Heritage site.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

V.12 The Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of five cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V.13 Butrinti (Albania)

The Bureau welcomed the progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures at Butrinti and the start of the process that should lead to the adoption of a management plan for the site. It recommended that due attention be given to the problem of illicit traffic of archaeological objects from Butrinti as well as the unauthorised constructions in its vicinity.

The Observer of Greece repeated the interest of her country to collaborate in and provide expert advice for the preservation of Butrinti.

The Bureau requested the Secretariat to submit a progress report to the twenty-second session of the Committee.

V.14 Angkor (Cambodia)

The Bureau expressed its appreciation for the report of the Secretariat and for the continued efforts of UNESCO in mobilising international co-operation for the protection, preservation and presentation of the site of Angkor, especially through the International Co-ordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of Angkor.

The Bureau, however, requested UNESCO to continue its work in the strengthening of training activities for local and national capacity-building, especially in measures prohibiting and preventing the illicit traffic of cultural property. In this regard, and alarmed by press reports on the alleged pillage of cultural property from sites of national importance, the Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report to the twenty-second session of the Committee. This report should summarise the steps taken in the preparation of a national inventory of cultural properties and on legal and regulatory measures adopted by the Government in the protection of cultural property in Angkor and in other sites on the Tentative List.

The Bureau underlined the serious need to address illicit traffic of cultural property, not only at a national level but also at an international level. To this end, the Bureau encouraged UNESCO Member States to ratify existing legal instruments for preventing illicit traffic of cultural properties, such as the *UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970* and the *UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects 1995*.

V.15 Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Croatian authorities had submitted a substantive report on the state of conservation of Dubrovnik requesting the Committee to delete the Old City of Dubrovnik from the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS informed the Bureau that it was greatly impressed by the restoration works undertaken in Dubrovnik and that it strongly supported the request made by Croatia.

The Bureau congratulated the Croatian authorities on the progress made in the restoration and rehabilitation of the city. With great satisfaction, the Bureau decided to recommend the Committee to delete the Old City of Dubrovnik from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

V.16 Bahla Fort (Oman)

Having taken note of the report of the Secretariat concerning the situation at the Bahla Fort, the Bureau thanked the Omani authorities for their effort in safeguarding the site. However, considering the serious deterioration of the monument, the Bureau requested the Omani authorities to continue the collaboration with the international expert and inform the Committee of the progress through the Secretariat. In this connection, it approved the continuation of co-operation on a cost-sharing basis as previously agreed, to continue rehabilitation and prepare a management plan for the site. It also recommended the early initiation of the hydro-metric survey as a matter of emergency.

V.17 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)

The Bureau commended the Government of Peru for its initiative to prepare a management plan for the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone. It requested the Government to submit a second report on

the progress made in this respect by 15 September 1998 for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session. The Bureau furthermore requested the Government to inform the Committee on the impact of the El Nino phenomenon, as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of the emergency measures taken.

B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL HERITAGE

V.18 Great Barrier Reef (Australia)

The Bureau, at its twenty-first extraordinary session in November 1997, requested that the Australian authorities provide specific information on the results of the financial review of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). The Bureau noted that the Minister for the Environment of Australia has informed the Centre that the financial review of the GBRMPA has been completed, and that more detailed information on the recommendations of that review would be made available to the Centre as soon as the Government has considered those recommendations and has taken relevant decisions. (See Annex IV).

The Observer of Australia, informed the Bureau of measures taken to address other potential threats to the site which had been brought to the attention of the Centre and the Chairperson of the Committee by several Australian NGOs. In doing so, she pointed out that the expressed concerns of the NGOs in their December 1997 letter were extremely vague, with no supporting evidence and that therefore they were difficult to respond to. However, she outlined the following steps which had been taken and indicated that she had in fact previously commented on most of these issues.

- rigorous environmental conditions have been put in place on the development activities in the Hinchinbrook region. The Government of Australia considered them to be adequate to ensure the continued protection of the World Heritage values of the Reef; a regional development plan has been developed;
- a special protected area had been established to conserve dugong populations and habitats;
- there are no proposals at present to mine oil shale anywhere near the Great Barrier Reef; the construction of a pilot-plant for investigating the viability of recovery from oil shale near Gladstone has undergone an EIA, but there are no plans to proceed with a full scale production facility in the foreseeable future; any future proposals to proceed towards a commercial facility will be subjected to a comprehensive impact assessment and the Commonwealth Government has made it clear that mining will not be allowed where it could have a detrimental affect to the Great Barrier Reef. World Heritage legislation in Australia would override any such proposals from the states;
- significant conservation measures have been taken as part of the regional planning process to ensure that fisheries management in the Reef is consistent with Australia's World Heritage obligations and to protect threatened species, and
- recently, a review of the values of the Great Barrier Reef was conducted by Mr B. Lucas. The review report augments information on the values of the Reef and confirms that they are well conserved, and makes some useful recommendations for future planning.

V.19 Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia)

The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that the granting of a petroleum exploration permit, on 29 November 1996, by the State Government of West Australia was brought to the attention of the Commonwealth Government in January 1997. In Australia decisions to issue mining exploration permits are taken at the level of the State Government. The State Government appeared to have been unaware that the area for which an exploration permit was issued was located within the World Heritage site. Following the intervention of the Commonwealth Government of Australia, the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) of the Western Australian Government has established a panel to assess the development proposal and prepare environmental strategies. The Observer of Australia assured the Bureau that no decision to allow oil exploration activities would be taken until the EPA assessment of the potential environmental impacts of such activities is completed, and no such development will take place if it threatens World Heritage values.

IUCN raised an issue in regard to the report submitted by the Australian. IUCN pointed out references to prospecting licences being issued by the Queensland Government which could have implications for the Great Barrier Reef area and by the Western Australian Government involving part of the Shark Bay World Heritage area. While IUCN noted the Australian statement that mining would not be permitted if it would have adverse effect on the World Heritage properties, and that the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act would override any State action which threatened World Heritage values, IUCN suggested the situation merited closer liaison with the Government over the issuing of property licenses, especially as IUCN understood the Queensland mining laws carried an automatic right to a mining permit following the granting of an exploration licence.

V.20 Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)

The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that based on the concern that clearing may have occurred within the World Heritage property, the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment appointed a senior officer from the Wet Tropics Management Authority (WTMA) as an inspector under the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act (1983). This official would determine the nature of any vegetation clearance that may have occurred on private properties within the World Heritage area.

The investigator reported three cases of clearing, two of which were within the World Heritage area. Based on the advice of the inspector, the Minister for the Environment determined that World Heritage values were not at risk and that no further action was required in relation to these incidents.

The Bureau was satisfied to note that the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area Plan of Management would come into effect on 1 September 1998. The Plan, by removing the ability of land management agencies like Local Councils and the Queensland Department of Natural Resources to clear vegetation without scrutiny from WTMA, and by developing better co-ordination between actions of agencies, will help to prevent the any future clearings within the World Heritage area.

The Bureau noted IUCN's acknowledgement that it receives a large volume of reports and statements concerning threats to many of the thirteen World Heritage sites of Australia and that it does not have the capacity at its Headquarters in Switzerland to evaluate all of them. The Bureau welcomed the offer of the Australian Committee of IUCN, made in November 1997, to undertake annual assessments of a selected number of properties and to provide reports to the annual sessions of the Committee.

The Bureau recommended that IUCN in co-operation with its Australian Committee, establish a mechanism for assessing, in a timely manner, the continuous stream of information received by the Centre on the state of conservation of Australian natural World Heritage sites. This would ensure that up-to-date state of conservation reports on the Great Barrier Reef, Shark Bay and the Wet Tropics of Queensland are submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee.

V.21 Iguacu National Park (Brazil)

The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-first ordinary session it requested the Brazilian authorities to close the 18km road traversing the Park that had been illegally re-opened by local people. The Committee at its last session (Naples, 1997), was informed by IUCN that the road had been temporarily closed, and that several actions had been undertaken by the Brazilian authorities to strengthen management of the Park. Nevertheless, the Committee called for the permanent closure of the road and requested the Brazilian authorities to provide information concerning the rehabilitation of the damaged areas.

The Centre informed the Bureau that: (1) on 11 January 1998, local people illegally re-gained access to the road in the Park; (2) the Brazilian National Congress had established a Task Force under its Permanent Environmental Commission to investigate the issue; (3) the Task Force visited the area on 5 March 1998 and urged that a solution to the conflict be found; (4) the National Institute for the Environment envisaged the preparation of a new management plan as soon as invaders left the area; and (5) members of the Brazilian judicial community have reiterated their call for the closure of the road. The Director of the UNESCO Office in Brazil received a letter dated 27 May 1998 from the Director of Ecosystems of the Ministry of the Environment, confirming that the road has been illegally reopened and that parts of the Park are damaged. The Ministry hopes to solve the problems through the Task Force, the revision of the Management Plan and the preparation of a comprehensive revitalisation programme.

The Bureau requested the Centre to prepare a mission to the site jointly with IUCN to review the situation and to assist the State Party to mitigate the threats to the Park. The Bureau furthermore requested the Centre to write to the Brazilian authorities to express its serious concerns with regard to the state of conservation of the site. The Bureau asked the State Party to provide by 15 September 1998: (1) a copy of the revitalisation programme and a time frame for the rehabilitation of damaged areas, and (2) a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and actions taken with regard to the permanent closure of the road.

V.22 Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its twenty-first session, noted with concern that logging activities, carried out under commercial, as well as sustainable forestry schemes, are contributing to the growing biological isolation of the Reserve and are not welcome by the local people. An IUCN project is aiming to minimise the degree of the Reserve's isolation through the establishment of a buffer zone and a protected corridor linking Dja with adjacent forests. Moreover, logging roads facilitate access for hunters, and concessionaires have logged forests up to the boundary of the Reserve.

The Bureau, at its twenty-first extraordinary session approved US\$29,900 to organise an *in-situ* Regional Training Workshop at Dja and the Committee, at its last session, had urged the State Party to use the Workshop as a forum for discussing with representatives of donors financing forestry operations, IUCN

and others concerned, ways and means to minimise the threat of biological isolation of Dja.

The Bureau noted that the Regional Training Workshop at Dja financed from the World Heritage Fund was held from 23 to 26 March 1998 in Sangmelima, Cameroon. It was attended by sixty participants representing four countries of the region, several national and international development and conservation organisations including IUCN's Dja Project staff, and UNESCO's Division of Ecological Sciences and the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau took note of the findings of the Workshop, in particular that Cameroon has adopted a national policy for natural resources conservation; a survey carried out indicated that 80% of the local people of Dja are in favour of maintaining it as a World Heritage site and a Biosphere Reserve, and are ready to collaborate in its protection. More than six international development organisations are implementing projects in and around Dja in co-operation with various non-governmental organisations. It was noted that the overall integrity of the site is still intact, that logging around the Reserve has not impacted the World Heritage site as yet, and that the Ministry for the Environment is in the process of finalising the management plan with the assistance of IUCN and ECOFAC. A zoning plan will accompany the management plan for Dja and the Forest of Ngoila – Mintom, south of the Dja Reserve, will be designated as a protected forest. There is a need to undertake a rapid bio-diversity assessment to ascertain the current status of faunal and floral populations in Dja and in surrounding areas so as to enable a scientific evaluation of the threat of the biological isolation of Dja. In addition, the Workshop recommended the need to improve co-ordination between non-governmental organisations, ECOFAC, IUCN project staff and the Government and the need for revising legislation regulations governing hunting. It also recommended the need for the Ministry for Environment and Forestry to consult with the Ministry's "Direction de la Faune et des Aires Protégées" in granting licences for forest exploitation.

The Bureau noted that the Workshop participants were of the view that Dja did not warrant designation as a World Heritage site in Danger. IUCN, however, remains concerned that commercial hunters and logging companies show little respect for regulations and are not subject to enforcement by Government officials.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party take urgent measures to act on the recommendations of the Workshop and present to the next session of the Committee in December 1998, a statement of actions to be implemented. The Bureau invited Cameroon to give priority consideration to implementing actions that would: (a) strengthen law enforcement against poaching and improve management of hunting and trade in wildlife products, and (b) halt the issue of new licences for forest exploitation immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the World Heritage area. The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate in designing and launching a rapid bio-diversity assessment to evaluate the impacts of on-going forestry operations on maintaining contiguity of habitats and gene pools in and around the Dja World Heritage site.

V.23 Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, at its twenty-first session, expressed its serious concerns with regard to potential threats to the integrity of this site due to the proposed Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 2.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this World Heritage area. A range of conservation organisations and Parks Canada had expressed concern regarding the negative impacts which the proposed mining project would have on the integrity of the World Heritage site. Nevertheless, the Federal

Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Alberta had subsequently approved the project and published a full EIA in favour of the project. The conservation groups subsequently challenged the Federal-Provincial Environmental Assessment Panel's report. The judge dismissed the case based upon the fact that the Panel report is not subject to judicial review.

The Centre received a report entitled "Government of Canada Response to a request from the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for Information on the Canadian Rocky Mountains World Heritage site" and a letter from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks Canada. The report provided details of the Cheviot mining project, which at its closest, would be 2,8km from the boundary of Jasper National Park. The mine will involve the development of an area of 3007 ha with open pits, infrastructure and roads. The report also highlights the review and approval process and indicates key elements of the Government of Canada's response to mitigate environmental impacts, including the objective to maintain ecological integrity of Jasper National Park, and an agreement for integrated grizzly bear management.

The Bureau thanked the Canadian Government for having provided a detailed report concerning the impacts that the proposed mining project would have on the integrity of the Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks and mechanisms put in place to ensure that strict mitigation measures will be applied. The Bureau invited the Canadian authorities to ensure that all possible environmental impacts on the World Heritage site are mitigated. The Bureau requested the Canadian authorities to provide a status report on the proposed mining project, including any proposed start-up date for the project, to the Centre, before 15 September 1998, for review by the Committee at its twenty-second session.

V.24 Los Katios National Park (Colombia)

The state of conservation of this Park was the subject of an extensive review submitted by a representative of Colombia's Ministry of Environment at a Regional World Heritage Workshop held in the Everglades National Park in November 1997. IUCN drew the attention of the Centre to serious threats to the integrity of this Park, caused by a breakdown of law and order in the area. The Centre contacted the Colombian authorities for confirmation of reports received by IUCN on the state of conservation of Los Katios. The Bureau noted that the Colombian authorities have provided a report on 19 June 1998 to the Centre and requested IUCN to report back on its review of this report to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau.

V.25 Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)

IUCN and the Centre have been informed of a proposed cable car construction project through the centre of the Park. The feasibility of the project, proposed by a private individual concerned with tourism development, is questionable due to the heavy rains, high winds and steep terrain which characterise the site. The construction of major access facilities in this area is not consistent with the management plan of the Park. IUCN was advised by the Dominican authorities that they will exercise great caution when considering the feasibility of this proposal.

The Bureau requested the Centre to contact the State Party to obtain detailed information on the proposal and requested that the Centre and IUCN be kept fully informed of progress in their review of the cable construction project proposal.

V.26 Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twenty-first session invited the Government of Ecuador to notify in a timely fashion, the Chairperson of the Committee of the final enactment and entering into force of the Galapagos Special Law. The Committee, although it did not include the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger, decided that if, by the opening date of the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, the Government of Ecuador had not notified the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee of the enactment and entry into force of the "Special Galapagos Law", then the Galapagos Islands be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Permanent Delegate of Ecuador to UNESCO, via his letter of 22 April 1998, transmitted a copy of the "Special Law on the Galapagos", published by the Official Registry of Ecuador as Law No. 278 on 18 March 1998, to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. At a meeting between the Ambassador of Ecuador, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and the Director of the Centre, the Chairperson took note of the official notification and commended the Government of Ecuador for its efforts. The Chairperson however, stressed the importance of ensuring effective implementation of the Special Law to protect this World Heritage site.

IUCN, in its report to the Centre on the state of conservation of Galapagos, has pointed out that the Law, if implemented, will greatly strengthen conservation in both the islands as well as in the surrounding marine reserve, which was extended from 24 to 64 km offshore. The Law addresses most of the major issues (particularly alien species and management of the marine reserve) relating to conservation and sustainable development of Galapagos and has been drafted on the basis of the outcome of an intense national debate. The main highlights of the Law and the evaluation of its effectiveness have been provided by the Charles Darwin Foundation, and include: (i) *Regulations* with regard to the control of introduced species, their eradication in agricultural lands, establishment of a quarantine inspection system, etc; (ii) incentives for *local appreciation and participation through environmental education*; (iii) *building local skills and conservation institutions, in particular strengthening of the GNPS*; (iv) improving inter-agency *co-ordination* through the work of INGALA (Instituto Nacional de Galapagos) which has been re-established; (v) immigration and residence control measures to stabilise the rate of growth of human *population size*; and (vi) initiating a participatory planning process for marine resources conservation.

The Law also provides for: (a) the Establishment of the Marine Reserve as a protected area and (b) the expansion of the Reserve boundaries to 64 km around the whole archipelago within which area only tourism and artisanal fishing are permitted. The provisions of the Law concerning marine areas have provided a historic opportunity for conserving 130,000 sq. km of a very important marine ecosystem.

The Bureau commended the Government of Ecuador and all the agencies, groups, local residents and experts for reaching a consensus on this new Law. The Bureau thanked the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr. Winkelmann and the Director of the Centre for having initiated the process through their mission to the site in June 1996.

The Bureau urged the Ecuadorian authorities to ensure the effective implementation of the Law. The Bureau invited the Ecuadorian authorities to re-nominate the Marine Reserve, deferred by the Committee in 1994, to be a part of the World Heritage site as soon as the management plan for the Marine Reserve is finalised in 1999. The Bureau recommended that the

Committee not consider Galapagos Islands for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegate of Ecuador thanked the World Heritage Committee, its Bureau, IUCN and the Centre for their understanding and commitment to preserve the Galapagos Islands World Heritage site. The full text of his statement is included in Annex V.

The Bureau also expressed its sincere regrets and sympathies to the families of the two senior Ecuadorian conservationists (Jorge Anhalzer and Fabricio Valverde) who perished in a plane crash after returning from a conservation meeting of the Islands.

V.27 Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)

The Bureau recalled that it was informed of an interim plan submitted by the authorities of Oman in 1997, which foresaw a new outer boundary, and provisional boundaries for five management zones, the construction of an administrative headquarters, visitor and local service centres and other facilities. Also foreseen was the launching of pilot projects in a variety of fields, including environmental tourism, and possible allocation of financial and human resources for the development of the site as Oman's first national park. As requested by the Bureau, the authorities of Oman submitted a draft map showing the outer boundary of the Sanctuary and the provisional boundaries of the five management zones and a report on the status of the Arabian Oryx population in the Sanctuary.

The Bureau noted IUCN's comments that the management plan and map still exists only in a draft form and that IUCN will postpone its review of the plan until such time as the final version is available. The Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre about the finalisation of the management plan as early as possible and submit it to IUCN and the Centre for review.

V.28 Huascarán National Park (Peru)

The Bureau noted that a Canadian/Peruvian mining consortium is in the final stages of obtaining approval to develop one of the world's largest copper and zinc deposits found at Antamina, located 20km east from this Park. Mining would commence in 2001 and have a life span of 20 years. The concentrates from this mine would be transported either via an existing road through or around the Park to the coast.

The Bureau noted the Centre's consultations with INRENA (Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales), the site managers and NGOs during a recent mission to Peru, and that a meeting with two representatives of the mining company, the Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO, INRENA and representatives from the Centre and UNESCO's Division of Ecological Sciences took place on 19 June 1998. The meeting reviewed the situation and the three options of road access, the Northern Road, the Central Road and the Southern Road. For the Central Route an EIA had been undertaken. Meanwhile the mining company agreed to take the so-called Southern Route, which is completely outside the Park, but however traverses the buffer zones of the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve. This alternative proposal is preferred by a number of groups, including IUCN and INRENA. No EIA has been carried out for the use of the Southern Route so far. In addition, the Central Route would be used for heavy equipment to be brought to the mining area for approximately one year, until a bypass at the Southern Route has been made. IUCN underlined that all impacts, especially the temporary use of the Central Route during the one-year period, should be closely monitored.

Several Bureau members stated that the efforts made by the State Party and the mining company should be recognised; however a number of issues should be addressed, taking into account the

necessity for social development of the region. The Chairperson proposed to use the situation at Huascarán as a model to establish a *Study Group* to reconcile environment and development and to review it as a case study which could be useful as guidance and advice to other World Heritage sites which face potential mining projects. He furthermore suggested that a mission to the site might be useful in future.

The Observer of Peru emphasised that the mining operation is important for his Government as it takes place in one of the poorest regions of Peru. The collaboration between INRENA, the private sector, IUCN, the Mountain Institute, the Centre and the State Party should be taken as a good example for the protection of the Park under the Convention.

The Bureau took note of the different options for accessing the mining area and the preference expressed by INRENA to use the Southern Road, and requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to control impacts of the temporary use of the road through the Park until the Southern Route becomes available. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a status report on the situation in time for the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and to consider that a Representative of IUCN be part of the "Working Group" being established by INRENA on the management of the site.

Noting the number of cases coming forward from various countries where mining projects may affect World Heritage sites, the Bureau furthermore requested the Centre and IUCN and ICOMOS to collaborate with the Chairperson in the setting up of a study group to examine all issues involved with mining projects with a potential to affect World Heritage sites, in order to establish principles which would guide the Committee's future work in this regard.

V.29 Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)

The Bureau recalled the report by IUCN at the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee reviewing a proposed mining project, the location of which was determined to be about 5 km outside of the Bystrinsky portion of the World Heritage area. The location of the mine will disrupt migratory wildlife that inhabit the region and impact fishery resources. IUCN has been in contact with proponents of the mine and has had a request from Canada regarding financial service support that could be provided by the Export Development Corporation (EDC). In this request it is noted that "as a critical first step in their due diligence, and in determining whether such support would be available for the project, EDC wants to be assured that it would not be contravening Article 6, paragraph 3 of the World Heritage Convention." The report of IUCN mentioned the issue of development project loans from various export credit agencies.

As requested by the Committee at its last session, the Centre had asked the State Party to provide detailed information on the proposed mining project, particularly on EIAs carried out and other pertinent information. The Centre informed the Bureau that a letter from the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation stated that at present there are no plans to carry out significant geological and operational work in areas adjacent to the World Heritage site which may result in negative ecological impacts. Should such work be carried out, all necessary arrangements will be made to observe existing laws and regulations. In addition, a letter of 18 June 1998 from the Governor of Kamchatka reiterated the Kamchatka Administration's commitment to the protection of the site and the support of the controlled development of the Aginskoe gold deposit. Furthermore, it stated that a formal environmental assessment of the project has been carried out. The final design of the project will be only made taking into account IUCN's comments. The Governor stated that the development of the gold

deposit does not put the World Heritage site at risk and that it is desirable because of the economic development needs of the region.

The Bureau noted the information provided by the Russian authorities and requested the Centre and IUCN to continue maintaining their contacts with the State Party and bring to the attention of the Committee details concerning the EIA carried out on the project. The Bureau expressed its concern to the Russian Government and the Regional Administration of Kamchatka over the potential consequences of the proposed mine, and recalled other cases of natural World Heritage sites threatened by mining proposals.

