

Limited Distribution
SC/84/CONF.004/9

Buenos Aires, 2 November

1984

Original: English and

French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee

Eighth Ordinary Session

Buenos Aires, Argentina, 29 October-2 November 1984

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The eighth session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the Centro Cultural General San Martin, Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 29 October

- 2 November at the invitation of the Argentine authorities. It was attended

by the following States Members of the World Heritage Committee: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cyprus, France, Germany (Fed. Rep. of), Guinea,

Italy, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Switzerland and Turkey.

2. Representatives of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) attended the meeting in an advisory capacity.

3. Observers from 16 States Parties to the Convention, not members of the Committee, were also present as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Holy See, Honduras, Iraq, Madagascar, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Portugal~ Spain, United States of America, Yugoslavia. The Chairman of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC) and a representative of the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) also attended the meeting. The full list of participants is found in Annex I to this report.

CLT-85/WS/11

*[2]

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. A formal inauguration of the session took place in the main hall of the Centro Cultural General San Martin. The Lord Mayor of the city of Buenos

Aires, Mr. S.C. Saguier, welcomed all participants and indicated how important

the work of the Convention was in protecting cultural and natural properties,
and stressed Argentina's full commitment to support its objectives.

5. Mr. M. Batisse, Assistant Director General (Science Sector), gave a welcoming address on behalf of the Director General of Unesco in which he explained the purpose, the functioning and the present situation of the Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. He stressed the importance and originality of the Convention and the unanimous support it was receiving in the world. He recalled that Argentina had already one property inscribed on the World Heritage List and that the nominations of two more, namely a cultural property - the Ruins of the Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis - and a natural property - Iguazu National Park - would be examined by the Committee at this session.

6. The meeting was opened by the outgoing Chairman, Mrs. L. Vlad-Borrelli (Italy) who welcomed all delegates and observers and thanked the Argentine authorities for their invitation to host the meeting.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. The Committee adopted the agenda for the meeting.

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

8. Mr. Jorge Gazaneo (Argentina) was elected Chairman of the Committee by acclamation. Mr. Lucien Chabason (France) was elected Rapporteur and the representatives of the following States Parties were also elected by acclamation as Vice-Chairmen: Algeria, Australia, Norway, Pakistan and Senegal.

V. REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

9. Mr. Batisse, Assistant Director General (Science Sector) presented the report of the Secretariat on the activities undertaken since the seventh session of the Committee held in Florence, Italy, on 5-9 December 1983. He noted that the Convention had since been ratified or accepted by another five States (Mexico, Qatar, United Kingdom, Arab Republic of Yemen and Zambia) bringing the total of States Parties to 83. However, in spite of this steady progression, some large countries were still missing and the representation of Asian countries was still to be strengthened. He indicated that 27 new nominations to the World Heritage List, recommended by the Bureau at its eighth session, would be examined by the Committee as well as 4 nominations to the List of World Heritage in Danger, of which three concerned natural sites. Mr. Batisse described the status of implementation of the technical cooperation requests approved by the Committee at Florence, and of the "small scale" technical cooperation, preparatory assistance and support for training which had been approved by the Chairman of the Committee during 1984. He

indicated that 9 new requests for technical cooperation were presented to the Committee but that regrettably the sums requested largely exceeded the possibilities of the World Heritage