V.30 Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee, when it inscribed this property on the World Heritage List at its twentieth session, noted that the Special Lake Baikal Law was in its second reading in the Duma, and expressed its concern over a number of integrity issues, including pollution of the Lake. The Bureau, at its twenty-first extraordinary session, expressed its concern regarding the inadequacy of the legal basis available for the protection of the entire World Heritage site. It requested the Russian authorities to provide, before 1 May 1998, detailed information on the status of the Special Lake Baikal Law, and the legal status of forests located adjacent to the boundaries of the World Heritage site.

A letter from the Deputy Minister for Natural Resources of the Russian Federation stated that a number of laws on the national protection of the Lake existed and indicated that the Duma had adopted the Federal Law on "The Protection of the Baikal Lake" which was, however, vetoed by the President. It is currently in its third reading in the Duma, taking into account comments made by the President's intervention. IUCN informed the Bureau that in addition to the concerns over the protection of the site, the open question of reprofiling the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill at Baikalsk, which is one of the main polluters, remains and that the authorities have not come to a conclusion on this issue.

The Observer of Russia indicated that the situation at Lake Baikal is of major concern, mainly because of: (1) the status of the proposed Baikal Law; (2) continuing pollution of the Lake by the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill; (3) increasing pollution at the Selenka River; (4) lack of resources for the protected area and national park management; (5) lack of resources for monitoring and (6) other negative factors such as logging. He concluded that the site is under serious threat and that the State Party would not oppose inclusion on the List of World Heritage Danger.

The Bureau noted the report and expressed serious concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal. It urged the State Party to inform the Centre by 15 September 1998 on the status of the Baikal Law and its adoption as well as a time-table for its implementation. It furthermore requested the State Party to consider paragraphs 82-89 "Procedure for the Inclusion of Properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger" of the Operational Guidelines and to prepare a programme for corrective measures to be brought to the attention of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

V.31 Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)

The Bureau at its twenty-first session expressed its serious concern about the proposed gold mining project in the World Heritage site and requested the Russian authorities to provide, before 1 May 1998, detailed information on the proposal, including any environmental impact studies that may have been carried out. In addition, the Bureau requested the Russian

authorities to keep the relevant authorities in the Komi Republic fully informed of the Bureau's concerns and involve them in discussions aimed at ensuring the integrity of the World Heritage site. A letter from the Deputy Minister for Natural Resources of the Russian Federation stated that a project for the change of boundaries of the site has been submitted for ecological examination. It is also stated that the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Komi Republic "deprived the TERRA company of its rights to produce gold this year". In addition, a letter of 27 May 1998 from the Deputy Chair of the Russian State Committee for Environmental Protection, indicated that "the realisation of the gold mining project in the World Heritage site has been suspended".

The Bureau urged the State Party to provide full information on the proposal to change the borders of the site, whether a withdrawal from any mining proposals occurred, and of any potential gold mining projects by 15 September 1998. The Bureau invited the State Party to undertake all necessary measures to fully inform the authorities of the Komi Republic of the status of the site.

V.32 Donana National Park (Spain)

Information indicated that a toxic spill in southern Spain upstream from Donana has caused an ecological disaster, and will seriously affect this World Heritage site. The crisis began on 25 April 1998, when a giant holding pool of the Aznalcollar mine owned by a Canadian-Swedish company burst. The toxic spill affected the surrounding areas of the World Heritage site. The Ramsar Convention Bureau informed IUCN that whilst the main toxic flow may have been diverted away from the National Park itself, the adjoining areas, including the Regional Natural Park 'Entorno de Donana', have been badly damaged. It is also likely that the impacts of the spill may spread into the World Heritage area as the pollution becomes more widely dispersed. The Centre has contacted the State Party to obtain an official report on the spill, its impacts on the World Heritage site and mitigation measures being taken. The Bureau was informed that the Spanish Government had submitted a number of reports on the situation and actions taken to mitigate the threats and that all reports have been transmitted to IUCN for evaluation. Most reports are of a technical nature and describe, for example, the least damaging technology to remove the retained contaminated water as well as the possibility of treating and removing the polluted crust. This contamination has accumulative effects on biological organisms inhabiting the site. The removal urgently needs to be completed before the autumn rains.

The Centre informed the Bureau that on 18 June 1998 a meeting took place with the President of the Spanish "Man and the Biosphere" (MAB) Committee, the former Director of Donana National Park, the Director-General of UNESCO, the Director of the SC/ECO and staff from the World Heritage Centre. The President of the MAB Committee suggested an international conference to review actions taken and rehabilitation plans elaborated for the conservation of the site. He also presented an outline for launching a project entitled "Donana 2005". It was suggested that UNESCO is involved in the preparation of the conference and that financial support may be provided for this purpose.

The Bureau thanked the State Party for immediate actions taken to mitigate the threats and for keeping the World Heritage Centre and other UNESCO Divisions fully informed on the situation at the site. The Bureau however, expressed its serious concerns on the long-term restoration of the property and urged the State Party to undertake all possible measures to mitigate the threats. It requested the State Party to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention in the preparation of an international expert conference to develop a long-term vision and prepare a

detailed report in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Observer of Spain thanked the Centre for rapid actions and support and stressed the commitment of his Government to the protection of the World Heritage site, which has been illustrated by submitting five reports since April. His Government has taken note of the proposal for an international scientific conference and will continue to work closely with the World Heritage Centre and the Committee.

V.33 Canaima National Park (Venezuela)

The Bureau recalled that the Committee at its twenty-first session expressed its concern with regard to the integrity of the Canaima National Park due to considerable threats posed by a proposal to erect a series of power transmission lines across the Park. The Committee invited the Director-General to write to the President of the State Party asking his intervention to search for possible alternatives and to determine the appropriate boundaries of the World Heritage site. The Venezuelan Permanent Delegation to UNESCO, wrote a letter to the Centre on 12 March 1998, explaining the actual situation of the proposed construction of one electrical power line that would pass through a part of the National Park. The letter indicates that: (1) the Ministry for the Environment and the National Parks Institute are in the process of evaluating the Venezuelan South East Project Transmission System; (2) distinct alternatives for the location of this line have been analysed. A decision has been made for an option that will cut across a smaller percentage of the Park. Moreover, the alternatives being considered include the erection of the power transmission lines along the existing Eldorado-Santa Elena de Uairén road as proposed by IUCN, which would reduce the impact of the project on the site; (3) local population interests are being considered in accordance with the existing laws. The President of Venezuela, in his letter of 13 March 1998 to the Director-General of UNESCO, has transmitted the Environmental Impact Study on the power transmission line project, which was finalised in December 1997. He has reaffirmed the commitment of his Government to protect the World Heritage site and welcomed the possibility of a UNESCO mission to the site to evaluate the proposals of boundaries.

IUCN stressed that the power line is of major concern to indigenous people and that a number of letters were received and that the proposed mission should take up this issue, in addition to potential threats to the site. The Observer of Venezuela welcomed a mission to the site and stated that interests of local people have been taken into consideration according to existing laws.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate in sending a mission to Caracas and to Canaima National Park to review with specialists and local technicians, proposals for alternative routes for the construction of electrical transmission lines. It should also determine appropriate boundaries for the site in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee and IUCN, made at the time of inscription of the site in 1994. The Bureau recommended that a detailed report of the mission be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee.

V.34 Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)

The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-first session, it urged the Vietnam authorities to co-operate with the Japanese International Co-operation Agency (JICA) in designing and implementing the study on environmental management for Ha Long Bay. A draft of the scope of work for the environmental study was provided to the World Heritage Centre by the Head of the Ha Long Bay Management Department. The draft has been transmitted to IUCN for information, review and comments. The study on

environmental management for Ha Long Bay is to be carried out from February 1998 to October 1999.

UNDP/Vietnam has provided the Centre with the minutes of two donor meetings concerning Ha Long Bay. In the first of those meetings held on 9 October 1997, the minutes indicate that a representative from the Japanese Embassy in Hanoi had pointed out that the environmental study is expected to run parallel to the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Cailan Port construction project.

At a second meeting held at the UNDP Resident Representative's Office, in Hanoi, on 27 February, information concerning negotiations between Vietnam and Japan for the construction of the Bai Chay Bridge, expected to link Bai Chay beach to Ha Long City across the Bai Chay Bay, had been made available. A loan agreement for engineering services for the construction of this bridge was signed by OECF, Japan and the Government of Vietnam in March 1998, and includes a feasibility study as well as an environmental impact assessment of the bridge construction project.

The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to maintain contact with the Vietnam authorities in order to monitor progress. The outcome of the Japan/Vietnam environmental study and the EIA of the Cailan Port construction project, as well as information on engineering services and EIAs that may be undertaken in connection with the Bai Chay Bridge construction project should be monitored and a report provided to the next session of the Committee.

V.35 Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro))

The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-first session it had requested the Park management to submit a map showing the proposed modification of the Park's boundaries to excise a 40 ha. area around the village of Zabljak, which had already been approved by the Government of the Republic of Montenegro. Furthermore, the Bureau had sought clarification from the Park authorities on whether they considered that an engineering evaluation of the earthen containment structures in the flood plains of the Tara River was needed. The Bureau had expressed its concerns regarding plans for tapping the hydropower potential of the Tara River and requested more information on such plans.

By a letter dated 8 April 1998, the Durmitor National Park authorities have informed the Centre that the map showing the 40 ha area to be excised is under preparation and that documentation concerning other information requested by the Bureau had been submitted to the Federal Ministry for the Protection of the Environment. The Park authorities have pointed out that there is a global protection regime for the Tara River and its Canyon. The Centre has contacted the Permanent Delegation of the State Party in UNESCO and is awaiting the receipt of the documentation sent by the Park authorities to the Federal Ministry for the Protection of the Environment.

The Bureau requested the Centre to write to the State Party to obtain further information on the global protection regime for the Tara River and Canyon and to provide a detailed report by 15 September 1998 in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

MIXED (CULTURAL AND NATURAL) HERITAGE

V.36 Kakadu National Park (Australia)

The Secretariat recalled that the Bureau, at its twenty-first extraordinary session in November 1997, had invited the Australian authorities to provide the World Heritage Centre with any new information concerning the proposed uranium mine at Jabiluka in Kakadu National Park. The Australian authorities were requested to provide information pertaining to their efforts to ensure that the proponents of mining in the enclave, within but outside of the boundaries of the Park, address the seventy-seven environmental conditions imposed by the Government. The Bureau was informed that the mine's proponent provide a six-monthly report to the Government on the progress which has been made in the implementation of these conditions.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that additional information concerning the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park had been recently provided by the Australian authorities and had been made available to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.12. The Secretariat mentioned a letter received from the lawyer for the Mirrar Aboriginal people who referred to the responses by the Bureau and Committee on the state of conservation of Kakadu at its twenty-first session as "entirely unsatisfactory". The Secretariat also informed the Bureau that a submission from four scientists in Australia had been received in which they criticise the quality and process of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Jabuluka uranium mine. The scientists state that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) largely ignores cultural heritage and calls for a new EIS to include proper assessment of the ecological and cultural impacts of the proposed mine. Furthermore, the Secretariat and the Chairperson referred to the many letters they had received which expressed concern about the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park and called for the inclusion of Kakadu on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN presented a detailed statement concerning the state of conservation of Kakadu. In summary, IUCN suggested that the Resolution on Kakadu, adopted at the World Conservation Congress in 1996 and the precautionary principle be used to guide IUCN's advice to the Committee. IUCN recommended that mining activity should be deferred until the Committee is satisfied with the implementation of the seventy-seven environmental conditions and requested the necessary information and resources for IUCN to participate in a multi-disciplinary mission to the site and report to the twenty-second session of the Bureau and Committee if requested by the Bureau. IUCN's statement was distributed to the Bureau and is included in this report as Annex VI.

The Observers of Australia, responded with detailed statements which are annexed in full to this report as Annex VII and Annex VIII.

ICOMOS expressed the need to better assess the full diversity of cultural values, including spiritual values and living cultural traditions, at Kakadu and in the Jabiluka mining lease. ICOMOS also commented that at the time of inclusion in the List (in three stages, 1981, 1987 and 1992), nomination as a cultural landscape had not been possible. ICOMOS raised the possibility of Kakadu being considered in the future as a cultural landscape of potential World Heritage value.

The Delegate of Benin recalled that concern had been expressed about the state of conservation of Kakadu at the twenty-first session of the Bureau and the Committee in Naples, Italy in December 1997. He stressed the need for the Bureau and the Committee to now take action and make a closer examination of conditions at the site. He agreed with IUCN that a joint mission

by ICOMOS and IUCN was needed to provide a clear report, to seek further information from the Australian authorities and the traditional owners and to prepare an analysis and recommendations as to whether or not the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegate of Japan commented favourably on Australia's management of its World Heritage properties. He agreed that it would be useful to dispatch a mission to Australia to collect further information on the state of conservation of Kakadu and to prepare a report for submission to the Bureau and the Committee in Kyoto, Japan in December. The Delegate of the United States of America similarly commented on the high level of protected area management practice in Australia, and agreed that an expert analysis would be useful. He offered his country's assistance in the mission. The Delegate of Morocco also agreed that a mission was required and suggested that one or two Bureau members should also join the mission.

The Chairperson summarised the debate as having reached consensus on the need to proceed on the basis of the precautionary principle even in the absence of complete data. He noted that the Bureau had received detailed information from the Australian Observers, and that they had expressed the utmost co-operation and full acceptance of the precautionary principle of the Australian Government. He stated that there was also general agreement that the information about the state of conservation of Kakadu presented to the Committee and Bureau required greater clarity. Finally, he emphasised that the multi-faceted environmental, cultural and legal issues relating to the conservation of the site highlight the need for a fact-finding mission. The Australian Observer reiterated that the record of conservation at Kakadu was very good and that the Australian Government did not consider that the World Heritage values were threatened. She stated that, for these reasons, a mission would be welcomed.

The Bureau noted the extent and level of representation to it concerning uranium mining in the area of Kakadu National Park. Uranium mining in an area of high natural and cultural values is of sensitivity and potential concern. The Australian Observers had reported in detail on the progress to date in imposing conditions on mining such that it does not affect the World Heritage or other natural or cultural values in this area. Progress had been good, and the care taken to protect World Heritage values is adequate.

Because of the importance, complexity and sensitivity of the issue, however, the Bureau proposed that a mission to Kakadu be undertaken by a team headed by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee with the participation of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS. This mission would examine the situation further, have discussions with relevant Aboriginal groups, officials, non-governmental organisations and the mining company, and report to the Bureau and Committee sessions in November-December 1998.

V.37 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

The Bureau noted that the Tasmanian Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA) signed by the Commonwealth and the Tasmanian Governments on 8 November 1997, has enabled the following:

- establishment of a significantly increased reserve system for Tasmania's Forest Estate;
- participation by the signatories in further World Heritage assessment of relevant Australia-wide themes; and
- initiation of discussions between the signatories on possibilities for further World Heritage nominations of parts of Forest Estate as "Dedicated Reserves", or additions to the present World Heritage site.

The Bureau requested the State Party to keep the Centre informed of any potential boundary extensions that may be foreseen for the Tasmanian Wilderness and to provide a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement, including possible boundary extensions to the World Heritage site.

V.38 Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)

IUCN informed the Bureau that the Department of Conservation in New Zealand has recently submitted a progress report on a number of management issues at Tongariro National Park, inscribed on the World Heritage List under both natural and cultural criteria. The report was distributed to the Bureau.

IUCN reported that Mount Ruapehu had erupted in 1995 and 1996 draining the volcano's crater lake and creating a build-up of ash that blocked the lake's outlet. IUCN noted that the best available scientific opinion is that, when the crater lake refills, probably within the next few years, and if nature is left to take its course, a rapid collapse of the ash dam could occur followed by a major lahar. The Park's managers are faced with the dilemma of either letting nature take its course and putting both human life and some natural values at risk or taking action to open up the outlet. The option currently being considered by the authorities is to excavate a trench through the ash at the crater outlet, an action that, on IUCN's preliminary assessment should not significantly affect the natural values for which the site is inscribed. However, IUCN indicated that any interference with the summit area has implications in terms of Tongariro's inclusion on the List as an associative cultural landscape because of the spiritual, traditional and cultural values to the Maori people, especially those who gifted the sacred volcanic peaks as a National Park in 1887. Consultation is proceeding with the two Maori tribes involved and with the Tongariro/Taupo Conservation Board on which Maori serve. One tribe has indicated its opposition to any interference with the summit whilst the other tribe has reserved its position. An Environmental Impact Assessment is awaited. ICOMOS commented on the report provided by IUCN by stating that the matter was of great concern.

The Bureau took note of the report and commended the State Party for its recognition of the cultural and natural World Heritage values of Tongariro National Park. The Bureau requested that the New Zealand authorities keep the Centre informed about the outcome of decisions concerning the management of the ash build-up at the crater outlet of Mount Ruapehu at Tongariro National Park so that the Centre in association with the Advisory Bodies can report back to the Committee and its Bureau.

V.39 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)

The Bureau recalled that the World Heritage Committee examined the state of conservation of Machu Picchu at earlier occasions and that it had made specific recommendations to the State Party on the basis of the recommendations of a joint ICOMOS/IUCN mission on the management, preservation and planning for the Sanctuary. These recommendations and the report of the IUCN/ICOMOS mission were transmitted to the Peruvian authorities for response.

The Secretariat stressed that Machu Picchu is a mixed World Heritage site that includes the well-known ruins of the Inca City, as well as an extremely high level of bio-diversity. It should be noted that a special programme for the preservation of the natural values of Machu Picchu is in implementation under a debt-swap agreement with Finland. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that:

- A report had been received from the National Institute for Culture, but that no substantive and complete response had

been received in response to the recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS mission;

- No decisions had been taken by the Government of Peru with regards to the management structure for Machu Picchu;
- No master plan had been adopted but that it had been informed through a joint letter from INC and INRENA dated 16 June 1998 and a resolution of INRENA dated 19 June 1998 that an existing draft of a master plan would be revised and completed before the end of the year;
- The concession had been given for the undertaking of studies and design of the cable car system between the village of Aguas Calientes and the ruins of Machu Picchu and that the Peruvian authorities had assured that construction would not be undertaken if environmental impact studies would not confirm its feasibility within the context of a master plan for the Park.

Both IUCN and ICOMOS confirmed the above information and reiterated their concerns with reference to management and co-ordination issues and stressed that a master plan as well as environmental impact studies would have to be studied in detail when they become available.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. It reiterated the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth and twenty-first sessions about the need for adequate management arrangements and a comprehensive master plan. It also reiterated the view of the Committee that no action should be undertaken on the implementation of the cable car system until an adequate master plan is in place.

The Bureau took note of the assurance from the Peruvian authorities that a master plan would be prepared and adopted before the end of the year and that the cable car system would be examined in the context of such a plan.

The Bureau requested the Peruvian authorities to submit by 15 September 1998 a report that should include:

- a response to each of the recommendations made by the ICOMOS/IUCN mission,
- the progress made in establishing adequate management arrangements,
- the progress made in the preparation of the master plan for the sanctuary, including the consideration of the access to the ruins of Machu Picchu. The master plan should also address the issue of the proposed extension of the boundaries of the Sanctuary to incorporate adjacent habitat that is important to endangered species.

On the basis of this report, the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session will examine if the concerns about the state of conservation of the property persist and make the appropriate recommendations to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

V.40 Historic Centre of Santa Cruz de Mompox (Colombia)

The Bureau took note of the information on the fire that occurred in Mompox and the damage caused to six of its historic buildings. The Bureau noted that the Chairperson had approved emergency assistance for the restoration of the six damaged buildings, as well as technical co-operation for the purchase of fire-fighting equipment

and the training of a voluntary fire brigade. It urged the national and local authorities to take the necessary measures for fire-prevention and requested the Colombian authorities to keep the Committee informed on the measures taken in this respect as well as on the restoration works undertaken.

V.41 Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and the interventions made by the Delegates of Morocco and Lebanon addressing the importance of awareness-building of those responsible for religious properties in the Arab region and their good conservation. The Moroccan Delegate proposed a new version of the recommendation concerning this property.

Consequently, the Bureau encouraged the national authorities to present a strategy and a conservation programme of Historic Cairo, to the next session of the Committee. With regard to the Al-Azhar Mosque, the Bureau considered that this sanctuary is a major monument of Arab-Islamic civilisation and insisted on the importance to ensuring the use of appropriate techniques for its preservation. The Bureau requested the authorities to present a detailed technical report on the work in progress at the Al-Azhar Mosque before 15 September 1998, for submission to the World Heritage Committee. Finally, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to obtain the Egyptian authorities agreement to send a UNESCO mission to the various parties concerned to examine the most appropriate conservation measures for the Al-Azhar Mosque.

V.42 Churches of Lalibela (Ethiopia)

The Bureau thanked the civil and religious authorities of Ethiopia and the Delegation of the European Union for the support they have provided for the integrated preservation of the site of Lalibela. It noted the positive results of the mission organized by the World Heritage Centre which took place in February 1998, and requested that information on the implementation of the mission's recommendations be communicated to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session in December 1998.

The Bureau expressed the wish that the co-operation between Ethiopia, UNESCO and the European Union be strengthened through a systematic monitoring of the projects envisaged at Lalibela.

V.43 Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)

In response to the report provided by the Secretariat on the construction of a media library at the square of the Reims Cathedral, the Observer of France pointed out that French legislation for the protection of monuments provides for a protective zone of five hundred meters around classified monuments. She clarified that this zone can be considered the buffer zone and that any modification or new construction in this zone has to be object of approval by the Architect des Bâtiments de France or by the Minister of Culture himself. In the case of the media library, the building permit had been blocked awaiting consideration of this matter.

The Bureau noted that an ICOMOS mission to Reims was to be undertaken during the Bureau session and that its results would not be available during its session.

The Bureau took note of the action undertaken by the Centre and ICOMOS and of the information provided by the French Observer. The Bureau thanked the French authorities for their efforts to find a solution in conformity with the Convention. The

Bureau also requested the authorities concerned to undertake the elaboration of a management plan for the site and its protective zone. To this end, the Bureau requested the concerned authorities to present to the Centre a progress report on the work required by 15 September 1998 for submission to the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session. It also requested ICOMOS to present the findings of its mission at that time.

V.44 Roman Monuments, Cathedral and Liebfrauen Church in Trier (Germany)

The Bureau took note of the report provided by the German authorities and of the information provided by ICOMOS on the participation of its expert in a consultative meeting on the Roman amphitheatre that took place in February 1998. It was reported that the planned buildings north of the amphitheatre are now at an acceptable distance from the theatre and that their overall volume had been reduced considerably.

The Bureau expressed its satisfaction that the main requirements to protect the integrity and authenticity of the Roman amphitheatre had now been fulfilled by reaching a compromise solution between private interests on the one hand, and the interests of urbanists and archaeologists on the other. The Bureau stressed that the integration of the archaeological remains that were discovered during the recent excavations requires further attention and reiterated that an extension of the protected area to include the adjacent vineyards is highly desirable to avoid further deterioration of the site and its setting.

The Bureau requested the German authorities to submit a report with particular attention to the issues of the archaeological remains and the extension of the site by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

V.45 Sun Temple of Konarak (India)

The Bureau requested the Secretariat to assist the State Party, if necessary, to ensure that the report on the structural stability study on the Sun Temple of Konarak is ready in time for examination by the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

V.46 Tchoga Zanbil (Iran)

In view of the information provided by ICCROM and the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Government of Iran to keep the Secretariat informed on the progress of the Japanese Trust Fund project for the conservation and management of Tchoga Zanbil, especially in relation to the urgently required measurement of the moisture content of the ziggurat of Tchoga Zanbil. This information will enable a structural analysis to be made for its appropriate conservation. The Observer of Iran thanked the Japanese authorities, UNESCO and ICCROM for their efforts to identify the problems at the site and their contribution to its protection. He also expressed the willingness of his Government to co-operate.

V.47 Petra (Jordan)

After having taken note of information provided by the Secretariat, the Bureau warmly commended the Jordanian authorities effort to follow-up to the recommendation made by UNESCO in 1994. The Bureau also thanked UNESCO for the forthcoming transfer of a specialist to the UNESCO Office in Amman to provide technical co-operation on cultural heritage, mainly for Petra.

V.48 Quseir Amra (Jordan)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Jordanian authorities to reconsider the

proposed location of the Visitors' Centre because of its excessive visibility and proximity to the monument. Furthermore, the Bureau also requested the authorities to study the possibility of diverting the present road.

V.49 Anjar (Lebanon)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to follow-up with the Lebanese authorities on the recommendations of the report, mainly the removal of any military presence from the vicinity of the site.

V.50 Baalbek (Lebanon)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the Delegate of Lebanon, the Bureau commended the Lebanese authorities for the relocation of the construction of the planned technical school outside of the inscribed zone. Moreover, the Bureau noted that the ongoing works for the Centenary exhibition foreseen in November at the site are totally reversible. Furthermore, the restoration work of the Grand Mosque is controlled by the Directorate General of Antiquities. The Bureau also thanked the Lebanese authorities for having requested technical assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the scientific study of the state of the Bacchus temple and its preservation. The Bureau encouraged the authorities to continue the preparation of a management plan. Finally, the Bureau thanked the Resident Representative of the UNDP for his offer of co-operation to finance a project on the integration of World heritage in the regional development of the Bekaa, and requested the Centre to proceed with the formulation of a project.

V.51 Byblos (Lebanon)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau warmly commended the Lebanese authorities for their co-operation and their decision to change the location of the new harbour. The Bureau also thanked the Technical University of Delft for its contribution and requested the authorities to begin the preparation of a management plan for the site in accordance with the recommendations of the specialist mission of the University, thus preventing other uncontrolled development taking place within the perimeter of the property, and improving its protection and enhancement.

V.52 Tyr (Lebanon)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the information provided by the Delegate of Lebanon, the Bureau congratulated the Lebanese authorities for the official launch of the International Campaign of Tyre. The Bureau encouraged the Lebanese authorities to continue the Campaign in co-operation with UNESCO, and requested the Secretariat to promote it broadly. Finally, the Bureau urged the Lebanese authorities to immediately halt all works endangering the heritage of Tyre, to reinforce co-operation between the national institutions involved in the region of Tyr and to improve control mechanisms in order to prevent any additional destruction of the heritage of the region.

V.53 Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico)

The Bureau noted that the international assistance to Puebla had been concluded and that the National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH) in collaboration with the State Council for the Historical Centre of Puebla had prepared a *conservation plan and urban and architectural ordinance for the Paseo del Rio San Francisco in Puebla*. It requested the Mexican authorities to provide the Secretariat with the details of this plan for information.

The Bureau took note of the intervention of the Observer of Mexico who stated that the results of the expert meeting on Indicators for Measuring the state of conservation of Historical Cities (Colonia del Sacramento, March 1998) provided valuable elements for the identification of the different values of historical cities and would contribute to their understanding and proper planning in a case such as Puebla. He suggested that it would be opportune to further explore the practical application of the results of this meeting. He informed that the works in Puebla are now advancing satisfactorily.

V.54 Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico)

The Bureau took note of the report submitted by the Mexican National Institute for Anthropology and History (INAH) on the actions taken for the management and conservation of Teotihuacan and thanked the Mexican authorities for the positive response given to the recommendations made by the 1997 UNESCO expert mission.

V.55 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)

The Bureau expressed concern over the continued demolition of traditional buildings of architectural value and illegal new development within the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage site, despite the building control efforts made by His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the concerned local authorities. It requested that the Report of the Joint UNESCO/ICOMOS/Government of Nepal Mission be submitted to its members well in advance of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau to enable a careful examination of the progress made in building control and the programme of corrective measures. On the basis of this examination, the Bureau will then formulate a conclusive recommendation to enable the Committee to decide whether or not to inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It will also consider actions it may wish to take in regard to the programme of corrective measures, as well as on the pending nomination submitted by the State Party to inscribe Kokhana as an additional Monument Zone of the site.

V.56 Chavin (Archeological site) (Peru)

The Bureau took note of the information on the emergency situation at Chavin caused by the El Nino phenomenon and that the Chairperson had approved emergency assistance to take corrective measures at the site. It requested the Peruvian authorities to keep the Committee informed on the measures taken in this respect as well as on the impact of El Nino on the site. It also encouraged the authorities to plan for long-term preventive measures and the stabilization of the site in the context of a comprehensive management plan.

V.57 Central Zone of the Town of Angra do Heroismo in the Azores (Portugal)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had not received a response from the State Party to its request to provide information on the new development proposal for a marina in the Bay of Angra. The Director of the Cultural Heritage Division of UNESCO pointed out that a mission to the site was recently carried out by an expert, the Co-ordinator of the UNEP Action Plan for the Mediterranean, at the invitation of the Mayor and Municipality of Angra do Heroismo, who are responsible for the approval of the project. The expert has transmitted a report to the Secretariat.

ICOMOS informed the Bureau that the marina project that was initiated in 1995, was now under construction, but that it had been brought to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS only recently. ICOMOS expressed its serious concern

about the impact of the project on the World Heritage values of the Town as well as on the submarine heritage of the Bay, which is full of historic shipwrecks.

In addition to the construction of the marina, the reconstruction of the waterfront of the city is also taking place. ICOMOS expressed its concern that, as a result, many of the characteristic features of the waterfront are going to be destroyed.

The Bureau requested the Chairperson to send a letter to the Portuguese authorities expressing the serious concern of the Bureau about the new construction and requesting full information about the project by 15 September 1998. It also requested ICOMOS to undertake an assessment mission and to submit its findings to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

V.58 Historic Centre of Porto (Portugal)

The Bureau was not able to examine the eventual impact of infrastructural works in the River Douro on the World Heritage values of Porto, due to the lack of response from the State Party to enquiries made by the Secretariat.

The Bureau requested the State Party to submit detailed information and an assessment of the impact of the works on the World Heritage site by 15 September 1998 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session.

The Bureau urged States Parties to respond in due time to Secretariat's requests for information which would greatly facilitate the work of the Secretariat and the Bureau.

At a later stage during the examination of the state of conservation reports, the Observer of Portugal informed the Bureau that the works at the marina in Angra do Heroísmo had been interrupted until the 17th century shipwrecks have been recovered. The legislation adopted by the regional authorities specifically covered the protection of the historic site of Angra. On the Historic Centre of Porto, he informed the Bureau that there was indeed an infrastructural project but that no works were being undertaken yet and that, even so, these would not affect the values of the site. The Bureau took note of his intervention.

V.59 Burgos Cathedral (Spain)

The Bureau took note of the report presented by the Principal Director of the Culture Sector on the plans to enhance the site of the Fortress of Burgos. The Bureau expressed its satisfaction to the local authorities for the decision to re-study the project for the site of the Fortress, taking into account the authenticity of the cultural landscape and the adequate interpretation and presentation of the historical remains.

It recommended the authorities to undertake a complete and integral study (including aspects of landscaping, urbanism, architecture and archaeology) of the hill on which the Fortress is located, as it is one of the main elements of the cultural landscape of Burgos.

The Bureau requested the Spanish authorities to present a report on the plans for the hill and the Fortress by 15 September 1998 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session.

V.60 Alhambra, Generalife and Albaycin, Grenada (Spain)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and information provided by the Observer of Spain, the Bureau thanked the national, regional and local authorities for the efforts

undertaken and the results achieved in the conclusion of the matter concerning the new construction of the Rey Chico. The Bureau also commended the UNESCO Centre of Andalucia for the success of the seminar in revitalising the Albayzin and thanked those who contributed towards its convening and successful outcome. It finally thanked the Mayor's Office, the Junta of Andalusia and the religious and economic authorities for the work undertaken in the framework of the rehabilitation of the quarter, its encouragement of tourism and development of its artisans. However, the Bureau reminded the authorities of the need to apply the Convention and the Guidelines with regard to the management plan and the unicity of the site. Consequently, the Bureau forthwith requested the Spanish national authorities to establish without delay the Spain-UNESCO Scientific Committee and to convene it as soon as possible so that the measures necessary for the appropriate management of the site be identified and programmed.

V.61 Historic Walled Town of Cuenca (Spain)

After having noted the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau commended the authorities of Cuenca as well as those of the Castilla-La Mancha for the positive attitude that they adopted in favour of the appropriate protection and management of the site. The Bureau requested that the authorities present to the Secretariat, as soon as it is ready, a special plan for Cuenca, and requested the Secretariat to provide technical assistance to the Town of Cuenca to this end. The Bureau then thanked ICOMOS-Spain for the positive role they played in this matter.

V.62 Sacred City of Kandy (Sri Lanka)

The Bureau took note of the reports from ICOMOS, the Secretariat and the Permanent Delegation of Sri Lanka. The Bureau expressed its deep concern over the terrorist bombing in the Sacred City of Kandy, and requested the Secretariat to appeal to the international community to assist the State Party to complete restoration work. Furthermore, in light of the increasing conflicts which threaten heritage sites around the world, the Bureau strongly encouraged the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to keep abreast with new developments in the 1954 Hague Convention. The Bureau was informed that there is a diplomatic conference planned in 1999 to re-draft the *1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, which would protect cultural heritage at a non-international level. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report concerning the progress made in the restoration work undertaken, by 15 September 1998.

V.63 Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka)

ICOMOS will undertake a mission to these two sites, as well as to Kandy, in autumn of 1998, and will present a report at the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

V.64 Old City of Berne (Switzerland)

The Bureau took note of the final report on fire protection measures for the Old City of Berne and thanked the State Party for its effort in improving the fire protection measures at this World Heritage site.

V.65 Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau thanked the Syrian authorities for their efforts in addressing the issue of Tekiya Suleymaniah. It also requested the Syrian authorities to continue informing the Secretariat of the progress of the consolidation work. It finally requested the

Centre to continue this co-operation as requested by the authorities.

V.66 Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau recommended that the Secretariat provide support to the Syrian authorities to elaborate the necessary management and development plans and to ensure capacity-building training courses.

V.67 Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau on the European Union-funded project on the Feasibility Study for the Rehabilitation of the Areas of Balat and Fener of Fatih District, Istanbul executed by the World Heritage Centre. This study initially included the area of Zeyrek, renowned for the wooden buildings of the Ottoman period, which is part of Fatih District and one of the three districts of the historic centre of Istanbul that is protected under national law as a conservation area. The three districts contain monuments, sites or buffer zones of the World Heritage site.

It was reported that Zeyrek was excluded as a direct beneficiary of the EU-funded project focused on housing improvement of the poor inhabitants because the population had already abandoned it due to the dangerous conditions of the buildings in Zeyrek. The alarming state of conservation of the historic timber buildings of Zeyrek which are included in the inventory of monuments and sites under World Heritage protection, led to a reactive monitoring mission by ICOMOS in November 1997.

The EU-commissioned study completed in April 1998, enabled a general evaluation on the application of national cultural heritage protection laws in Fatih District. Initial conclusions indicated that part of the cause of the degradation of the historic buildings was due to the poverty of the inhabitants of these buildings compounded by the strict regulations which have led to the "freezing" of development and hence the degradation of the built environment and the eventual exodus of the inhabitants.

The Secretariat also reported that the European Parliament had already approved a budgetary appropriation of 3 million ECU for the national execution of this project. UNESCO expressed its wish to continue being involved in the operational phase of the project as a member of the scientific advisory group of the project so that the impact of this social development project in a World Heritage buffer zone could be monitored and reported to the Committee as required.

The Bureau was informed that this EU-funded project has already resulted in the establishment of a community advisory service by the Municipality of Fatih to enable dialogue between the inhabitants and the authorities on the improvement of housing and the urban environment. The Secretariat stressed the importance of this project which foresees, for the very first time, the investment of social housing funds of the Turkish Ministry of Housing into the rehabilitation of historic buildings, which has been to date, used only for the construction of new low-cost housing buildings. This could set a precedent that may lead to public and international development funds being made available to the rehabilitation of vernacular houses in other areas of Historic Istanbul and other historic cities in Turkey.

The Delegate of Lebanon questioned why the World Heritage Centre was implementing this EU-funded feasibility study, which was not specifically approved by the Committee and adds to the workload of the Centre. The Director of the Centre responded that it was within the function of the Centre as part of the UNESCO Secretariat and carried out under instructions from the

Director-General who attaches the greatest importance to this "up-stream" study. The Secretariat added that this study was the first entrusted to UNESCO for implementation that tangibly demonstrates the European Commission's response to UNESCO's promotion of the cultural dimension of development and to the "Humanize the City" appeal launched by the Director-General at the Habitat II City Summit Conference in 1996.

The Observer of Greece stated that the Committee should not be involved in buffer zone areas and should be concerned only with the core World Heritage site. The Secretariat stated that in Istanbul, as in many historic cities inscribed on the World Heritage List in the 1980s, the inventory of monuments and the exact delimitation of the World Heritage protected areas are unclear, but that in any case, the entire district of Fatih is protected under national law and constitutes a buffer zone. The Secretariat further noted that this feasibility study is an example of the mobilising role of UNESCO for international co-operation activities that bridge social development and heritage preservation in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention.

The Delegate of Benin raised his concern over the World Heritage emblem being used by the Centre in letterheads and in reports of projects since this may give the impression of the Committee's involvement or commitment. He also expressed concern about the European Commission or other entities making agreements that concern World Heritage. The Secretariat responded that this EC-UNESCO project was like other extrabudgetary projects being executed by UNESCO that are financed from the Japan Funds-in-Trust, the Italian Funds-in-Trust or UNDP among other donor sources, or activities under the International Safeguarding Campaigns that are for World Heritage sites but not financed through the World Heritage Fund.

The Observer of Thailand recalled the creation of the World Heritage Centre within UNESCO and underlined that all agreements concerning World Heritage sites should be approved by the Committee or its Chairperson. If the Director-General of UNESCO assigns functions to the Centre which are outside its scope of work, this would add to its workload and it would be preferable if this type of project would be assigned to the Division of Physical Heritage.

The Chairperson recalled that a decision was made in Merida at the twentieth session of the Committee that the Centre is not to sign any contracts or agreements that commit the World Heritage Committee and that such contracts are to be signed by the Committee Chairperson. The Secretariat stated that this project agreement with the European Commission does not commit the Committee in any way (N.B. the EC-UNESCO project agreement was signed by the Director of the Bureau for External Funding Relations (BER), on behalf of the Director-General). The purpose of the state of conservation report was to inform the Bureau of the alarming state of conservation of Zeyrek which is part of the World Heritage site and to provide information on innovative international aid activities that support World Heritage preservation. The Chairperson stated that he would look into the agreement(s) and/or contract(s) related to this project and would report back to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau, if necessary.

The Bureau took note of the report of the Secretariat on the study carried out jointly by UNESCO, the Fatih Municipality and the Institut Francais d'Etudes Anatoliennes under contract from the European Commission and supported the integrated community development approach in heritage preservation. The Bureau requested the Secretariat and the State Party to inform the Committee at its twenty-second session on the progress of the European Union project. The Bureau, furthermore, expressed its concern over the state of conservation of the historic buildings in

Zeyrek and requested the State Party to report on its conservation efforts.

**V.68 Itchan Kala (Uzbekistan)
Historic Centre of Bukhara(Uzbekistan)**

The Bureau took note of the report presented by ICOMOS and commended the State Party on the importance it has attached to restoration and rehabilitation projects at these two sites. The Bureau, however, expressed concern over the development projects within the two sites, and urged the State Party to give special attention to the upgrading of street surfacing and furniture in the vicinity of the major monuments, to the control over non-listed buildings in the historic centres, and in the case of Bukhara, to the clearance of blocked cisterns and channels so as to lower the water table.

V.69 Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)

The Bureau requested the State Party to reconsider its hotel-building policy and specific hotel projects in respect of their historical context. It requested the authorities to submit a report on this matter by 15 September 1998 for consideration by the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

V.70 Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom)

The Bureau expressed its satisfaction with the management and presentation proposals for the Stonehenge World Heritage site. It stressed, however, the need for the closure of the road passing close to the monument, foreseen when the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1986 and for the completion of a management plan with the minimum delay.

V.71 Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau invited the Yemeni authorities to prepare an overall management plan in collaboration with the Secretariat. The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to study the impact of the new sewerage project on the architecture and conservation of buildings of the city.

V.72 Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen)

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau invited the Yemeni authorities to prepare an overall management plan in collaboration with the Centre. The Bureau also requested the Centre to study the possibility of initiating a large-scale rehabilitation programme in co-operation with potential regional and international partners.

VI. REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY OF THE COMMITTEE

VI.1 The Chairperson recalled that at its twentieth session in December 1996, the Committee requested a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ending 31 December 1996 and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, the Committee established a Consultative Body "to take action on the proposal adopted by the Committee, to undertake a review of the way in which the World Heritage Centre has assisted the Committee in implementing the World Heritage Convention". He recalled that at its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee had requested that the Consultative Body examine four issues and present a report to the

twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical issues
2. Communications and Promotion
3. Management Review and Financial Audit
4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.

VI.2 The Consultative Body had asked Professor Francioni (Italy) to chair the Consultative Body in 1998. Members of the Consultative Body are Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, United States of America and Zimbabwe. The Chairperson referred to the work of the Consultative Body as having addressed complex issues in a cost-effective way. A meeting of the Consultative Body was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 29 and 30 April 1998. At the invitation of the Chairperson, representatives of Germany and Greece also attended, as did observers from Ecuador and Hungary and the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

VI.3 The Report of the Rapporteur of the meeting of the Consultative Body was adopted by the Consultative Body at its meeting on 24 June 1998 and was made available as Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr. Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4, an executive summary of the work of the Consultative Body prepared by the Centre at the request of the Chairperson, was withdrawn. Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11 included copies of all of the discussion papers that had been prepared by the members of the Consultative Body prior to their meeting in April. Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.9 provided the Report of the Amsterdam Meeting (Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25 to 29 March 1998, Theatre Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands).

VI.4 The Chairperson requested that the Bureau examine issues 1 to 4 above and asked those delegates who had prepared the preliminary discussion papers on each of the issues to summarise the main recommendations of the Consultative Body to the Bureau.

1. Technical Issues

VI.5 The Observer of Australia began by congratulating the Chairperson for having constantly encouraged the Consultative Body in its work. She referred to the discussion paper (section A of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11) she had prepared on a number of technical issues that had been identified during the twenty-first session of the Committee. The Observer of Australia acknowledged the contributions made by Malta, Zimbabwe, ICOMOS and Greece (section B of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11).

VI.6 The Observer of Australia summarised the technical issues under discussion as: (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi), (b) the test of authenticity, (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List, and (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

VI.7 Concerning the application of cultural heritage criterion (i), the Observer of Australia referred to the assessment by Mr Demicoli (Malta), that the application of the criterion needed to be more stringent in order to remove the emphasis on the monumental heritage. She then referred to the Amsterdam meeting as having concluded that a more holistic view of the World Heritage is required and that one set of criteria should be considered. The Bureau adopted the recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) which appears as paragraph 15 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr:

15. *With reference to a more stringent interpretation of cultural criterion (i), the Amsterdam Expert Meeting has set up a working group, chaired by Madam Bercé (France) to finalise the wording for a new set of criteria, to operationalize them, and to bring forward recommendations regarding this to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. It is suggested that Mr Demicoli's proposals on wording be referred to this group.*

VI.8 In addition, the Bureau adopted the following recommendations:

In light of the endorsement of the recommendations of the Amsterdam meeting of experts (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.9) by the Consultative Body, the Bureau recommends to the Committee that it endorse the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts.

The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre, in co-operation with the advisory bodies, to co-ordinate the preparation of draft revisions to the sections of the Operational Guidelines relating to the criteria, test of authenticity and conditions of integrity for submission to, and the final decision of, the twenty-second session of the Committee.

VI.9 The Observer of Australia then proceeded to outline the discussions of the Consultative Body on the Test of Authenticity. The Consultative Body had concluded that there should perhaps be a more stringent application of the Test of Authenticity to places where the fabric is the most important. This would rely upon the full examination by the Committee and ICOMOS. Further examination of what Authenticity means for living cultures was also considered to be required. She also referred to places, such as those referred to in the Nara Document on Authenticity, where part of the actual significance of the place derives from the process of continual rebuilding.

VI.10 The Observer of Greece suggested that further discussion on authenticity and up-to-date evaluation of the Venice Charter were required and offered to host a discussion on this topic in Greece. The Chairperson welcomed the Greek proposal and asked for the submission of a detailed plan. The Observer of Mexico also called for a further analysis of the concept of authenticity as it applies in different regions. ICOMOS stressed that it had made the decision in 1981 not to revise the Venice Charter and that the Nara Document on Authenticity represents a contribution to the updating of the interpretation of authenticity.

VI.11 The Delegate of Japan expressed her support for the Venice Charter. She noted that the Nara Document was designed to implement the Venice Charter to reflect the many expressions of culture and of heritage in the world. She urged ICOMOS to hold further meetings and to continue its work on the subject. In conclusion she emphasised that authenticity is a very important qualifying factor to judge the values of sites. ICCROM added support to these statements, and those of ICOMOS. He also referred to integrity as an important tool in the management of sites. It should be assessed at the time of inscription and then used as the fundamental basis by which to assess the integrity of a site over time.

VI.12 The recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the Test of Authenticity which appears as paragraph 21 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr. was adopted by the Bureau.

21. The Consultative Body concluded by asking that the text on criteria, including integrity and authenticity, prepared

as a result of the Amsterdam expert meeting be referred to the Bureau. The Delegate of Australia noted that the final contribution should refer to the papers submitted by Malta, Zimbabwe and Greece.

VI.13 The Observer of Australia reported that the Consultative Body had discussed the balance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy in detail. The main issue of discussion had been how to move faster in the implementation of the Global Strategy whilst maintaining the rights of States Parties. The Consultative Body had been encouraged by news of the results of the Global Strategy now emerging from Africa and the Pacific. The recommendations of the Consultative Body concerning the balance of the List and the Global Strategy which appear as paragraph 35 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr. were adopted by the Bureau.

35. Noting that it had, in general, endorsed the outcomes of the Amsterdam meeting of experts, the Consultative Body referred them to the Bureau.

The Consultative Body recommended that:

- in particular, in line with the discussions at the meeting of experts, that further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-represented on the World Heritage List. This work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage;*
- when considering ways of improving the balance and representativeness of the World Heritage List, the sovereign rights of the States Parties be fully respected and reference is made to Paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines.*
- the World Heritage Centre prepare a prioritised action plan to ensure an acceleration in the implementation of the Global Strategy. The action plan should include reference to (i) methods for communicating the objectives and regional and thematic approach of the Global Strategy to all States Parties, (ii) objectives to be set in relation to regions and sub-themes currently underrepresented in the World Heritage List, and (iii) ways of channelling and increasing resources available to States Parties to ensure the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties in the long term. The preparation of an action plan, which should be submitted to the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee, is in line with Paragraph 43 of the report of the 1997 Management Review.*

VI.14 In summary,

The Bureau asks the World Heritage Centre to prepare, in close co-operation with the Advisory Bodies, a prioritised action plan for the future implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and balanced World Heritage List, to be submitted for the approval of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

VI.15 IUCN supported this approach for the advisory bodies to work with the World Heritage Centre in preparing the prioritised action plan for the Global Strategy. IUCN welcomed the recognition by the Consultative Body of the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage and noted the increased co-operation between IUCN and ICOMOS as being a positive move towards

recognition of the nature-culture continuum that is at the heart of the World Heritage Convention.

VI.16 The Observer of the United Kingdom stated that the technical issues under discussion were crucial to the future of the Convention and congratulated the Consultative Body for their extremely good work. He also mentioned that it might be useful in the future if States Parties who are fully represented on the World Heritage List voluntarily slow down the pace of their nominations and provide assistance to those States Parties whose heritage is currently not well represented.

2. Communications and Promotion

VI.17 The Chairperson invited the Delegate of Canada to present the discussion paper on Communications and Promotion (item C of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11).

VI.18 The Delegate of Canada thanked the Mexican Delegation for their co-operation in preparing the discussion paper. She outlined the objectives of the paper as:

- (a) to focus on communication and promotion activities as they relate to the objectives of the Convention,
- (b) to examine the potential of a cost-recovery policy for World Heritage information products and, in view of that,
- (c) to consider the future allocation of funds for promotion activities and conservation work.

VI.19 The Delegate of Canada recalled that these points had been examined by the Auditor General, and recommended that the Committee guide the Centre:

- to develop adequate policies for quality control of information and publication products to protect the interests of States Parties,
- to ensure that its presentation and information activities are in harmony with activities undertaken by States Parties,
- to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.

VI.20 She stated that these issues were intimately linked with matters related to corporate funding but in so far as they are related to the use of the emblem and fund-raising, they need to be addressed in conjunction with the paper presented by the United States and Japan. The Delegate of Canada pointed out that the Convention does not foresee any promotional activity other than the publication of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, the latter for the specific purpose of raising funds to support efforts for their conservation. It was also recalled that the discussion paper did not consider information management at the World Heritage Centre which was considered under the Management and Financial Review. The Delegate of Canada then reiterated the three recommendations proposed and adopted by the Consultative Body. They were subsequently adopted by the Bureau.

52. Recommendation I

The World Heritage Committee should adopt a set of principles and guidelines for the future governance of the communications and promotion activities. While any individual, organization or enterprise is free to publish or produce products associated with World Heritage, any authorization to do so in formal association with UNESCO and use of the emblem is the prerogative of the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO and will therefore adhere to the following

principles and guidelines. These would apply to States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, the UNESCO Publishing Office and the UNESCO Office of Public Information.

Principles:

- *States Parties retain full control over the content of texts and images related to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories*
- *Quality of content takes precedence over the quantity of products*
- *Communications and promotion products respect the values and objectives of the Convention*
- *Priority is given to products of educational, cultural, scientific or artistic value*
- *Authorized products do not exploit or endanger World Heritage sites*
- *Revenues flowing from communications and promotion activities benefit World Heritage Sites or the World Heritage Fund in agreement with the relevant States Parties*

Guidelines:

- *Standard texts and images are updated regularly by States Parties and then disseminated by the World Heritage Centre on demand without further approval from States Parties*
- *Texts and images for World Heritage communications and promotional products are reviewed and approved in writing by States Parties, with respect to World Heritage Sites situated on their territories, before authorization is granted to use the emblem*
- *The choice of external partners to sponsor communications and promotional products follows annex 5 of the UNESCO Internal Guidelines and requires the States Parties' approval; doubtful cases are referred to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee*

Recommendation II

The World Heritage Committee should review and approve a strategic plan for communications and promotion activity, including target markets, anticipated reach, cost implications (including potential for cost recovery) and performance measures. Performance against this plan should be reviewed annually and adjustments made as required. The Committee should evaluate periodically the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.

Recommendation III

A Business Case for the quarterly World Heritage Review should be tabled for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee, since it has never received formal approval. The Business Case should include information on circulation, readership, quality, sustainability, cost (financial and staff time), policy on corporate sponsorship and options.

VI.21 With regard to Recommendation II, the Delegate of Canada recalled that the World Heritage Centre, had proposed a strategic plan during the 20th Session of the Committee held in Merida, Mexico and stated the need for the Committee to examine and adopt a strategy to guide the Secretariat. She noted that Recommendation III, regarding the business case for the

World Heritage Review, was particularly important since the Committee had never formally approved the launch of this publication. She stressed that what was requested was a business case as opposed to a business plan, as the latter connotes a tacit approval by the Committee of the Review's continuation.

VI.22 The Director of the World Heritage Centre reminded the Bureau that the World Heritage emblem was not protected in most countries and encouraged the States Parties to take the necessary measures to protect the use of the emblem in their country and the income flowing from its use. The Director also recalled that the Committee had discussed in previous sessions, the use of the UNESCO emblem in association with the World Heritage emblem as a means of protection since the use of the former is already protected. He however noted that tighter regulations for the use of the World Heritage emblem might lead to it no longer being used, with preference being given to the use of the UNESCO emblem alone. The Chairperson stated that that there was no legal obligation for the two emblems to be used together.

VI.23 The Observer of Australia stated that despite the practical difficulties inherent in the adoption of a policy requiring the clearance of texts and images by the States Parties concerned, this was necessary to avoid problems arising in the use of photos that ignore, for example, the sensitivities of indigenous peoples. The Delegate of Germany supported the need for quality control by citing the example of the Spanish-language publication with the World Heritage emblem that contains errors and is sold at the UNESCO bookshop. The Delegate of Lebanon recalled paragraph 36 of the Consultative Body Report (WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.) concerning cost-recovery and proposed that the Bureau focus on the quality of the products issued using the World Heritage emblem.

VI.24 The Delegate of Japan referred to the Italian Touring Club project which led the Centre to seek co-operation from the Japanese authorities to clear a text in Italian. Stating that this was not possible due to the language barrier, he pointed out that this case illustrates the need to entrust the responsibility of quality control to the Secretariat and called for flexibility. He also emphasised the popularity of World Heritage publications and other products in Japan noting that these were produced in Japanese and it would be difficult to expect the partners to have the texts translated into English or French for clearance by the States Parties concerned. The Chairperson responded by asking all States Parties to co-operate and endeavour to work together to find solutions and not to accept the dissemination of erroneous information about World Heritage sites.

VI.25 The Delegate of Benin asked for clarification regarding the term "rentabilit " used in Recommendation II in the French version, questioning how impact from education and information activities can be measured in financial terms. The Chairperson commented that this was due to a translation problem and it was decided that the word would be replaced by "analyse c ut efficacit " in French.

VI.26 The Chairperson asked the Bureau for approval of the following decisions submitted in writing by the United States of America and suggested that Japan add a proposal regarding the notion of flexibility if they so wished. The decisions below were approved by the Bureau.

1. *The Bureau endorses the principles and guidelines as enumerated in paragraph 52 of the Consultative Body Report (WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.) and recommends their adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session.*

2. *The Bureau instructs the Centre to prepare a strategic plan as referred to in the Consultative Body Report (paragraph 52 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.) for the future work on World Heritage communications and promotion activities for adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session. The plan should contain provisions for periodic review. The Bureau recommends that the Committee periodically evaluate the cost-effectiveness and impacts of its information and education activities.*
3. *The Bureau asks the Centre to prepare a business case as stated in the Consultative Body Report (paragraph 52 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.) for the World Heritage Review for submission to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.*

3. Management Review and Financial Audit

VI.27 The Chairperson recalled that the Consultative Body had examined the recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit with reference to a discussion paper prepared by France and Italy (Section D of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11). In presenting the conclusions of the Consultative Body, the Delegates of France and Italy drew the Bureau's particular attention to the recommendations concerning the Management Review in Paragraphs 78 to 90, and the Financial Audit in Paragraph 110 of the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.). The Delegate of the United States of America requested that paragraph 112 of the Report of the Rapporteur (WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.) entitled "Background" be removed, since it is a quotation from a background report and not a record of the discussion of the Consultative Body. Her request was not agreed to.

VI.28 During the discussion on this subject, the Chairperson emphasised the need to clarify and reduce the ambiguity concerning the different roles and the institutional context of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and of the different Sectors of UNESCO. The Director of the Centre responded by informing the Bureau that the Director-General of UNESCO was committed to ensuring that the Secretariat to the World Heritage Committee be both efficient and effective.

VI.29 On the subject of staffing of the Centre, and with specific reference to Paragraph 90 of the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.), the Observer of the United Kingdom asked that States Parties to the Convention be alerted to vacancies in the Centre so that they could help the Centre in a constructive fashion, for example, by seconding suitably qualified staff. The Director of the Centre replied by informing the Bureau that all vacant posts in the Centre had been filled and all have post descriptions. He reassured the Bureau that all vacancies in the Centre were announced according to the procedures established by UNESCO's Bureau of Personnel.

VI.30 The Bureau adopted the following recommendations:

1. The Bureau,

Having taken note of paragraphs 79 to 89 of the "Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee", adopted the following decision:

That a detailed document be prepared by the Director-General of UNESCO and made available to the Committee members before the end of October 1998. The report should specify:

- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention;*
- *the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialised sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage;*
- *the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre.*

The document will be submitted to the twenty-second session of the Committee, which will then formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly of the States Parties.

2. The Bureau,

Taking into account paragraph 90 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has recommended that:

UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre:

- *ensure that all the permanent posts of the Centre are clearly identified with a corresponding job description and qualifications required for employment, following a rigorous application of the Classification Standard. This document must be approved and made public.*
- *fill all the permanent posts.*

3. The Bureau,

Taking into account paragraphs 91 to 109 of the Report of the Consultative Body, has adopted the following:

Shares the view that ambiguities exist in the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the programmes and projects relevant to the 1972 Convention;

Reaffirms that this concern should form the subject of an urgent and scrupulous examination;

Recommends to the Director-General to clearly specify (in the report requested in Recommendation 1 above):

- *the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;*
- *the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.*

VI.31 Following the adoption of these recommendations, the Observer of Australia referred back to the opening session of the Bureau, at which time the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO had mentioned that the Director of the Centre might be retiring. She commented that, in general, the work of the Centre was excellent and, in the spirit of the Convention, brought together the protection of natural and cultural heritage. She expressed her hope that any review of the future of the Centre should not lead to a dilution or an absorption of the Centre by any other Sector of UNESCO as this would diminish the servicing of the Committee and the important linkages between the protection of natural and cultural values. She commented that it was important for States Parties to know about the replacement of the present excellent Director. These comments were endorsed by the Delegate of Lebanon.

VI.32 The Chairperson stated that he would, if requested, take up this question with the Director-General of UNESCO. He agreed that this was a delicate time and that it was important to stress the unicity of World Heritage.

VI.33 The Director of the Centre responded to the remarks of the Observer of Australia by attributing the success of the World Heritage Centre to his colleagues, who he then thanked for all their work. He assured the Bureau that the Director-General had prolonged his contract until next year and that he continued to be available to serve the Committee.

VI.34 The Delegate of the United States of America remarked that whilst the Culture Sector of UNESCO does a superb job of providing the Secretariat to UNESCO's Conventions for the protection of cultural heritage, the United States of America sees that the World Heritage Convention is qualitatively different as it is affirmative rather than prescriptive. Furthermore it addresses the rapidly emerging unity of the cultural and natural heritage. He expressed the view that the World Heritage Convention is one of the finest international conventions and that it has significantly contributed to the continued existence of the natural environment in a healthy state. He referred to the Centre as being innovative and successful as a central point in the implementation of the Convention.

VI.35 The Representative of IUCN commented on personnel changes in IUCN's support to the Convention, and said that as from August 1998, Dr Jim Thorsell was taking voluntary severance from his full-time professional role in the IUCN Secretariat but that his expert contribution to World Heritage would continue on a part-time contractual basis. IUCN's World Heritage input will be co-ordinated through David Sheppard as the Head of its Programme on Protected Areas.

4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines

VI.36 The Chairperson invited the Delegations of Japan and the United States of America to present the discussion paper on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising (items E and F of the Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.11).

VI.37 The Delegate of Japan presented an overview of the paper on the use of the emblem outlining its three major points:

1. Guidelines for the use of the Emblem
2. Guiding principles for authorisation of the use of the Emblem
3. Authorisation procedure for the use of the Emblem

VI.38 The Delegate of Japan then gave a presentation of the fund-raising guidelines outlining the three major chapters as follows:

1. Proposed procedures for authorisation – defining the current framework of the Convention in which fund-raising was not foreseen, recommending that the UNESCO internal Fund-raising Guidelines be adapted to World Heritage needs.
2. Procedures for External Funding and Fund-raising under the "Guidelines" – recommending to use articles 4 and 5 of the UNESCO internal document to select potential partners and recommending that a request form, to be filled in by the potential partner, be devised as well as an explanatory booklet destined for potential partners to give them information on the procedure and other formalities.
3. Issues suggested to the Consultative Body: a suggestion was made during the meeting of the Consultative Body to delete the a portion of paragraph (8) of the issues suggested to the Consultative Body as follows:

From the financial perspective, the Centre's use of alternative mechanisms, such as regionalization through the possible creation of local or regional "satellite"

heritage site offices, delegation of implementation projects to UNESCO field offices, and contracting out, as well as more straightforward private and public partnerships, are sources of external funding support that need to be evaluated, aside from the issues of policy and their cost-effectiveness.

VI.39 The Delegate of Japan concluded by requesting the Bureau to support the discussion paper and authorise the Guidelines to be amended before the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau in Kyoto as stated in paragraph 138 of the Consultative Body Report of the Rapporteur (WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr.).

VI.40 The Delegate of the United States of America noted that it was not necessary to add anything to the Japanese presentation. The Delegate also invited the members of the Bureau to forward proposals for amendments to the Guidelines on the use of the emblem and fund-raising before they are finalised for the next Bureau meeting. The Observer of the United Kingdom asked whether the Guidelines would inform States Parties about the procedures to protect the World Heritage Emblem in their own countries.

VI.41 The Chairperson proposed that a second recommendation be drafted asking the United States of America and Canada, who have already taken measures to protect the Emblem, to supply a legislative text as an Information Document for the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session. The Bureau adopted the following recommendation:

The Bureau asked the United States of America and Canada, who have already taken measures to protect the Emblem, to supply a legislative text as an information document for the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session.

VI.42 Finally, the recommendation of the Consultative Body concerning the use of the emblem and fund raising which appears as paragraph 138 of WHC-98/CONF.201/4Corr. was adopted by the Bureau.

138 *Whilst the guidelines concerning the use of the emblem, quality control and Fund Raising were endorsed in-principle, the Delegates of Japan and the United States of America proposed to amend them, in co-operation with the Centre, to reflect the decisions reached in the discussions. The amended guidelines will be prepared for the twenty-second extraordinary session of the World Heritage Bureau prior to submission to the Committee.*

VII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

NATURAL HERITAGE

VII.1 The Secretariat informed the Bureau that one natural property was withdrawn by the States Party: The Palace Cave (No.878) from Uruguay.

VII.2 The Bureau examined four new natural nominations and one mixed property received for review by IUCN. IUCN informed the Bureau that for climatic reasons access to three nominated sites in the Russian Federation (Bashkirian Ural (No. 879), Vodlozero National Park (No. 767), Golden Mountains of Altai (No. 768 Rev.)) was not possible prior to the Bureau session. The Bureau noted that these properties would be presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998.

VII.3 Upon completion of the agenda item on nominations, the Delegate of Italy expressed her concern with regard to the evaluation document presented by IUCN (The full statement is attached as Annex IX). She stated that out of the eight nominations submitted to IUCN, only three evaluations were transmitted to the Bureau members prior to the meeting. The Delegates of Morocco and the United States supported the statement. In response, the Representative of IUCN indicated that nine dossiers had been transmitted to IUCN, of which six had been concluded at the time of the Bureau meeting and that for three sites climatic conditions have led to a delay in the field missions. The Chairperson concluded that ways and means should be sought to complete the evaluation document for timely transmission to the Bureau members.

A. Property which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands
Id. N °	877
State Party	New Zealand
Criteria	N (ii)(iv)

The site consists of five island groups (the Snares, Bounty Islands, Antipodes Islands, Auckland Islands, and Campbell Island) in the Southern Ocean south-east of New Zealand. The islands, lying between the Antarctic and Sub-tropical Convergences, and the seas have a high level of productivity, bio-diversity, wildlife population densities, and endemism among birds, plants and invertebrates. The bird and plant life, especially endemic albatrosses, cormorants, land birds and "megaherbs" are unique to these islands and are clearly of outstanding universal value under criterion (iv). Under criterion (ii) the islands display a pattern of immigration of species, diversifications and emergent endemism. Several evolutionary processes such as the development of loss of flight in both birds and invertebrates offer particularly good opportunities for research into the dynamics of island ecology. Human impacts are confined to the effects of introduced species at Auckland and Campbell islands but their ongoing eradication is leading to a recovery of native vegetation allowing evolutionary processes to continue.

The Bureau recommended that the Committee inscribe the New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands nomination under criteria (ii) and (iv). The Bureau commended the State Party for submitting a model nomination but at the same time expressed its concern over the integrity of the marine area and the conservation of the

marine resources. The Bureau noted the need for co-operation with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) in elaborating strategies for strengthening the protection of the marine environment (especially regarding fishery by-catch). It recalled that the Committee at its twenty-first session had encouraged the Australian authorities to consider for the future a re-nomination of Macquarie Island with the Sub-Antarctic Islands of New Zealand as one single Sub-Antarctic site. It invited both States Parties to continue to liaise on this possibility.

B. Properties for which the nomination was referred back to the State Party

Property	The Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and Dobsinska Ice Cave
Id. N°	858
State Party	Slovak Republic
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and the Dobsinska Ice Cave are part of an extensive karst plateau with numerous deep ravines, waterfalls, surface karst phenomena and caves containing speleothems and ice. The natural values of the Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and the Dobsinska Ice Cave are considered to be of national and regional significance. The current nomination thus does not meet World Heritage criteria.

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party and asked the Slovak authorities to consider incorporating the Dobsinska Ice Cave portion into the nearby site of the Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst, already recognised as a World Heritage site, shared by the Slovak Republic and Hungary.

The Observer of the Slovak Republic agreed that criterion (iv) is not met, and stressed a positive justification of The Ravines of the Slovak Paradise and Dobsinska Ice Cave, as considered by the experts' evaluation report. At the same time, he submitted to the Bureau a favourable recommendation given by the former long-standing Vice-President of the International Union of Speleology. The Observer also stated that the proposed recommendations are not entirely corresponding to the experts' appraisal.

Property	East Rennell
Id. N°	854
State Party	Solomon Islands
Criteria	N (ii)

East Rennell is part of Rennell Island, the southernmost of the Solomon Islands group. Rennell, the largest raised coral atoll in the world, is 86km long and 15 km wide and covers an area of 87,500ha. A major feature is Lake Tegano which was the former lagoon on the atoll and is the largest lake in the insular Pacific (15,500ha). Rennell is mostly covered with dense forest with a canopy averaging 20m in height.

East Rennell is of outstanding universal value under natural criterion (ii), demonstrating significant on-going ecological and biological processes and is an important site for the science of island bio-geography. These processes relate to the role of East Rennell as a stepping-stone in the migration and evolution of species in the western Pacific and for speciation processes underway, especially with respect to the avifauna. Combined with the strong climatic effects of frequent cyclones, the site is a true natural laboratory for scientific study. IUCN informed the Bureau that the protection and the management of the site are based on customary land tenure and community consensus and

objectives and practices do not yet exist in written form. However, a draft national World Heritage Protection Bill exists and the national Government could take steps to introduce it for adoption and implementation. At the site level the local Management and Conservation Committee (MCC) has started a consultative process intended to produce written management principles and practices.

The Bureau took note of the draft national World Heritage Protection Bill and that customary ownership patterns are in place. Several Bureau members stated that well-established contractual or traditional protection and adequate management regimes have been acceptable for cultural sites (Operational Guidelines 24 (ii)b including cultural landscape categories), but that these do not apply to natural heritage. A number of delegates emphasised that the recent Global Strategy Meeting in Amsterdam (March 1998), which was presented to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-98/Conf.201/INF.9, suggested changes to harmonise the Operational Guidelines on this topic.

The Bureau noted that the East Rennell nomination breaks new ground in terms of nominating a natural site under customary land ownership. The site meets natural criterion (ii), but does not meet the current Conditions of Integrity for natural heritage. The Bureau invited the State Party to also consider cultural values of the site for a possible nomination under the cultural landscape categories (para. 39 of the Operational Guidelines). The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party and requested it to submit a report on the process of the local Management and Conservation Committee (MCC) to prepare a resources management plan for the site and for further information on actions on the proposed national World Heritage Protection Bill in time for the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

MIXED PROPERTY

Property for which the nomination was referred back to the State Party

Property	The Cilento and Vallo di Diano National Park
Id. N°	842
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)

The Bureau noted that the site is characterised by mountains, valleys and coast with a succession of cliffs, promontories, valleys and beaches. Karst features include over 400 caves in the limestone mountains and caves and natural arches along the coast. The site is heavily populated and environmentally modified. The natural values of the National Park of Cilento are considered to be of national and regional significance but are not of outstanding universal value.

Concerning cultural values, the Bureau decided that this nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting further information on the draft management plan and a revised delineation of the area proposed for inscription, to include the Certosa di Padula and Teggiano. In the event of this information being supplied and found acceptable, ICOMOS recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (iii): During the prehistoric period, and again in the Middle Ages, the Cilento region served as a key route for cultural, political, and commercial communications in an exceptional manner, utilizing the crests of the mountain chains running east-west and

thereby creating a cultural landscape of outstanding significance and quality.

Criterion (iv): In two key episodes in the development of human societies in the Mediterranean region, the Cilento area provided the only viable means of communication between the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian Seas, in the central Mediterranean region, and this is vividly illustrated by the relict cultural landscape of today.

ICOMOS reported that the additional information requested had been received during the present meeting and that insufficient time had been available to study it. ICOMOS would therefore present a report at the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

VII.4 The Bureau took note of the letter sent by the Czech Republic informing that the State Party has withdrawn the nomination of The Honorary Holy Trinity Column and the Complex of Baroque Fountains in the Historic Core of the City of Olomouc.

A. Properties which the Bureau recommended for inscription on the World Heritage List

Property	Flemish Béguinages
Id. N°	855
State Party	Belgium
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)(iv)

Error! Bookmark not defined.

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): The Flemish *béguinages* demonstrate outstanding physical characteristics of urban and rural planning and a combination of religious and traditional architecture in styles specific to the Flemish cultural region.

Criterion (iii): The *béguinages* bear exceptional witness to the cultural tradition of independent religious women in north-western Europe in the Middle Ages.

Criterion (iv): The *béguinages* constitute an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble associated with a religious movement characteristic of the Middle Ages associating both secular and conventual values.

Property	The Four Lifts on the Canal du Centre and their Environs, La Louvière and Le Roeulx (Hainault)
Id. N°	856
State Party	Belgium
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (iii): The boat-lifts of the Canal du Centre bear remarkable testimony to the hydraulic engineering developments of 19th-century Europe.

Criterion (iv): These boat-lifts represent the apogee of the application of engineering technology to the construction of canals.

Property	Choirokoitia
Id. N°	848
State Party	Cyprus
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (iii): Choirokoitia is an exceptionally well preserved archaeological site that has provided, and will continue to provide, scientific data of great importance relating to the spread of civilisation from Asia to the Mediterranean world.

Criterion (iv): Both the excavated remains and the untouched part of Choirokoitia demonstrate clearly the origins of proto-urban settlement in the Mediterranean region and beyond.

Property	The Gardens and Castle at Kromeríz
Id. N°	860
State Party	Czech Republic
Criteria	N (ii)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): The ensemble at Kromeríz, and in particular the Pleasure Garden, played a significant role in the development of Baroque garden and palace design in central Europe.

Criterion (iv): The Gardens and Castle at Kromeríz are an exceptionally complete and well preserved example of a princely residence and its associated landscape of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Property	The Routes of Santiago de Compostela in France
Id. N°	868
State Party	France
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)(vi)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi)*:

Criterion (ii): The Pilgrimage Route of Santiago de Compostela played a key role in religious and cultural exchange and development during the later Middle Ages, and this is admirably illustrated by the carefully selected monuments on the routes followed by pilgrims in France.

Criterion (iv): The spiritual and physical needs of pilgrims travelling to Santiago de Compostela were met by the development of a number of specialised types of edifice, many of which originated or were further developed on the French sections.

Criterion (vi): The Pilgrimage Route of Santiago de Compostela bears exceptional witness to the power and influence of Christian faith among people of all classes and countries in Europe during the Middle Ages.

Property	The Historic Site of Lyon
Id. N°	872
State Party	France
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)(vi)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): Lyon bears exceptional testimony to the continuity of urban settlement over more than two millennia on

a site of great commercial and strategic significance, where cultural traditions from many parts of Europe have come together to create a coherent and vigorous continuing community.

Criterion (iv): By virtue of the special way in which it has developed spatially, Lyon illustrates in an exceptional way the progress and evolution of architectural design and town planning over many centuries.

The Observer of Finland stated that although Lyon undoubtedly possesses architectural values, it lacks a coherent and homogeneous urban structure. He therefore questioned the outstanding universal value of the site.

Property	The Archaeological Area and the Patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia
Id. N°	825
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)(vi)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi)*:

Criterion (iii): Aquileia was one of the largest and most wealthy cities of the Early Roman Empire.

Criterion (iv): By virtue of the fact that most of ancient Aquileia survives intact and unexcavated, it is the most complete example of an Early Roman city in the Mediterranean world.

Criterion (vi): The Patriarchal Basilican Complex in Aquileia played a decisive role in the spread of Christianity into central Europe in the early Middle Ages.

Property	Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara
Id. N°	870
State Party	Japan
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): The historic monuments of ancient Nara bear exceptional witness to the evolution of Japanese architecture and art as a result of cultural links with China and Korea which were to have a profound influence on future developments.

Criterion (iii): The Nara Palace archaeological site bears exceptional testimony to the high level of culture of Japan at a critical period in its history.

Criterion (iv): The 8th century Nara Period was a crucial one in Japanese history and culture, when it took a significantly new direction, and this is reflected in the historic monuments of Nara.

Property	The Archaeological Zone of Paquimé, Casas Grande
Id. N°	560rev
State Party	Mexico
Criteria	C (iii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (iii): Paquimé Casas Grandes bears eloquent and abundant testimony to an important element in the cultural

evolution of North America, and in particular to prehispanic commercial and cultural links.

Criterion (iv): The extensive remains of the archaeological site of Paquimé Casas Grandes provide exceptional evidence of the development of adobe architecture in North America, and in particular of the blending of this with the more advanced techniques of Mesoamerica.

Property	Ir.D.F. Woudagemaal (D.F. Wouda Steam Pumping Station)
Id. N°	867
State Party	The Netherlands
Criteria	C (i)(ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iv)*:

Criterion (i): The advent of steam as a source of energy provided the Dutch engineers with a powerful tool in their millennial task of water management, and the Wouda installation is the largest of its type ever built.

Criterion (ii): The Wouda Pumping Station represents the apogee of Dutch hydraulic engineering, which has provided the models and set the standards for the whole world for centuries.

Criterion (iv): The Wouda pumping installations bear exceptional witness to the power of steam in controlling the forces of nature, especially as applied to water handling by Dutch engineers.

Property	National Monument of the Côa River Valley Archaeological sites
Id. N°	866
State Party	Portugal
Criteria	C (i)(iii)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List, subject to the State Party agreeing to the proposed renaming of the nominated property, on the basis of *criteria (i) and (iii)*:

Criterion (i): The Upper Palaeolithic rock-art of the Côa valley is an outstanding example of the sudden flowering of creative genius at the dawn of human cultural development.

Criterion (iii): The Côa Valley rock art throws light on the social, economic, and spiritual life on the life of the early ancestor of humankind in a wholly exceptional manner.

The Observer of Portugal agreed that the site should be renamed: **“Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley”**. The Observer of Australia stated that she had visited the Côa Valley and had been very impressed by the efforts made by the State Party in the protection and management of the site. The Bureau congratulated the State Party on its actions in respect of this important cultural property.

The Observer of Portugal also mentioned that the Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia and the Portuguese National Commission for UNESCO are planning to organise an International Symposium on Conservation and Management of World Heritage Rock Art Sites in early spring 1999.

Property	Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula
Id. N°	874
State Party	Spain
Criteria	C (iii)

The Bureau took note of the additional information provided by ICOMOS, notably that the comparative study on the rock art sites had been completed and the site in question, one of the most renowned, was very favourably evaluated. The Bureau considered that an inscription of a part of the property rather than the ensemble would have a negative impact on its qualities and recommended that the Committee inscribe it on the basis of criterion (iii).

Criterion (iii): The corpus of late prehistoric mural paintings in the Mediterranean basin of eastern Spain is the largest group of rock-art sites anywhere in Europe and provides an exceptional picture of human life in a seminal period of human cultural evolution.

Property	The University and Historic Precinct of Alcalá de Henares
Id. N°	876
State Party	Spain
Criteria	C (iii)

The Bureau recommended to the Committee the inscription of this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi), recalling in particular that one of the giants of world literature, Miguel de Cervantes, author of the immortal *Don Quixote*, was born in Alcalá de Henares.

Criterion (ii): Alcalá de Henares was the first city to be designed and built solely as the seat of a university, and was to serve as the model for other centres of learning in Europe and the Americas.

Criterion (iv): The concept of the ideal city, the City of God (*Civitas Dei*), was first given material expression in Alcalá de Henares, from where it was widely diffused throughout the world.

Criterion (vi): The contribution of Alcalá de Henares to the intellectual development of humankind finds expression in its materialization of the *Civitas Dei*, in the advances in linguistics that took place there, not least in the definition of the Spanish language, and through the work of its great son, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra and his masterpiece, *Don Quixote*.

Property	The Naval Port of Karlskrona
Id. N°	871
State Party	Sweden
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): Karlskrona is an exceptionally well preserved example of a European planned naval town, which incorporates elements derived from earlier establishments in other countries and which was in its turn to serve as the model for subsequent towns with similar functions.

Criterion (iv): Naval bases played an important role in the centuries during which naval power was a determining factor in European *Realpolitik*, and Karlskrona is the best preserved and most complete of those that survive.

B. Property which the Bureau did not recommend for inscription

Property	The Medieval Town of Provins
Id. N°	873
State Party	France
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended the Committee not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List.

The Bureau noted that the site is not of outstanding universal value, but it does, however, possess European significance.

C. Properties for which the nominations were referred back to the State Party

Property	La Grand-Place, Brussels
Id. N°	857
State Party	Belgium
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be *referred back to the State Party, requesting the redefinition of the buffer zone as proposed by ICOMOS*. In the event of the revised buffer zone being submitted by 1 October 1998 and positively evaluated by ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): The Grand-Place is an outstanding example of the eclectic and highly successful blending of architectural and artistic styles that characterizes the culture and society of the Low Countries.

Criterion (iv): Through the nature and quality of its architecture and of its outstanding quality as a public open space, the Grand-Place illustrates in an exceptional way the evolution and achievements of a highly successful mercantile city of northern Europe at the height of its prosperity.

Property	The imperial capital of Tiwanaku
Id. N°	567rev
State Party	Bolivia
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to enable it to provide additional information relating to the protection and management of the site. If this information would be provided before 1 October 1998, ICOMOS would be able to present a revised evaluation and recommendation to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Property	El Fuerte de Samaipata
Id. N°	883
State Party	Bolivia
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)

Error! Bookmark not defined.

The Bureau decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party, requesting a redefinition of the buffer zone by 1 October 1998 as proposed in the ICOMOS evaluation. In the event of this modification being implemented and positively evaluated by ICOMOS, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

Criterion (ii): The sculptured rock at Samaipata is the dominant ceremonial feature of an urban settlement that represents the apogee of this form of prehispanic religious and political centre.

Criterion (iii): Samaipata bears outstanding witness to the existence in this Andean region of a culture with highly developed religious traditions, illustrated dramatically in the form of immense rock sculptures

The Observer of Bolivia informed the Bureau that an extension of the protected area has been undertaken and will be confirmed in due time with the submission of the relevant documentation.

Property	The Summer Palace, an Imperial Garden in Beijing
Id. N°	880
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i)(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting information on the extension of the buffer zone proposed by ICOMOS, to be provided by 1 October 1998. In the event that the information is provided and judged satisfactory, the Bureau recommended the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), (iii)*.

Criterion (i): The Summer Palace in Beijing is an outstanding expression of the creative art of Chinese landscape garden design, incorporating the works of humankind and nature in a harmonious whole.

Criterion (ii): The Summer Palace epitomises the philosophy and practice of Chinese garden design, which played a key role in the development of this cultural form throughout the east.

Criterion (iii): The imperial Chinese garden, illustrated by the Summer Palace, is a potent symbol of one of the major world civilisations.

Property	The Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing
Id. N°	881
State Party	China
Criteria	C (i)(ii)(iii)

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting information on the extension of the buffer zone proposed by ICOMOS, to be provided by 1 October 1998. In the event that the information is provided and judged satisfactory, the Bureau recommended the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), (iii)*.

Criterion (i): The Temple of Heaven is a masterpiece of architecture and landscape design which simply and graphically illustrates a cosmogony of great importance for the evolution of one of the world's great civilisations.

Criterion (ii): The symbolic layout and design of the Temple of Heaven had a profound influence on architecture and planning in the Far East over many centuries.

Criterion (iii): For more than two thousand years China was ruled by a series of feudal dynasties, the legitimacy of which is symbolised by the design and layout of the Temple of Heaven.

Property	Holasovicé Historical Village Reservation
Id. N°	861
State Party	Czech Republic
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, requesting additional information on the authenticity and current usage of the site by 1 October 1998.

Property	The Historic Centre of Urbino
Id. N°	828
State Party	Italy
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau recommended that this nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting: (a) information on any urban plan(s) that may be in force; (b) further information on conservation and restoration projects since the end of World War II, and (c) a redefinition of the buffer zone, as proposed by ICOMOS. In the event of this information being made available by 1 October 1998 and found acceptable under the terms of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): During its short cultural pre-eminence, Urbino attracted some of the most outstanding humanist scholars and artists of the Renaissance, who created there an exceptional urban complex of remarkable homogeneity, the influence of which carried far into the rest of Europe.

Criterion (iv): Urbino represents a pinnacle of Renaissance art and architecture, harmoniously adapted to its physical site and to its medieval precursor in an exceptional manner.

ICOMOS reported that the additional information requested had been received during the present meeting and that insufficient time had been available to study it. ICOMOS would therefore present a report at the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November.

Property	Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab)
Id. N°	850
State Party	Lebanon
Criteria	

The Bureau noted that the Qadisha Valley and the remnant Cedar Forest on the western flank of Mount Lebanon form a cultural landscape of outstanding universal value. Several Bureau members noted the need for a management and conservation plan for the site.

The Bureau decided that further consideration of this nomination be *referred* to await the submission of an overall management and conservation plan for the monastic sites and monuments of the Qadisha Valley and for the Cedar Forest (including the establishment of a commission to coordinate the activities of the different owners and agencies involved and the definition of an effective buffer zone). The Bureau furthermore noted that a comparative study of early Christian monastic settlements in the Near East would be useful.

	The Historic Monuments Zone of Tlacotal
Id. N°	862
	Mexico
Criteria	C (ii)(iv)

The Bureau decided to refer this nomination back to the State Party for adjustment of the buffer zone as proposed by ICOMOS. In the event of a new delimitation being received by 1 October 1998, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

Criterion (ii): The urban layout and architecture of Tlacotalpan represent a fusion of Spanish and Caribbean traditions of exceptional importance and quality.

Criterion (iv): Tlacotalpan is a Spanish colonial river port on the Gulf coast of Mexico which has preserved its original urban fabric to an exceptional degree. Its outstanding character lies in its townscape of wide streets, modest houses in an exuberant variety of styles and colours, and many mature trees in public and private open spaces.

Property	The Early Medieval Architectural Complex and Town of Panauti
Id. N°	869
State Party	Nepal
Criteria	

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, and that the documentation requested in the letter of 21 July 1997 from the World Heritage Centre be provided by 1 October 1998: information on the gazetting of the Monument Zone to protect the core area of Panauti under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, the legal document defining the buffer zone as a Conservation Area under the Municipalities Act, and the site management plan.

Property	Historical Part of the City of Oviedo (Extension of the Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias)
Id. N°	312bis
State Party	Spain
Criteria	

The Bureau took note of the evaluation of this property by ICOMOS and of its recommendation. Following interventions by members of the Bureau, it was decided to *refer back* this nomination to the State Party and requested that it be revised and renamed "The Churches of Oviedo and of the Kingdom of the Asturias". This property would include the Camara Santa, the San Julian de los Prados Basilica as well as the Foncalada. The Observer of Spain thanked the Bureau and ICOMOS for their recommendation and insisted on the importance, as a public building, of the Foncalada, church and hydraulic structure dating from the Middle Ages.

Property	Truva/Troia/Troy
Id. N°	849
State Party	Turkey
Criteria	C (ii)(iii)(vi)

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting precise cartographic information regarding the area proposed for inscription and that proposed as a buffer zone. It was also decided to consider the possibility of applying *criteria (i)* as pointed out by the Observer of Greece. In

the event of this information being provided by 1 October 1998 and found acceptable, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii)*, *(iii)*, and *(vi)* and possibly *(i)*:

The archaeological site of Troy is of immense significance in the understanding of the development of European civilisation at a critical stage in its early development. It is, moreover, of exceptional cultural importance because of the profound influence of Homer's *Iliad* on the creative arts over more than two millennia.

The Observer of Germany wished to know what measures were being taken by the Turkish authorities to protect the site now that the surrounding area had lost its status as a military zone.

Property	L'viv - The Ensemble of the Historic Centre
Id. N°	865
State Party	Ukraine
Criteria	C (ii)(v)

The Bureau recommended that the nomination be *referred back* to the State Party, requesting confirmation that the conservation programme had been approved and that the redundant mast and antenna were to be removed, and also that the modifications to the area proposed for inscription by ICOMOS had been accepted. In the event of this information being received by 1 October 1998, the Bureau recommended that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (v)*:

Criterion (ii): In its urban fabric and its architecture, L'viv is an outstanding example of the fusion of the architectural and artistic traditions of Eastern Europe with those of Italy and Germany.

Criterion (v): The political and commercial role of L'viv attracted to it a number of ethnic groups with different cultural and religious traditions, who established separate yet interdependent communities within the city, evidence for which is still discernible in the modern townscape.

D. Nominations to be considered by the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau

Property	Classical Weimar
Id. N°	846
State Party	Germany
Criteria	

ICOMOS had recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The State Party requested in writing the Chairperson to postpone the discussion on this site until the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998.

Property	Cultural Stratification in the Historic Centre of the City of Pecs
Id. N°	853
State Party	Hungary
Criteria	

ICOMOS had recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The State Party requested in writing the Chairperson to postpone the discussion on this site until the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998.

Property	Gdansk : The Main Town, the Motlava Side Channel, and the Vistula Mouth Fortress
Id. N°	882
State Party	Poland
Criteria	

ICOMOS had recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The State Party requested in writing the Chairperson to postpone the discussion on this site until the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998.

Property	The Archaeological Ensemble of Tárraco
Id. N°	875
State Party	Spain
Criteria	

ICOMOS had recommended that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The State Party requested in writing the Chairperson to postpone the discussion on this site until the extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 1998.

VIII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

VIII.1 The Bureau examined eight requests for international assistance presented in working Documents WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev., WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev.Add. and WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev.Add.1, and made the following decisions.

NATURAL HERITAGE

Dominica (Technical Co-operation for the Morne Trois Pitons National Park inscription ceremony and Regional Conference on the World Heritage Convention)

The Bureau approved US\$ 30,000 for the organization of this regional conference.

United Republic of Tanzania (Technical Co-operation for a Natural Heritage Workshop for “Kilimanjaro Stakeholders”)

The Bureau approved US\$ 30,000, subject to the Tanzanian authorities providing information concerning other organizations contributing to the activity and confirming the exact dates of the Workshop.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Bulgaria (Technical Co-operation for the purchase of dehumidifying equipment for the Boyana Church)

The Bureau approved up to US\$ 25,000 for this request on the condition that the UNESCO Purchasing Unit assist the State Party in purchasing the necessary equipment. ICOMOS underlined the alarming situation at the Boyana Church site and the fact that no conservation work could proceed without the initial installation of the environment controlling equipment. ICOMOS reiterated its support for this international assistance request.

Colombia (Technical Co-operation for the conservation of the National Archaeological Park of Tierradentro)

The Bureau approved US\$ 30,000 for the structural conservation of the burial chambers at this site. ICOMOS reiterated its support for this activity, considering the alarming state of conservation of this World Heritage site.

Syrian Arab Republic (Technical Co-operation for the restoration and conservation of the Roman Baths in the south of the Ancient City of Bosra)

The Bureau approved US\$ 30,000 for the restoration and conservation of the Roman Baths within the Ancient City of Bosra.

Turkey (Technical Co-operation for the “House of Fatih Inhabitants” within the Historic Centre of Istanbul)

The Chairperson noted that the request did not clearly show whether the State Party had submitted this request or not, noting that the Municipality of Fatih of Istanbul had prepared and submitted this project. In the same sense, the Observer of Argentina stated that international assistance requests, as well as proposals for nominations, should only be submitted by the competent national authorities representing States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the request was prepared by the Municipality of Fatih (being the site management authority) and was submitted by the Turkish National Commission as well as the Permanent Delegation of Turkey to UNESCO, both official representatives of the Government of Turkey to UNESCO (under cover letters dated 25 May 1998 and 27 May 1998, respectively).

The Chairperson informed the Bureau that several delegates had questioned where the districts of Zeyrek, Fener and Balat were located within the Historic Centre of Istanbul site. He questioned the validity of approving international assistance requests for areas outside of the core zones of World Heritage sites. The Delegate of Japan noted that many sites inscribed on the World Heritage List in the early years of the Convention lacked adequate documentation, particularly maps delineating the protected area and buffer zones. She questioned whether international assistance should be refused for this reason.

The Secretariat and ICOMOS confirmed that Zeyrek is located within the core zone, while Fener and Balat are located within the buffer zone of this World Heritage site, all three being in the Fatih District, as stated in the Working Documents WHC-98/CONF.201/3B (on state of conservation) and WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev (on international assistance). ICOMOS and ICCROM reiterated their strong and full support for this request, underlining the crucial need to protect the urban historic fabric and buffer zones composing the essential setting of World Heritage monuments and buildings. Both advisory bodies stressed the need to promote the active participation of the local inhabitants in maintaining the integrity of urban conservation areas, which require not only the preservation of historic monuments but also of vernacular buildings of architectural value. ICCROM emphasized the importance of this project to strengthen the local management capacity. The Delegate of Japan supported this view, stating the need for the inhabitants' involvement to preserve the historic urban fabric.

The Delegate of Lebanon suggested that this request be approved on the condition that the Chairperson be authorized to clear the questions raised by the Bureau concerning the location of the districts of Zeyrek, Fener and Balat. The Chairperson stated that he did not feel competent to study cadastral maps.

The Delegate of Lebanon, furthermore, requested clarification between this activity and the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign of the Historic Centre of Istanbul. The Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage, being responsible for the implementation of this Campaign, informed the Bureau that the Division had so far mobilized funds for the conservation of historic monuments and buildings within this site, such as Hagia Sophia and its mosaics.

The Delegate of Italy stated that she wished to view further detailed information of the project budget breakdown and that the Bureau should not consider this request until such information was provided. The Observer of France confirmed the financial contribution by the Government of France for this project, as indicated in the Document WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev., specifying that the Ministry of Equipment had made this commitment. The Secretariat noted that the detailed breakdown of the total budget of US\$ 170,920 was indicated in the aforementioned Document, including the details of the US\$ 30,000 requested from the World Heritage Fund.

The Chairperson stated that he did not wish to have an international assistance request approved by the Bureau during his Chairmanship without thorough examination of all necessary details. Furthermore, he underlined the need to be careful in providing international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the preservation of World Heritage sites within the context of social development projects. The Observer of Finland expressed his agreement with the Chairperson, supporting the view that new usage of the World Heritage Fund should not be created. The Director of the World Heritage Centre stated that there was ample cartographic and socio-economic information on the site in the study undertaken in the European Commission/UNESCO/Fatih project, and that protection of the architectural fabric of historic urban centres could not be separated from the social development of the inhabitants.

Finally, the Bureau postponed the approval of this request for **US\$ 30,000** to its twenty-second extraordinary session. The Bureau requested that maps clearly indicating the core and buffer zone of the Historic Centre of Istanbul as well as further detailed budget breakdown information be submitted to the Bureau for its examination.

Cambodia (Emergency Assistance for the restoration of the steps of the West Moat of Angkor Wat)

In view of the fact that the Emergency Assistance Reserve of the World Heritage Fund for 1998 was exhausted at the time this request was submitted, the Bureau approved **US\$ 28,595** under the Technical Co-operation budget for carrying out the hydrological and topographical studies. The Bureau recommended that the State Party requests further funding under the 1999 World Heritage Fund budget after the completion of these studies.

Sri Lanka (Emergency Assistance for the Sacred City of Kandy)

In view of the fact that the Emergency Assistance Reserve of the World Heritage Fund for 1998 was exhausted at the time this request was considered, the Bureau approved **US\$ 25,000** out of the Technical Co-operation budget, to carry out the initial emergency measures for Dalada Maligawa, including a provision for an ICOMOS or ICCROM expert mission. The Bureau recommended the State Party to request further funding under the 1999 World Heritage Fund budget.

VIII.2 The Bureau recalled the discussions on the state of conservation of the four properties of the Democratic Republic of

the Congo inscribed on the List of World Heritage sites in Danger (see Para V.4, page 10). It noted that some requests submitted by this State Party for undertaking research studies could not be considered as the Emergency Assistance budget set aside by the Committee for 1998 was exhausted. Those requests submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo cannot be considered under Technical Co-operation because it had not yet settled its dues to the World Heritage Fund. Given the fact that the State Party under consideration is recovering from a war situation, the Bureau authorized the Chairperson to consider the approval of projects which genuinely require Emergency Assistance from un-earmarked funds of other budget lines, such as Technical Co-operation, on a case-by-case basis, and upon recommendation by the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

VIII.3 ICOMOS reminded the Bureau of the difficulties it faced in receiving requests for international assistance for its evaluation only a few days before the Bureau considered such requests. The Bureau expressed its appreciation for the efforts made by the advisory bodies in swiftly evaluating such requests.

IX. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SECOND EXTRAORDINARY SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Kyoto, Japan, 27-28 November 1998)

IX.1 The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/7, the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau to be held in Kyoto, Japan, 27-28 November 1998. The Provisional Agenda was adopted without modification and is attached as Annex X. The Observer of the United Kingdom noted that there should be a possibility to discuss the results of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam in March 1998.

X. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Kyoto, Japan, 30 November – 5 December 1998)

X.1 The Chairperson presented Working Document WHC-98/CONF.201/8, the Provisional Agenda of the twenty-second session of the Committee to be held in Kyoto, Japan, 30 November – 5 December 1998. The Rapporteur noted that the agenda item "Requests for International Assistance" should come after the discussions on Agenda item "Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1999, and presentation of a provisional budget for 2000". The Provisional Agenda was adopted with this amendment and is attached as Annex XI. The Delegate of Benin asked if the results and follow-up to the Amsterdam Meeting could be made available to the Consultative Body prior to the next Bureau and Committee sessions. The Bureau noted that the results of the Amsterdam Meeting shall also be discussed under the Agenda item "Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention".

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

XI.1 The Observer of Canada suggested that the Bureau might wish to pay tribute to Dr. Jukka Jokilehto who represented ICCROM at numerous Bureau and Committee sessions and who will leave the organisation after 27 years of service. Dr. Jokilehto thanked the Bureau and expressed the wish for future collaboration on World Heritage preservation.

XI.2 The Chairperson also expressed the Bureau's thanks to Dr. Jim Thorsell. The Representative of IUCN informed the Bureau that Dr. Thorsell will continue to work on a part-time contract basis and that he will be present at the forthcoming Committee session.

XI.3 The Representative of ICCROM informed the Bureau of a new programme that has been developed in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM for the conservation of immovable cultural heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa, which was distributed as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.201/INF.10. He highlighted in particular the need for increased professional capacity in the region and improved conservation conditions of World Heritage sites. The programme, which is a follow-up to the "Training Strategy for Cultural Heritage" adopted by the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee, can be seen as part of a long-term strategy for increasing the representation of African sites on the World Heritage List.

XI.4 The Observer of Mexico informed the Bureau that, in the framework of the discussions in the Consultative Body on Communication and Promotion prepared by Canada and Mexico, the National Institute for Anthropology and History was preparing a series of radio features on the cultural heritage of Africa. He furthermore stressed the need to organise a second meeting on *Indicators for measuring the state of conservation of historical cities* in Latin America, to further develop specific issues of urban preservation.

XII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

XII.1 The Bureau adopted its report with the amendments and clarifications noted during the debate. The Chairperson thanked the Bureau members and the representatives of the advisory bodies for their participation and congratulated the Bureau for the work achieved. He expressed his personal satisfaction that the Bureau was able to recommend the removal of one site from the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the inscription of the Galapagos Islands on the Danger List was avoided due to the actions taken by the State Party. He also expressed high recognition for the excellent work of the Secretariat and of the interpreters.

XII.2 The Delegate of Morocco thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur of the Bureau for their accomplishments during the Bureau session. He expressed his sincere thanks to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his staff, as well as to all Bureau members and observers for their contributions. The Delegate of Japan thanked the Chairperson for his efficient chairmanship and reiterated the invitation of his Government to host the forthcoming Bureau and Committee sessions in November/December 1998 in Kyoto, Japan.

XII.3 The Director of the Centre thanked the Chairperson and the Bureau members for the guidance given to the Secretariat. The Chairperson then declared the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee closed.

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

Vingt-deuxième session / Twenty-second session

**Paris, Siège de l'UNESCO, Salle X (Fontenoy)
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, Room X (Fontenoy)**

22-27 juin 1998 / 22-27 June 1998

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

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

BENIN

*S. Exc. M. Nouréini TIDJANI-SERPOS
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO*

*M. Jules BOCCO
Directeur du patrimoine culturel
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication
B.P. 120
COTONOU*

*M. ALADJI SYLLA BONI Alioune
Directeur des Forêts et Ressources naturelles
Ministère du Développement rural
B.P. 393
COTONOU*

*Mr Isidore MONSI
Premier Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO*

EQUATEUR/ ECUADOR

*H. Exc. Mr Abelardo POSSO-SERRANO
Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Av. 10 Agosto y Carrion
QUITO*

*Mr Hernan GUARDERAS
Director
Cultural Heritage National Institute*

*M. Mauricio MONTALVO
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO*

*M. Galo GALARZA
Ministre
Ministère des Affaires étrangères
Ambassade de l'Equateur
34, avenue de Messine
75008 Paris*

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

*Ms Karen T. KOVACS
Counselor to the Assistant Secretary
Fish and Wildlife and Parks
United States Department of the Interior
1849 C ST. N.W, WASHINGTON DC 20240*

*Mr William McILHENNY
United States Observer to UNESCO
United States Embassy
2, avenue Gabriel
75008 PARIS*

*Mr John J. REYNOLDS
Regional Director
Pacific West Region
National Park Service
600 Harrison Street
Suite 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107*

*Mr James H. CHARLETON
International Cooperation Specialist (Culture)
U.S. National Park Service
1849 C ST., NW WASHINGTON DC 20240*

ITALIE/ ITALY

*Mr Francesco FRANCIONI
Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial
Professeur de Droit international
Université de Sienne
Piazza San Francisco
53100 SIENA*

*H. Exc. Mr Gabriele SARDO
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO*

*Mr Giovanni ARMENTO
Attaché pour les affaires financières et administratives
Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO*

Mme Lucia FIORI
 Conseiller
 Direction générale des relations culturelles
 Ministère des Affaires étrangères
 ROME

Mrs Margherita SABATINI
 Attachée au Secteur UNESCO
 Direction générale des Affaires culturelles
 Ministère des Affaires étrangères
 ROME

Mr Bruno MALARA
 Surintendant pour les Biens architecturaux du Piémont

Mme Licia BORELLI VLAD
 Vice-Président du Comité Culture
 Commission nationale italienne pour l'UNESCO

Mme Marina MISITANO
 Délégation permanente de l'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Stefano De Caro
 Consultant scientifique
 Surintendant archéologique de Naples
 NAPLES

JAPON/ JAPAN

H. Exc. Mr Koichiro MATSUURA
 Ambassador to France
 Embassy of Japan
 7, avenue Hoche
 75008 PARIS

Mr Yasukuni ENOKI
 Director-General
 Cultural Affairs Department
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Mr Yuichi ISHII
 Director
 Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division
 Cultural Affairs Department
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Mr Takahiro OKAMOTO
 Official
 Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division
 Cultural Affairs Department
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Mr Tomoyuki ONO
 Attaché
 Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO
 UNESCO House

Mr Hiroshi SOUWAKI
 Director
 Monuments and Sites Division
 Cultural Properties Protection Department
 Agency for Cultural Affairs
 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Mr Makoto MOTONAKA
 Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
 Monuments and Sites Division
 Cultural Properties Protection Department
 Agency for Cultural Affairs
 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Dr Nobuko INABA
 Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
 Architecture Division
 Cultural Properties Protection Department
 Agency for Cultural Affairs
 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Mr Naohisa OKUDA
 Assistant Director
 Planning Division
 Nature Conservation Bureau
 Environment Agency
 1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
 TOKYO 100

Ms Kumiko YONEDA
 Research Staff
 Japan Wildlife Research Center
 2-29-3 Yushima, bunkyo-Ku
 TOKYO 113-0034

Mrs Keiko YAMADA
 Troisième Secrétaire de la Mission du Japon
 auprès de l'Union européenne
 Ministère des affaires étrangères
 C/o Mission du Japon auprès de l'Union européenne
 5-6, Square de Meeus
 B-1000 BRUXELLES

LIBAN/ LEBANON

M. Camille ASMAR
 Directeur général des Antiquités
 Direction générale des Antiquités
 Musée National
 BEYROUTH

Mr Noel FATTAL
 Conseiller
 Délégué permanent adjoint
 Délégation permanente du Liban auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Roger SAYAH
 Ingénieur
 Expert pour le patrimoine naturel
 Ministère de l'Environnement
 BP 70-1091 ANTELIAS

Mme Agnès ROUSSEAU
 Consultant UNESCO
 Direction générale des Antiquités
 Musée National
 BEYROUTH

MAROC/ MOROCCO

Mr Abdelaziz TOURI
Directeur
Direction du patrimoine culturel
17, rue Michlifen, Agdal
RABAT

Mr Abdelmalk BENABID
Professeur – Enseignant Chercheur
Ecole Nationale Forestière d'Ingénieurs de Salé
Expert pour le patrimoine naturel
BP 511 Tabriquet
11000 SALE

Mr Salah-Eddine EL HONSALI
Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

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

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

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN
Secretary-General
49-51 rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Mme Carmen AÑON FELIU
Member of the Executive Committee
Puerto Santamaria 49
MADRID 28043

Mr Leo van NISPEN
Acting Director
49-51 rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Dr Henry CLEERE
World Heritage Co-ordinator
49-51 rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Ms Regina DURIGHELLO
Assistant World Heritage Coordinator
49-51 rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Mr Joseph PHARES
Vice-Président
119, avenue Victor Hugo
75116 PARIS

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

Dr James THORSELL
Head - Natural Heritage Programme
Rue Mauverney, 28
CH-1196 GLAND
Switzerland

Mr P.H.C. LUCAS
Vice-Chair World Heritage
World Commission on Protected Areas
1/268 Main Road
Tawa
WELLINGTON 6006
New Zealand

Mr David SHEPPARD
Head
Programme on Protected Areas
Rue Mauverney, 28
CH 1196 GLAND
Switzerland

Mr Jeremy HARRISON
World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL
United Kingdom

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

Dr Jukka JOKILEHTO
Chief
Assistant to the Director-General
ROME, Italy
Via di San Michele 13,
00153 ROME, Italy

Mr Joseph KING
Programme Officer
Africa 2009 Programme
Via di S. Michele, 13
00153 ROME, Italy

III. OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVERS

AFRIQUE DU SUD/ SOUTH AFRICA

Dr Tanya ABAHAMSE
Deputy Director General
Departement of Environmental Affairs and Tourism

Mr Makgolo MAKGOLO
Assistant Director
Cultural Ressource Management
Departement of Environmental Affairs and Tourism

Ms Bulelwa MBANGU
Environmental Officer
Cultural Ressources Management
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism

Ms Laura ROBINSON
Regional Manager
Western Cape
National Monuments Council
P.O. Box 4637
Cape Town

Mr Devandhran MOODLEY
Third Secretary
South African Embassy
59, quai d'Orsay
75343 PARIS Cedex 07

ALLEMAGNE /GERMANY

H. Exc. M. Christoph DERIX
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Dr Hans CASPARY
Conservator of Historic Monuments
Landesamt für Denkmalpflege Rheinland-Pfalz
Gottelmannstrasse 17
D-55130 MAINZ

Mr Hendrik WASSERMANN
Federal Foreign Office
Adenauerallee 86
Postfach 1148
51113 BONN

ARGENTINE/ ARGENTINA

Ms Maria Susana PATARO
Ministre
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de l'Argentine auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Ariel Walter GONZALEZ
Délégation permanente de l'Argentine auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

AUSTRALIE/ AUSTRALIA

Ms Sharon SULLIVAN
Head
Australian and World Heritage Group
Environment Australia
GPO Box 787
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dr Peter BRIDGEWATER
Chief Science
Adviser Environment Australia
Environment Australia
P.O. Box E 305 Kingston Act. 2604

Mr David WALKER
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Australian Permanent Delegation
4, rue Jean Rey
75015 PARIS

AUTRICHE/ AUSTRIA

Mr Hans HORCICKA
Director
Federal Ministry for Education and Cultural Affairs
Minoritenplatz 5
A-1014 VIENNA

BELGIQUE/ BELGIUM

Mme Bénédicte SELFSLAGH
Relations avec les organisations internationales
Division du patrimoine
Direction générale de l'Aménagement du territoire,
du logement et du patrimoine
Ministère de la Région wallonne
Rue des Brigades d'Irlande, 1
B-5100 JAMBES

Mme Gislaine DEVILLERS
Directrice de la Protection
Division du patrimoine
Direction générale de l'Aménagement du territoire,
du logement et du patrimoine
Ministère de la Région wallonne
Rue des Brigades d'Irlande, 1
B-5100 JAMBES

Mr E. GOEDLEVEN
Chef de Division
Département de l'Environnement et des Infrastructures
Administration de l'Aménagement du territoire,
du logement, des monuments et sites

Mme S. VAN AARSCHOT
Directeur
Département de l'Environnement et des Infrastructures
Administration de l'Aménagement du territoire,
du logement, des monuments et sites

BOLIVIE/ BOLIVIA

M. Eduardo LORINI TAPIA
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de Bolivie auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

M. Fernando LAREDO
Membre suppléant au Conseil exécutif

BRESIL/ BRAZIL

M. Ricardo Alonso BASTOS
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Brésil auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

CAMEROUN/ CAMEROON

M. Charles ASSAMBA ONGODO
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Cameroun auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

CANADA

Dr Christina CAMERON
Director General
National Historic Sites
Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Street
HULL - Quebec KIA 0M5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN
Affaire internationale
Parcs Canada
Ministère du patrimoine canadien
25 rue Eddy
HULL - Quebec KIA 0M5

Mr John PINKERTON
Analyst, National Park Directorate
Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy St, 4th Floor Hull
HULL -Quebec KIA 0M5

Mr Sean MOORE
Attaché administratif
Délégation permanente du Canada auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

CHINE/ CHINA

Mr Liu Tong GENG
Associate Research Fellow
Municipal Bureau of Gardens and Parks
BEIJING

Mr KONG Fanzhi
Deputy Director
Beijing Municipal Bureau of Parks & Gardens
BEIJING

Ms YAO An
Engineer
Beijing Municipal Bureau of Parks & Gardens
BEIJING

Ms YU Xiaoping
Program officer
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO
BEIJING

Mr Jianping TIAN
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation of China to UNESCO
UNESCO House

COLOMBIE/ COLOMBIA

Mlle Marcela ORDOÑEZ
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente de la Colombie auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

COSTA RICA

Mme Iris LEIVA-BILLAULT
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Costa Rica auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Gabriela CASTILLO GARCIA
Ministre conseiller
Délégation permanente du Costa Rica auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

CUBA

Mme Marta ARJONA PEREZ
Presidenta del Consejo Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural
Ministerio de Cultura
LA HABANA

ESPAGNE/ SPAIN

S. Exc. M. Jesus EZQUERRA
Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente de l'Espagne auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Clara BARREIRO
Conseiller (Education)
Délégation permanente de l'Espagne auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

FEDERATION DE RUSSIE/ RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mme Olga IVANOVA
Conseiller
Délégation permanente de la Fédération de Russie
auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Ivan BLOKOV
Directeur
Succursale de "Greenpeace"
Moscou

FINLANDE/FINLAND

Mr Henrik LILIUS
Director-General
National Board of Antiquities

FRANCE

Mme Anne LEWIS-LOUBIGNAC
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Françoise BERCE
Conservateur en chef du patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture
3, rue de Valois
75001 PARIS

Mme Aimée DUBOS
Adjoint du Sous-Directeur des monuments historiques
Ministre de la Culture
3, rue de Valois
75001 PARIS

Mme DUMENIL
Commission de la République française pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture
36, rue La Pérouse
75775 PARIS Cedex 16

GRECE/ GREECE

Mme Eleni METHODIOU
Conseiller pour la culture
Délégation de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Yannis TZEDAKIS
Director of Antiquities
Ministry of Culture
20-22 Bouboulina St
Athens

GUATEMALA

Mr Juan MENDOZA ROSALES
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Guatemala auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

HONGRIE/ HUNGARY

M. Zoltan SZILASSY
Directeur
Ministère de la Protection de l'Environnement
et du Développement du Territoire
H-1121 Költö u 21
1121 BUDAPEST

M. Tamas FEJERDI
Directeur du Comité National Hongrois
pour l'ICOMOS-Hongrie
BUDAPEST

M. Jenő UJVARI
Adjoint au Maire de la ville de Pecs

M. Béla KOVACSI
Conseiller
Ministère de la Protection de l'Environnement et
du Développement du Territoire
H-1121 Költö u 21
1121 BUDAPEST

INDE/ INDIA

H. Exc. Mr Chiranjiv SINGH
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of India to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Mr Gauri Shankar GUPTA
Councillor
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Mr RAM DUTT
Second Secretary
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO
UNESCO House

IRAN (REPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')/ IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

H. Exc. Mr A. JALALI
Ambassador
Permanent Delegate
Permanent Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran
to UNESCO
UNESCO House

Mr Reza BAYEGAN
Education specialist
Permanent Delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran
to UNESCO
UNESCO House

MEXIQUE/ MEXICO

Mr Francisco LOPEZ-MORALES
Subdirector
INAH
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)
CORDOBA # 45, Col. Roma
04700 MEXICO D.F.

NIGER

M. Amadore TCHEKO
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente du Niger auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

NOUVELLE ZELANDE/ NEW ZEALAND

Mme Mary OLIVER
Deputy Permanent Delegate
First Secretary
New Zealand Embassy
7 ter, rue Léonard de Vinci
75016 PARIS

Mme Elspeth WINSHAM
228 Sunrise Valley Road
R.D.1, Upper Moutere
NELSON

PANAMA

Mr Jorge PATIÑO
Troisième secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Panama auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

PAYS BAS/ NETHERLANDS

Mr Robert DE JONG
Coordinator World Heritage
State Department for Conservation
President
ICOMOS – IFLA Committee
P.O. Box 1001
3700 BA ZEIST

PEROU/ PERU

S. Exc. Maria Luisa FEDERICI SOTO
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

M. Carlos M. VELASCO MENDIOLA
Ministre Conseiller
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Carlos VASQUEZ
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Pérou auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mr Luis ALFARO LOZANO
Director General de Areas naturales
Protegidas y Fauna Silvestre del INRENA

Mrs Elva GOMEZ ROMERO
Directora General de Medio Ambiente Rural

PHILIPPINES

Ms Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO
First Secretary
Délégation permanente des Philippines auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

POLOGNE/ POLAND

Prof. Andrzej TOMASZEWSKI
Directeur général du patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture
Ksawerow 13
VASORVIE

PORTUGAL

S. Exc. M. Jorge RITTO
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente du Portugal auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Maria Manuel DURAO
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Portugal auprès de l'UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO

Prof. J. ZILHAO
Directeur
Institut Portugais d'Archéologie
Av. Da India, 136
P-1300 LISBOA

REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE / SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Mr Jozef KLINDA
Head of the Environmental Conception,
Law and Organisation Division
Ministry of the Environment
BRATISLAVA

Mr Kamil VILINOVIC
Specialist
Environmental Conceptions and Planning Department
Ministry of the Environment
BRATISLAVA

Mrs Adriana KLINDOVA
Assistant
Ministry of Environment
BRATISLAVA

Mr Jozef HLAVAC
Director
Administration Slovak Show Caves
Ministry of Environment
BRATISLAVA

Mr Peter HRONZAK
Director
National Park Slovak Paradise
Ministry of Environment

REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE/ CZECH REPUBLIC

M. Michal BENES
Secrétaire pour les Affaires culturelles
Ministère de la Culture
Hilay Horakové 139
16041 PRAHA

Mr Josef STULC
Director
State Institute for the Protection of Monuments
Valdstejske 3, 118 PRAGUE 1

ROYAUME UNI/ UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Nigel PITTMAN
Head of Buildings
Monuments & Sites Division
Department for culture, Media & Sport
2-4, Cockspur Street
LONDON SW1Y 5DH

Ms Hilary IZON
Deputy Observer
Embassy of Great Britain
35, rue du Faubourg St Honoré
75383 PARIS Cedex 08

SAINTE LUCIE/ SAINT LUCIA

Ms Vera LACOEUILHE
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation de Sainte Lucie auprès de l'UNESCO
21 bis, avenue d'Iéna
75116 PARIS

SUEDE/ SWEDEN

Ms Birgitta HOBERG
Director
National Heritage Board
P.O. Box 5405
STOCKHOLM

Mr Per-Arne ANDREASSON
Deputy Governor
County Administration of Blekinge
KARLSKRONA

Mr Leiph STENHOLM
County Antiquarian
County of Blekinge
KARLSKRONA

Mr Björn FRIES
Municipal Commissioner
KARLSKRONA

THAILANDE/ THAILAND

Dr Adul WICHENCHAROEN
Chairman
National Committee on the Convention for Protection
of the World Heritage
Council of State, Chief of Div. II
BANGKOK

Mr Manit SIRIWAN
Secretary
National Committee on the Convention for Protection
of World Heritage
 BANGKOK

Mrs Siriporn NANTA
Environmental Official
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
 BANGKOK

TUNISIE/TUNISIA

S. Exc. M. Mongi BOUSNINA
Ambassadeur
Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente de la Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Dhouha BOUKHRIS
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente de la Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

Mme Amissa BARRAK
Attaché culturel
Délégation permanente de la Tunisie auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

M. Jamel THLIBI
Sous-Directeur des études et projets
Agence nationale de protection de l'environnement
 12, rue du Cameroun
 BP 52 TUNIS

VENEZUELA

Mme C. ENGELBRECHT
Deuxième secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Venezuela auprès de l'UNESCO
 Maison de l'UNESCO

IV. AUTRES OBSERVATEURS ADMIS AU VINGT DEUXIEME SESSION DU BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL/ OTHER OBSERVERS ADMITTED TO THE TWENTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU

Ms Jacqui KATONA
Executive Officer
Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation
 Australia

Ms Yvonne MARGARULA
Senior Traditional Owner
Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation
 Australia

Mr Alec MARR
National Campaign Director
The Wilderness Society
 P.O. Box 188 Civic Square
 ACT 2608, Australia

V. UNESCO SECRETARIAT

Mr Adnan BADRAN
Deputy Director-General

Ms Lourdes ARIZPE
Assistant Director-General for Culture

WHC

Mr Bernd von DROSTE
Director

Ms Vesna VUJICIC-LUGASSY

Mr Georges ZOUAIN
Deputy Director

Mr Masayuki MORI

Ms Minja YANG

Ms Margareta KARLSSON

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO

Mr Peter STRASSER

Mr Herman VAN HOOFF

Ms Sabine SAMADY

Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN

Mr Peter STOTT

Ms Josette ERFAN

Mr Carlos ROMERO

Ms Mechthild ROSSLER

Ms Jane DEGEORGES

Ms Sarah TITCHEN

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU

Ms Junko TANIGUCHI

Mr David MARTEL

Ms Marianne RAABE

CLT/CH

Mr Azedine BESCHAOUCH
Chargé de Mission

Mr M. BOUCHENAKI
Director

Mr H. CRESPO-TORAL
Principal Director

Ms Lyndel PROTTE
Chief of Section

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS

Mr Etienne CLEMENT

Ms Ana DUMITRESCU

Ms Anne LEMAISTRE

Ms Anna PAOLINI

SC/ECO

Mrs Mireille JARDIN

Mr Sami MANKOTO

Ms Jane ROBERTSON

Mr Thomas SCHAFF

BOC

Mr Dan DALY
The Comptroller

LA

Mr John DONALDSON
Legal Advisor

BRX/ICP

Mme M. BRIGAUD-ROBERT

CII/INF

Mr Abdelaziz ABID
Information and Informatics Division

**SPEECH BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL FOR UNESCO,
Mr ADNAN BADRAN**

Mr Chairman, Prof. Francisco Francioni, Members of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, your Excellencies, Distinguished Permanent Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish to welcome you to the Bureau meeting on behalf of Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO. I have been following and representing the Director-General in many of your meetings. As a matter of fact, the first meeting of the World Heritage Committee I have attended was in Cartagena, and since Cartagena, to Phuket, to Naples, I have been following with interest your work, the growth of the World Heritage List. As a matter of fact, I have been following how the World Heritage Centre was born. It was between the Sector of Culture and the Sector of Science, where natural sites were done under Science and cultural sites were done under the Sector of Culture and I have participated fully with Mr Lopes at that time in formulating a Steering Committee to co-ordinate our work when I was ADG/SC.

Ms Arizpe, the ADG/CLT followed also, co-chairing with me the Steering Committee to follow the same path for creating the World Heritage Centre. The growth of the heritage sites has been commendable: 552 sites now; I remember the figure when I came in the early 90s to UNESCO, in fact 1990, it was about 200 or less. I think the work your Committee has done is commendable. You have really steadily done a lot of work to preserve the World Heritage of the humanity – on behalf of the Director-General, I do thank everyone of you for the efforts you have done in making the World Heritage List very well-known, visible and many of them have been restored and many of them always examined by your Bureau, to watch, to be the eye of the world of the humanity if anything goes wrong, to mobilise the opinion of the international community. Obviously we don't have force to prevent, only building world opinion. The Parties, States Parties to the Convention, obviously have done a remarkable job in bringing the 552 sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

However, with the growth of sites and the growth of the work, more challenges are foreseen. More challenges ahead of us, with limited means, and probably the most challenging is to innovate. How to do more with less resources. Do we continue to grow? Is there a danger of losing control or is there a limit to this growth. If there is a limit, how to increase the ways and means to cope with such a growth.

Today for example, you have to review in your meetings the status of 18 of the 25 most threatened sites included in the List of World Heritage which are endangered. As usual, your recommendations will be very important to us all. This brings me to the challenge of globalisation. Globalisation brings with it market oriented policies, brings with it privatisation, brings with it also less government. It is extremely important to look into the future and to see where do we fit in this transition of change which is taking place very rapidly. How to continue our work and become more effective in a changing world.

One point which is very important is how to monitor and assess continuously the 552 World Heritage sites in place using the information network, how to up date this information network when the information becomes available to every State Party to the Convention. How to accommodate development in a world

which is moving very quickly into market economy. How to safeguard those monuments where many are used increasingly for cultural tourism; and how to strike a balance between economics, cultural tourism and safeguarding the World Heritage sites, which represent the memory of the world, about its civilisation. Let us remember we are not after preserving dead cities as monuments. We are not after isolating Heritage sites away from the public, but we are after inviting the public to share and care with us as partners to develop ways and means to restore and to preserve and to disseminate. I think it is extremely important, not only to increase the government participation, but it is important to look for new partners. To look for partners who have the same objectives, and the same goals. The job is big and getting bigger, and we have to stand firm, otherwise future generations will never forgive us for the opportunities we have missed. We have now to develop and restore those World Heritage sites, the memory imprinted physically on the work of humanity and nature.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Ms Arizpe and myself will be leaving you this year. This is our last meeting with you. I have invited Ms Arizpe to say, also, a few words before her departure. Mr von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, will join us also in leaving the Organization at a later stage. I think it is extremely important at this time, to share with you our experience. Complementarity between the World Heritage Centre and the Sectors of Science and Culture (Biosphere Reserves and cultural sites) has to be strengthened. It is extremely important to develop complementarity, but also to encourage co-operation among sectors to serve Member States.

The World Heritage Centre is a jewel programme in the crown of the UNESCO C/5. It should grow and be safeguarded in terms of identity, and of autonomy, under the World Heritage Committee. It should continue, in terms of identity and complementarity with other sectors. We are leaving this message to you for your future work at the World Heritage Committee.

In their recognition of UNESCO's role in the protection of World Heritage I am pleased to announce also that the staffing of the World Heritage Centre has finally been completed. Eight posts have been regularised in the Centre in accordance with the agreement reached in 1996 between the Director-General and the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. All vacant posts in the Centre have now been filled. Not a single vacant post exists any more.

As a matter of fact, I have requested Mr von Droste recently what else we have to do to further strengthen the World Heritage Centre. He told me that as far as staff was concerned, there is no complaint any more. But he asked for more space in the Japanese Garden building. I have already requested ADG/MA to make space available for newly appointed staff.

Finally, on behalf of the Director-General, I wish you a very successful meeting. I do thank you for your attention.

DISCOURS DE Mme LOURDES ARIZPE, SOUS-DIRECTEUR GENERAL POUR LA CULTURE

Monsieur le Président,
Monsieur le Rapporteur,
Mesdames et Messieurs les Délégués et Observateurs,
Excellences,

Chers collègues,

Cette année 1998 nous apparaît à tous comme propice à la réflexion, au bilan, et à la prospective.

Le 25^e anniversaire de la Convention du patrimoine mondial vient de s'achever, marqué par diverses manifestations, tandis que la 11^e Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la Convention et la 29^e Conférence générale de l'UNESCO se sont tenues il y a juste six mois, et ont pris des décisions importantes, en particulier en ce qui concerne le suivi de l'état de conservation des sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Mais aussi, et cela, je crois, aura son importance, des changements de personne, dans ceux qui ont la charge de veiller aux destinées du Centre du patrimoine mondial, vont se produire dans les six prochains mois: mon propre départ, en tant que Sous-Directeur général pour la culture, et Présidente du Comité directeur du Centre, et, à la fin de l'année, celui du Directeur du Centre lui-même.

Que peut-on souhaiter dans l'avenir, pour améliorer le fonctionnement du Centre, et, à travers lui, de la Convention du patrimoine elle-même?

Depuis que j'ai pris mes fonctions à l'UNESCO, les questions qui se sont posées me sont apparues récurrentes, année après année, et l'examen des documents de travail préparés par le Secrétariat pour cette 22^e session du Bureau me semble les reproduire, une fois encore.

1. Vous allez étudier, au cours de cette semaine, les conséquences à tirer des deux audits financiers et de gestion, qui avaient été décidés à l'unanimité par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à Madrid.

Je sais qu'en matière financière, des premières mesures ont déjà été prises. Mais toutes les conséquences n'ont pas encore été tirées, tant pour obtenir une plus grande transparence dans la gestion du Centre que pour savoir comment préciser davantage les textes qui, directement ou indirectement, régissent le fonctionnement des principales composantes de la Convention, en particulier le Fonds du patrimoine mondial et les questions liées à la promotion de la Convention. Comme M. Badran l'a très clairement dit, une meilleure articulation devra également être recherchée entre le Centre et, pour ce qui concerne le Secteur de la culture, la Division du patrimoine culturel. Ceci est nuisible pour l'efficacité que sont en droit de réclamer les Etats membres de l'UNESCO - et les Etats parties à la Convention - tout autant que préjudiciable à la bonne conservation des sites eux-mêmes. En ce sens, je ne puis que souhaiter que le Directeur général prenne, dans un avenir proche, et comme il en a, je crois, l'intention, les mesures structurelles de nature à pallier cette difficulté.

2. Le suivi de l'état de conservation des biens inscrits doit être amélioré et l'inscription, année après année, de nouveaux biens sur la liste en perspective, démontre que le travail préventif du Centre doit encore être renforcé. Au cours de cette session, vous allez étudier de nouvelles modalités pour un suivi systématique. C'est

une direction souhaitable, mais qui sera très difficile à mettre en oeuvre de façon satisfaisante dans la pratique. Ce suivi ne remplira vraiment son rôle, me semble-t-il, que s'il ne se contente pas d'enregistrer "a posteriori" l'état des sites, mais fournit à l'avance des sortes de "pré-diagnostic" des problèmes qui vont se poser, afin de permettre au Comité de prendre les mesures préventives nécessaires dans les délais voulus.

3. L'assistance internationale, ou plutôt la faiblesse du nombre des demandes, est également pour moi un sujet d'inquiétude, alors que nous savons combien les besoins sont immenses. Je pense qu'ici aussi on ne peut plus se contenter d'attendre que ces demandes arrivent, ni considérer davantage que leur montant, modeste, peut résoudre les problèmes qui se posent sur place. Ici encore, je crois qu'il faudra de plus en plus identifier les besoins longtemps à l'avance, et accorder les fonds du patrimoine mondial d'une façon beaucoup plus préventive, ou comme élément d'un projet d'ensemble plus vaste, que comme une réponse au coup par coup, qui, dans ces conditions, aura justement souvent un coup de retard.

4. Enfin, les propositions d'inscriptions sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial qui, cette année encore, en particulier pour les biens culturels, sont extrêmement nombreuses.

J'éprouve une vive inquiétude à ce sujet. J'ai vu, année après année, la Liste du patrimoine s'accroître d'environ 30 à 40 sites nouveaux par an, sans justifications toujours clairement compréhensibles par nos partenaires, et, plus important encore, par le public. C'est qu'il manque à ce jour, je crois, une réflexion fondamentale à laquelle on ne pourra plus échapper si l'on veut assurer la crédibilité de la Liste: qu'est-ce qu'un site du patrimoine mondial? Qu'est-ce qui fait vraiment la différence entre un site qui mérite l'inscription et un autre? Et donc aussi, quels sont le contenu et l'étendue de la notion de "valeur universelle exceptionnelle", qui sont au centre de la Convention?

Ni le monde, ni la Convention, ne sont les mêmes qu'il y a 25 ans. La notion de patrimoine culturel a beaucoup changé. La nature et l'ampleur des menaces qui pèsent sur lui aussi. Un patrimoine mondial de 550 sites n'est plus le même, en quantité et en nature, qu'une liste de 50 ou 70 biens, et de toute évidence, la Convention ne peut plus fonctionner comme à ses débuts. J'aurais aimé que son 25^e anniversaire soit aussi l'occasion d'une réflexion de fond, à côté des nécessaires améliorations qui devaient être apportées au fonctionnement du Centre du patrimoine mondial lui-même.

Au-delà des questions essentielles, je l'ai dit, concernant l'organisation et le fonctionnement du Secrétariat du Comité c'est à présent sur la Convention elle-même, ses concepts, son rôle, ses finalités qu'il faut s'interroger, si nous ne voulons pas que, faute d'avoir pris la mesure des profonds changements advenus en 25 ans, tant dans le monde qui nous entoure, que dans la mise en oeuvre de la Convention elle-même, ce formidable espoir d'un patrimoine commun à toute l'humanité et protégé par elle, ne se vide peu à peu de sa substance et de sa force mobilisatrice, mais demeure au contraire une des figures exemplaires de l'unité de l'homme et de la solidarité humaine.

Je ne puis donc qu'appeler de mes vœux cette réflexion en profondeur sur le patrimoine mondial, 25 ans après et à l'aube du III^e millénaire.

Fostering creativity around World Heritage sites

Since this is the last time that I will address the Bureau of the World Heritage Centre as Assistant-Director General, I would like to leave with you some thoughts about culture heritage in today's context of rapid cultural change and globalization, and a few suggestions for the future work of the World Heritage Program.

The best practice for safeguarding world heritage, we know, is for all of society to appreciate and participate in its preservation. Not only as a objectified site, or monument or landscape but one which offers individuals signs and symbols with which to build a cultural or national identity, a relationship with Nature or a feeling for the past. The sites inscribed in the World Heritage List are concrete places and objects but the ways in which they are interpreted change over time and their outlook varies in different places. Thus, the **cumulative meanings**, that is, the connotations that cultural heritage sites, monuments and landscapes have for different people must be given greater attention in the work of the World Heritage Program.

This is why it is important to understand **cultural heritage as a process**, -natural heritage as well with its own parameters-.

We also know that new challenges that are arising for understanding and effective mobilization of people to safeguard World Heritage must also be analyzed and monitored. Among the major ones I would point to the following.

Culture is no longer conceptualized as a set of norms, symbols and customs that people inside its boundaries unanimously agree to.

Without going into the more complex questions of representation and translation of cultural items, at present cultures are being discussed as a site of contestation. That is to say that **the vitality of a given culture comes from a constant debate with its own members and it is the contrast it creates towards other groups that makes it change**.

In previous epochs such change took decades, even centuries. Today it takes only years. We see everywhere that this process has accelerated and young people around the world are contesting and wanting to create new meanings to adapt to the unprecedented situations they are living in. It seems to me that all of those youths who flock to Teotihuacan for the spring equinox or to Stonehenge to recreate ancient rites are demanding that these ancient stones and places give them a new symbolic sites around which to rally round and recreate their identities.

The language in which they are couching their search is that of a new spirituality and cosmology but this is because they are offered no other language by institutions which keep their action only within the limits of strict conservation of what is. It is not a question of accepting lunatic or acrobatic practices in world heritage sites, but the question to be raised is why haven't artists, writers, inventors, creators been invited to give new life to the powerful symbolism of world heritage sites?

This is, of course, an extremely sensitive question precisely because world heritage sites touch the core of cultural or historical values. And here another challenge is on the rise. As governance structures shift and as more nationalistic or ethnically oriented governments take power in some countries, debates over origins, symbolism and proprietary rights will be much more fierce. The World Heritage Program must then emphasize a much stronger knowledge-based debate.

We have seen how the symbolism of heritage sites has been used for political mobilization, sometimes leading to destruction,

as in the case of the Old Bridge of Mostar¹. How can UNESCO help in counteracting this antagonistic ethnically-based use of the representation of world heritage? It seems to me by fostering the production of cultural knowledge of sites with a deep historical perspective. In fact, the great majority of world cultural sites are the culmination of many centuries during which **diverse** cultures contributed, directly or indirectly, to the building of such sites. By showing that cultural achievements are not created through linear processes but through exchanges with other cultures which are then translated into the idiom of a particular culture, ethnically-driven proprietary demands on world cultural sites may be suitably dealt with.

In summary, I would like to say that the World Heritage Program must emphasize the following:

1. World Heritage cannot be safeguarded unless the whole of society feels responsible for it and supports governments and specialized groups in working towards its preservation. This awareness is already present in the World Heritage Program, as we all agree, in the intent to broaden the base of appreciation and participation of societies in safeguarding such heritage. One way of doing this is to emphasize creative activities around world cultural and natural sites, so that young artists and writers and creators may reinvigorate the symbols and images of such heritage in new cultural practices.
2. The program must develop the emblematic role of the World Heritage Convention as decision-making shifts between local, national and global institutions. This could not be more strongly emphasized. In a world in which all international exchanges are intensifying yet narrow interests are becoming more forceful, the universal consensus that lends support to the World Heritage Convention is a great achievement. And it should have a demonstration effect in providing a concrete example of how cooperation may be maintained in a context in which competition is fast becoming the only major driving force of world relations.
3. The World Heritage Program must also help governments to deal with the paradox that, the more world heritage is valorized, both in cultural as well as in economic terms, the more it becomes vulnerable to special interests or to antagonistic forces in political struggles. The counterbalance to be developed is an equally forceful defense of World Heritage sites by the broadest coalitions possible: youth, artists, foundations, private and voluntary organisations, scientists and politicians.
4. A deeper, and more philosophical, rather than purely political and conjunctural, analysis of the representativity of the World Heritage List and its implications in the new context of local/global structures should also be advanced.

I would like to end by saying that it has been an honour for me to have been able to serve the world community through this organization. And to have had the opportunity to work in culture, especially on cultural heritage which, as one delegate said it in the General Conference, is so close to our hearts.

¹See Beschouch, Azedine. "The Destruction of the Old Bridge of Mostar" in World Culture Report, no.1, June, 1998:117.

Statement by Australia

In responding to the issues, the Australian Observer outlined the positive steps taken to protect World Heritage properties in Australia generally. In 1996, the Australian Parliament conducted a review of the management of Australia's World Heritage, indicating the high level of importance given to these matters in Australia. The Government has responded to the constructive recommendations of this report.

The Australian Government employs eighteen staff (cultural and natural specialists and administrators) full time to monitor and co-ordinate the management of World Heritage sites in Australia.

The Australian Government nominated two new sites for World Heritage last year and will do so again this year.

The Australian Government has boosted the resources available for World Heritage management. In 1997-98 the Government allocated US\$22.7 million for World Heritage

management. This excludes separate external funding for Kakadu, Uluru, the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage property, and also contributions from the states.

The Government has established ministerial councils (consisting of responsible ministers from the Australian Government and the relevant state governments) for all World Heritage properties. The regular meetings of these councils have all been attended by the Australian Minister for the Environment. These councils constantly monitor major threats to World Heritage properties.

Australia is ensuring that World Heritage properties have official community consultative bodies and scientific advisory bodies in place. The Australian Government is reviewing the World Heritage property areas to strengthen the Government's ability to manage more effectively World Heritage properties and give it more powers of protection.

INTERVENTION OF AMBASSADOR ABELARDO POSSO-SERRANO, HEAD OF THE ECUADORIAN DELEGATION TO THE MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE.

PARIS, JUNE 23 1998

Mr. Chairman:

Please allow me to make an official statement of the Government of Ecuador concerning the Special Regime Law for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Province of Galapagos due to the importance that my Government concedes to this Law, which was inspired in a very justified demand from the World Heritage Committee and which expedition has permitted that the Galapagos Islands will not be threatened to enter in the Danger List.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, ever since the creation of the National Park of Galapagos in 1959, the different Governments that my country has had have maintained a consistent position for protection of the maritime and terrestrial ecosystems from the Archipelago of Galapagos and all Ecuadorian Governments have always maintained present the obligation to start actions for the preservation and protection of the natural environment, this has reached the works for the infrastructure and development of the stands be performed, always have subordinated the principles for conservation and the foundation for sustainable development.

It is crucial that we recognize that this permanent attitude of the Governments has had its highs and lows, for that is that in some opportunity, the Archipelago of Galapagos, fundamentally, was in a condition to enter in the Danger List and thanks to the decision of this Committee the Government of Ecuador had the opportunity to make the adequate steps to solvent the risk situation and get out of the announced danger.

The Government of Ecuador always knew that one of the fundamental problems that affects the Galapagos Islands is based in the action of the animal and plant species introduced, in the influence of the human population and in the fragility of the natural endemic resources. The Galapagos Islands, also have been, especially during the last years, a place of tourist attraction and especial interest for the Ecuadorian population that leave in the continental area, this has signified an unexpected rise of the resident population of Galapagos, to the point that from the 4037 people that lived in Galapagos during 1974, have passed to be nowadays 14000 people, population that of course, have collaborated with the actions of preservation and protection of the natural environment, pressure that has been even greater due to the unprecedented tourism and other related activities such as transportation of food, accumulation of solid waste and the consequent growth of species introduced to the environment.

The generation of waste, only to refer to one of the problems, has been one of the issues of more incidence in the preservation of the natural environment, summed to the operations a little bit irresponsible of

tourism and a violent illegal fishery activity, in charge of well know multinationals around the world.

In this matter of fishery, it is crucial to consider that there is a growing international demand for determinate natural species of Galapagos, which has obligated pirate enterprises to incur in irrational actions in areas considered and continue to be considered reserves.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, due to the current threats, Ecuador has the pride to manifest that the Terrestrial areas of the National Park and the interior sea of Galapagos, have been very little changed, due to the fact that the natural environment of the Islands continues to maintain a estate of nature very much acceptable, and it could be said that the conditions to recognize Galapagos as one of the sanctuaries of conservation of nature, and for that, Natural heritage of humanity are still present, all these thanks to the understanding, assistance and permanent support of the World Heritage Center.

The good disposition of the Committee was the factor that moved, as I said at the beginning of this statement, the Government of Ecuador to renew the legal framework to guarantee the adequate conservation of the bio-diversity and the ecological richness of the Archipelago and to put to work some important actions of vigilance and protection so that the commitments of the Special Regime become a reality.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Ecuador has constituted a Special Commission for the new Law elaboration, the same that was widely discussed by all the institutions and natural persons that have special interests for the preservation of the natural environment of Galapagos. Du ring January of last year, the National Congress approved a special regulation relative to the Maritime reserve, which gave place that the complete text could be submitted for Presidential approval, which with very light reserves, became a reality in March of the current year, when it was accomplished to finish the substantial solemnities and to put in vigilance the Special Law under discussion.

The Special Regime Law, starts with the consideration that the right of residence, property and commerce of the Ecuadorians have to necessarily be restricted in protection areas that the Galapagos ecosystem deserves; this means, that even though ,he Political Constitution of Ecuador warranties these rights, it is thought that the right to live in an environment free of contamination, obligates the State to control, in a special manner, to delimit special actions for the preservation of nature, and with this objective, to take special actions of vigilance, that in certain way could restrict the rights and liberties mentioned earlier.

This restriction totally justify, for singular natural, scientific and educational value that has to be preserved perpetually in the Galapagos Islands, not only for the

intrinsic value of the natural park but also for the intentional compromise that Ecuador acquired with this Committee and the international community.

The Special Law of Galapagos recognizes the existence of special dangers for bio-diversity and establishes that the first of these dangers is the presence of species taken from the Continent to the islands and also determines the conservation of the national heritage as a priority to maintain in the natural terrestrial areas as well as in the natural maritime areas, with a close coordination with the development of human settlements and with the measures that have to be adopted for the control of tourism and other parallel activities.

It is recognized that an interconnection exists between the terrestrial zones and the maritime zones of course, also with the human settlements in everything that has to do with the conservation of the first and the necessities to maintain a sustainable development that depends upon the adequate management of the three components, for the needed preservation of the exceptional biological diversity and to reach integrity and functionality on the particular ecological and evolution processes, in benefit of humanity, local populations, science and education.

The Law establishes, as it has been correctly reflected in the document prepared by the Secretariat, basic norms for the establishment of planning policies, the institutional framework, with the strengthening of the National Institute of Galapagos, which was matter of special concern to this Committee, and the determination of its specific attributions, of internal organization, of the attributions of the Council and Technical Secretary.

An important chapter of the Law refers to the protected areas that constitute the National Park and the Maritime Reserve, both components of the National Heritage of Protected Areas. Regarding the maritime reserve of the province of Galapagos, which became a matter of special concern of this Committee, the Law foresees that it has to be subject to some conditions of multiple use and integrated administration, the same that comprehends a strip of 40 maritime miles, measures from the lines of base of the Archipelago and internal waters.

In the same manner, the Law foresees the conformation of an Inter-institutional authority for the management of the islands, in which all the public ministries and private institutions that have to do with the islands such as the Provincial Chamber of tourism, and the Chambers of the fishery sector and conservation, science and education of the Galapagos. It has also been established as a maritime area.

Another section of the Law establishes the residency categories of human being in the Islands, in order to differentiate permanent residents, temporary residents and tourists, this is done with the objective of clearly determining each group's responsibilities and obligations.

Finally, it deserves special mention the legal provisions concerning the productive activities in the Galapagos Islands, especially the fishery activity, which is subject to fundamental principles of conservation, adaptive management and sustainable utilization of the hydro-biological resources, besides the fishery zones, transport and commercialization, of the regulations for artesian fishing and special requirements and registers.

In the same way, inside this productive activities is adequately regulated the tourism and the conservation, taking under consideration the proper operators, the development and tourism, the construction of infrastructure for foreign ships and the allowed numbers in the islands.

Concerning the artesian activity, this is closely linked with the necessities of environmental control and for the effect some provisions are established, and specific rules for the waste management, with the corresponding imposition of incentives and sanctions to the aggressors.

Last but not lest, I would like to underline that Ecuador will honor with responsibility and effort all the commitments adopted in Naples and will present periodic reports of the state or conservation of the site.

As can be seen. Mr. Chairman, in this extent exposition that Ecuador felt necessary so it is adequately registered, not only the appreciation of the country for the help received, for the support of this Committee, but also for the effort of the Authorities for having planned and later approved a modern Law which has been adequate to the fundamental principles that have taken this committee to declare Galapagos a Natural Heritage of Humanity and that have imposed some obligations to Ecuador, which to day ratifies that is willing to strictly abide always in the benefit of Mankind.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Ecuador is fully aware that it is only a first step and still remains a lot to do, for which we count on the international cooperation of the members of the Committee and the Convention as a whole.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT BY IUCN ON ITEM 5.2 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA: State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List: under the heading of NATURAL HERITAGE: Australian World Heritage sites and specifically relating to Kakadu National Park World Heritage Area

1. IUCN recognises that World Heritage has a very high profile in Australia and receives great public attention, often articulated through non-government organisations, many of which are members of IUCN along with IUCN's State and government agency members.

2. Agenda Item 5.2 refers to correspondence addressed to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee on the subject of what are seen as threats to a number of properties in Australia inscribed on the World Heritage List including Kakadu National Park. IUCN also notes advice from the World Heritage Centre dated 18 June 1998 that fifteen faxes had been received in the 24 hours to 18 June 1998 "from a variety of non governmental organisations from around the World expressing concern about the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park, Australia. The faxes refer to the commencement of construction of the Jabiluka uranium mine and call for the site to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger".

3. On issues of major significance, IUCN's approach is derived, *inter alia*, from the periodic World Conservation Congresses. Resolution 1.104 dealing with "Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia" was adopted by the Congress at its 1st Session in Montreal, Canada, 14-23 October 1996 and a copy of this resolution is attached to this statement.

4. This resolution recognises that Kakadu has been inscribed on the World Heritage List for its natural and cultural values, that its wetland areas are listed under the Ramsar Convention and that the sites of "the three uranium deposits, Ranger, Jabiluka and Koongarra, are located on land owned by Aboriginal people. Were never included in Kakadu National Park and are surrounded by the Park. " The resolution noted, *inter alia* that 'mining in Jabiluka or Koongarra has the potential to damage the natural and cultural values of Kakadu' and recognisad that " the Aboriginal Traditional Owners have the right to make decisions about the use of their land, including whether mining takes place...."

5. Key points in the action section of the resolution are:

i. to urge the Government of Australia "if the Traditional Owners and the Northern Land Council should ever approve of mining of the Jabiluka or Koonagarra sites, to :

a) ensure that any proposal to mine is subject to a public process of stringent environmental assessment:

b) ensure that any mining activity is subject to a standard of monitoring, supervision and regulation sufficient to ensure the continued absence of any detectable impact on Kakadu National Park;

ii. to urge the Government of Australia to prevent the development of Jabiluka and Koongarra uranium mines should it be shown that such mining would threaten the Park's World Heritage values;

iii. to urge the Government of Australia to facilitate inclusion of the Jabiluka and Koongarra areas in Kakadu National Park when and if requested by Traditional Owners and the Northern Land Council"

IUCN believes that these key points remain pertinent and merit consideration by the Committee/Bureau.

6. Events since the adoption of the World Conservation Congress resolution in October 1996 confirm the concerns expressed in the resolution. For example, IUCN is quoted in the Report of the Rapporteur of the Extraordinary session of the Bureau (Naples, 28-29 November 1997) as reporting on a proposal to mine on a mining lease enclave within but not part of the World Heritage area. IUCN reported then that 77 concerns had been identified over the proposal and that (Environment Australia's) Senior Supervisory Scientist had also suggested that a new Environmental Impact Assessment would be needed should the location of the mill be changed. IUCN said that IUCN "is receiving reports from Australian groups about the potential impacts and some have proposed the site should be considered for the List of World Heritage in Danger". The Rapporteur's report goes on to say that "Australia advised that the 77 "concerns" are in fact conditions that have been set by the Government on the mining company. Particular attention in these recommendations was paid by the Minister for the Environment to protecting World Heritage values." The record of the Australian statement goes on to say that "Mining will not proceed until these conditions are met" and that "The issue of Aboriginal involvement is recognized as an important one and the Australian Government and the mining company have committed themselves to ongoing consultation with the Aboriginal people. The Australian Government has commissioned an independent social impact study, at the request of the traditional owners, and is responding to the outcome.

Referring back to the IUCN Resolution, it would be helpful to know if the Traditional Owners and the Northern Land Council have approved of mining of the Jabiluka and/or Koongarra sites,

7. Although an Environmental Assessment of the Jabiluka mine has been carried out, IUCN is aware of public concern expressed in Australia and internationally on the adequacy of it. IUCN is also aware of a statement by Professor Michael Pitman as Chief Scientist, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Australia headed "Precautionary Principle" which said:

"Where there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.

In the application of the precautionary principle, public and private decisions should be guided by:

- careful evaluation to avoid, wherever practicable, serious or irreversible damage to the environment.

- an assessment of the risk-weighted consequences of various options."

8. In its Technical Evaluation of the re-nominated Kakadu National Park, IUCN in 1992 reported to the Committee that the issue of mining 'is addressed only briefly in the nomination but the long-term aspects of waste disposal and eventual recovery give some cause for concern. In addition to the excised uranium mine at Ranger, there are also two other excised leases, one of which (Jabiluka) is located close to an important floodplain inside the park. The future potential effects on Kakadu of uranium mining outside the park and from within the enclosure deserve on-going scrutiny. In concluding that the conditions of integrity of the re-nominated Kakadu World Heritage site were met, IUCN flagged its view that the possible effects of future mining in the excised leases could cause future problems.

9. At a meeting of the Steering Committee of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) held on 8 -12 June 1998, a draft policy on mining and associated activities in relation to protected areas, in general, was adopted. This includes, *inter alia*, the statement that WCPA 'believes that exploration and extraction of mineral resources which are outside of, but impacting on, protected areas should be subject to EIA procedures which consider, *inter alia*, the effects of any activity on the protected area, recommend operating and after use conditions, and ensure that the values of the protected area are safeguarded.'

10. In relation to Kakadu, IUCN is not in possession of information on the 77 conditions set by the Australian Government on the mining company so is unable to make any assessment of their adequacy or otherwise.

11. **IUCN's position** on the issue of Kakadu and mining can be summed up as follows:

- a) the resolution from the World Conservation Congress in October 1996 remains a valid source of guidance for IUCN's advice to the Committee, including in relation to the rights of the traditional owners;
- b) the precautionary principle is relevant;
- c) IUCN is unable at this time to assess the adequacy of the 77 conditions set by the Australian Government on the mining company;
- d) on the basis of a), b) and c) IUCN considers that mining activity should be deferred until the World Heritage Committee is satisfied that the adequacy of the 77 conditions is assessed; and
- e) if invited to do so and provided with the necessary information and resources to support a multi-disciplinary team, IUCN would participate in a mission to assess the situation and report to the Bureau/Committee.

1.104 Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia

**FROM: World Conservation Congress: Resolutions and Recommendations.
IUCN, 1997, pp89-90**

RECALLING Recommendation 19.87 from the 19th Session of the IUCN General Assembly;

RECOGNIZING that Kakadu has been described as one of the more important national parks in the World, and has been inscribed on the World Heritage List for its natural and cultural values;

NOTING that all wetland areas in Kakadu National Park are listed under the Ramsar Convention;

NOTING that the sites of the three uranium deposits, Ranger, Jabiluka and Koongarra, are located on land owned by Aboriginal people, were never included in Kakadu National Park and are surrounded by the Park;

AWARE that the independent scientific authority established to monitor the impact of the Ranger mine has detected no adverse impact on Kakadu National Park or its World Heritage values;

NOTING that, subject to the appropriate approvals, the Ranger site will be included in Kakadu National Park following rehabilitation;

NOTING, however, that mining in Jabiluka or Koongarra has the potential to damage the natural and cultural values of Kakadu;

RECOGNIZING that the Aboriginal Traditional Owners have the right to make decisions about the use of their land, including whether mining takes place, and that the issue is now being discussed among the Traditional Owners, some of whom support mining while others oppose it;

The World Conservation Congress at its 1st Session in Montreal, Canada, 14-23 October 1996:

1. URGES the Government of Australia if the Traditional Owners and Northern Land Council should ever approve mining of the Jabiluka or Koongarra sites, to:
 - a) ensure that any proposal to mine is subject to a public process of stringent environmental assessment;
 - b) ensure that any mining activity is subject to a standard of monitoring, supervision and regulation, sufficient to ensure the continued absence of any detectable impact on Kakadu National Park;
2. URGES the Government of Australia to prevent the development of Jabiluka and Koonagarra uranium mines should it be shown that such mining would threaten the Park's World Heritage values;
3. URGES the Government of Australia to facilitate inclusion of the Jabiluka and Koongarra areas in Kakadu National Park when and if requested by Traditional Owners and the Northern Land Council.

Note. This Recommendation was adopted by consensus. The delegations of the State members Australia stated that since the Recommendation deals with matters about which the Australian Government is forming a view, it was inappropriate for their delegation and that of the Northern Territory Government Agency member to support or object to the Recommendation. Had there been a vote the delegations would have abstained. The delegation of the State member Germany indicated that it had not participated in discussion of the Recommendation nor would it have participated in any voting. The delegation of the State members Norway, Sweden and United States indicated that had there been a vote they would have abstained".

**Statement by the Representative of Australia
on Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

Mr Chairman

When Kakadu was placed on the World Heritage List, it had an operating uranium mine in an enclave within it.

The mine has been operating for eighteen years. There has been no damage to the World Heritage Values of Kakadu as a result. The mine has been overseen by a specific agency within the Commonwealth Environment Department, headed by the Supervising Scientist.

The present proposal is to mine in the same area, and under more stringent conditions. Neither the area of the operating mine, nor of the proposed mine, is not part of the World Heritage area and the values of these areas were not taken into account in the nomination. The area of the mineral lease, which is being mined, comprises less than 0.005% of the area of Kakadu National Park, and predates it. Less than approximately 1% of the Jabiluka lease which will be used for mining.

In 1982 the Northern Land Council, a statutory organisation elected by and representing all the traditional landowners of the northern part of the Northern Territory, agreed to mining within the Jabiluka lease area. So did the traditional owners of the lease. I will like to stress, Mr Chairman, that mining on Aboriginal land in the Northern Territory is illegal without the consent of the traditional owners. Careful procedures have been taken to ensure that consensus is, in this case, valid.

In 1997 the Northern Land Council and representatives of affected Aboriginal groups in the Kakadu area were represented on a Committee to consider the change of scope for the Jabiluka project, in line with the 1982 Agreement. The Committee also included representatives from the Commonwealth government, the Northern Territory and the mining company. The Committee agreed to the proposed changes. The revised project contains substantial environmental improvements by comparison to the one which was the subject of the 1982 Agreement.

One group - the traditional owners of the Jabiluka lease area itself - did not agree to the change of scope proposal, and considers that the 1982 Agreement was signed under duress. This group (the Mirrar People) is one of many groupings of traditional landowners and affected Aborigines within the Kakadu area.

Extensive work has been done on an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the mine, which especially addressed the safeguarding of the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The Minister for the Environment has a statutory obligation to protect such values along with other natural and cultural values.

As a result 77 conditions were set, and these will have to be met, before the Commonwealth will issue an export licence for uranium ore from the mine. Some of these had to be completed before construction of the mine could commence.

A recent review by the Commonwealth's Environment Department, including the Federal Environment Protection Agency and the statutory body responsible for overseeing the mine, the Supervising Scientist Group, confirmed that these applicable conditions either have been met, or are in progress to be met.

The Australian Government however, while acknowledging this, has not approved of any mining in the area.

Recently, construction has begun on works for the proposed underground mine, and this is in accord with Commonwealth requirements. Construction of the pit head will have no significant environmental effects. Construction of the pit head is at the company's own risk - no final approval for mining has yet been given. It will be another 18 months before sufficient works have been completed to allow extraction of uranium ore to take place.

Mining will not happen until all the conditions are met, and is at least 18 months away. A requirement at that time will be that an export licence for uranium be obtained from the Australian Government.

There is no evidence that mining will effect the natural environment for which the Park was listed. The proposed milling method of the ore from the mine has been changed because of the objections of the traditional owners of the Jabiluka lease area (the Mirrar people). A Public Environment Review (PER) is now underway to assess the proposed change, which involves milling on site. The original proposal involved the trucking of the ore, through the lease, to the existing facility at the Ranger mine. Commonwealth environmental approval has not yet been given for the proposed method but approval will depend on the outcome of the PER.

In parallel with part of the EIS process a comprehensive study of the social impacts on the Aboriginal community over the last 20 years has also been undertaken. Mining, tourism, westernisation generally have contributed to changes in the local community, with some deleterious effects. The introduction to the study makes it clear that it is impossible to determine the relative impact of the different influences on the community.

Nevertheless, the outcome of the study is a series of recommendations to address negative impacts and to enhance opportunities for Aboriginal people in the Kakadu region. The list includes proposed benefits in education,

housing, provision of services to the Aboriginal community and measures to ensure the maintenance of Aboriginal culture.

There are some important aboriginal cultural sites in the lease area which are listed on Australia's Register of the National Estate. These are not part of the World Heritage area, and were not assessed as part of its value. However, there is certainly a deep spiritual connection between these sites and those within the Park. For this reason, stringent conditions have been developed to protect them. None of the sites are in the area to be mined, or proposed ancillary services. The government considers that the stringent conditions are sufficient to physically protect these sites.

One other site - Boyweg, is located within the lease area. Boyweg is a natural sacred associated with natural features. The Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority of the Northern Territory Government has examined the site and has concluded that there is insufficient evidence about this site to register it as a sacred site. The Company has respected the traditional owner's wishes to do no survey works at all in this area: and has undertaken to move, after consultation, any ancillary facilities which may affect this site.

I was pleased with the key points flagged by IUCN in its statement. They remain relevant, and have either been, or are in the process of, being met. I will briefly respond to each of the points:

1. if approval should ever be obtained from traditional owners: traditional owners have given their approval for mining.
2. any proposal to mine be subject to stringent environmental assessment: stringent conditions have been set for existing and any proposed mining operation to ensure the protection and safeguarding of the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park.
3. supervision and regulation of mining: existing and any future mining in Kakadu has been overseen by a specific agency within the Commonwealth Environment Department, headed by the Supervising Scientist, established for that purpose. 77 conditions have been set by the Commonwealth, and all must be met before any further mining will be approved.
4. prevent mining development if it is shown it would threaten the World Heritage values of Kakadu: as stated above, 77 conditions aimed at protecting World Heritage values must be met before mining will be approved.
5. include Jabiluka and Koongara in Kakadu National Park when and if requested by traditional owners and the Northern Land Council: This issue has been discussed with traditional owners, and these areas will eventually be included in Kakadu National Park, if that is their wish.

Thank you Mr Chairman.

**Statement by the Supervising Scientist,
Department for the Environment, Australia,
on Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

Mr Chairman

I can only sympathise with Bureau members who may feel they are drowning in complexity and ambiguity, given the amount of official and unofficial comment on this issue. In the spirit of trying to clarify some of these issues, I make the following observations. I make the observations in my role as Supervising Scientist, an independent statutory position established by the Australian Government to monitor the operations of any mining in the Alligator Rivers Region - a region which includes the Kakadu National Park World Heritage Area, and a number of mining leases. I might also add that prior to taking this position I held the position of Head of the Agency responsible for managing Kakadu and Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park World heritage Areas for Seven and a half years.

In the 20 years or so since the position of Supervising Scientist was established, in the same set of decisions which also established the first stage of Kakadu National Park, no significant environmental effects from the operations of the Ranger uranium mine have been detected. Despite frequent statements that releases of contaminated water occur regularly that is simply not the case. It is a matter of record that my agency was for some years devising a regulatory regime which would allow water release if the rainfall conditions both required it, and provide the volume flow to dilute any release. The system was never put into effect, however. Some three years ago the Kakadu National Park Board of Management requested that no release of contaminated water be allowed. The Mining company has complied with that request, and release of contaminated waters is now not on the agenda. All waters to do with the tailings operations of mining are contained within a restricted release zone.

Mr Chairman, I cannot emphasise enough the attention given to this issue by the Australian Government, and, indeed, the Mining Company. It is true to say the Mine is the most thoroughly supervised in the world - as of course it should be. I should now like to turn to the proposal for the establishment of a mine at Jabiluka. The historical perspective has been sketched by my colleague. An Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Jabiluka mine, with ore milling at the existing infrastructure at the Ranger site, has been accepted, with 77 conditions placed on the Company by the Ministers for Environment and Resources. These conditions cover a wide range of issues, and attest to the level of concern by the Australian Government to this issue. The traditional owner of the lease area however has not agreed to this development, leaving, in a legal sense, only the original proposal, including milling at the Jabiluka minesite, able to be pursued.

There was a process of arbitration foreseen for any changes when the original agreement was made in 1982. As did my colleague, I note that the Traditional Owner has the view that this 1982 agreement was made under duress. The process of Arbitration has proceeded, including the Northern Land Council and other Aboriginal representatives, and the Committee has agreed the Mine could proceed, including modifications for milling at the Jabiluka minesite. This latter proposition was not included in the approved Environmental Impact Statement and is currently being assessed through a Public Environmental Report, part of the Australian legal Environmental Impact Assessment process.

Mr Chairman, I should like to touch briefly on some of the detail in the clear and comprehensive report from the IUCN. Australia notes the representations received by the IUCN on this issue, but wishes to indicate that these representations are often based on incorrect factual data. We understand that IUCN is a complex creature on whom we all rightly depend for independent technical advice. As a State member of the Union we are confident its' clear technical advice can be delivered without any political gloss, although we recognise that some close and further investigation may be necessary to achieve that position. We particularly draw Bureau members attention to the footnote to the resolution referred to in the IUCN information.

Mr Chairman, I have already noted that the Northern Land Council was part of legal process which agreed to a process for further assessment of the milling facilities for the Jabiluka milling option. There is no proposal before Government concerning the lease known as Koongarra. I am puzzled with respect to comments attributed to Professor Pitman, who retired as Chief Scientist two years ago, I should note the Precautionary approach is a bi-partisan approach to environmental management in Australia. Neither Professor Pitman nor his successor have made any comment with respect to the Jabiluka situation. It might also be of interest to add that the precautionary principle is to be enshrined in new environmental legislation currently being developed by the Government.

Mr Chairman, I again re-iterate that the Australian Government has not given any approval for mining, and is still pursuing the Public Environmental Review process of the Jabiluka Milling option Environmental Impact Assessment process. While it is true the Company have been allowed to start some preliminary work covered the approved EIS, it is on the assumption that this work will not prejudice the outcome of the PER. Indeed, it is worth noting that mining would not commence until approximately 18 months after final approvals, should that be given. So, Mr Chairman it is the view of the Australian

Government, as well as my professional independent view, that there are no issues posing potential danger to the natural criteria for which the Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List. Indeed it is worth reminding delegates that the 1992 listing of Kakadu National Park with increased boundaries included a number of former gold and uranium mines which used mining methods which would not today be allowed! Part of the long term management strategy for the Park will include re-habilitation of these minesites. Rehabilitation of the existing Ranger Mine and the proposed Jabiluka mine, to a standard where they may be able to be included in the Park, if desired by the traditional owners, is part of the long term strategy for these areas.

While perhaps not of direct concern to this Bureau, it is worth noting that key areas of the Site adjacent to the Mines are also listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. My organisation has spent considerable research effort to ensure the ecological character of these systems is not changed, as required by that Convention. The Government clearly understands its double responsibility for these wetland ecological systems.

Mr Chairman, I hope it is now clear that there are still processes to be worked through in a careful way by all parties in the coming months on these issues. Besides the Impact assessment procedures, implementation of the outcomes of a study on social impact of mining on Aboriginal Communities in the region is a high priority for Government. As the foreword to the recent Study into Social Impact by Patrick Dodson, a prominent Aboriginal Australian states, and I quote:

What is important is that the social contract of 20 years ago, which was to have the safeguards and offsets to allow the various cultures to co-exist and to flourish has not lived up to expectations of the people of the time. However it is neither fair nor accurate to deduce that mining or miners have failed or have caused the problems. Nor the Aborigines, governments agencies or even the tourists. Indeed we see no profit in applying blame to particular groups".

The Australian Government aims to achieve fair and equitable outcomes on these issues. We also want, and operate through, transparent processes. Although we see no real need for a mission on this or other issues we will, of course, cooperate in every way possible should the Bureau so decide.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Statement by Italy

Upon conclusion of the examination of the dossiers concerning the state conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and the proposals for new inscriptions, the Delegation of Italy wishes to express, Mr Chairman, a few thoughts on certain difficulties which have arisen during this exercise.

Considering, for instance eight natural properties proposed for inscription, we noted that the evaluation reports of the advisory body were only available for three proposals. Italy fully understands the difficulties with which IUCN might have been confronted. Nevertheless, it believes that - in order to respect the timetable established by Article 65 of the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention - an attempt should be made to organise the work of the advisory bodies in collaboration with the Secretariat in such a way as to keep to the timetable and permit the States Parties to complete their dossiers as well as to finalise and transmit the said evaluation reports before the Bureau session.

In fact, the non-availability, in due time, of evaluation reports prevents the necessary thorough elaboration for the adoption of well-considered decisions.

Although nothing to this effect is specified, in the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention, the prior knowledge of such evaluations would satisfy the needs of the Bureau and the Committee in fully and correctly carrying out their functions, and also States Parties would have more confidence in the organs of the Convention.

To this end, it would be desirable to introduce into the Guidelines appropriate rules.

Italy undertakes to present to the next session of the Bureau appropriate proposals. Those States Parties wishing to be associated with this exercise will be welcome.

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-second extraordinary session
Kyoto, Japan**

27-28 November 1998

Provisional Agenda

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
4. Nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
5. Requests for International Assistance
6. Recommendations to the World Heritage Committee based on the report of the Consultative Body
7. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention
8. Other business
9. Adoption of the report
10. Closure of the session.

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-second session
Kyoto, Japan**

30 November – 5 December 1998

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur
4. Report by the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee
5. Report of the Rapporteur on the sessions of the World Heritage Bureau
6. Methodology and procedures for periodic reporting
7. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger
8. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
9. Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee
10. Progress report, synthesis and action plan on the Global Strategy and thematic and comparative studies for a balanced and representative World Heritage List

11. Examination of the World Heritage Fund and approval of the budget for 1999, and presentation of a provisional budget for 2000
12. Requests for international assistance
13. World Heritage documentation, information and educational activities
14. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
15. Date, place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
16. Date and place of the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee
17. Other business
18. Adoption of the report of the session
19. Closure of the session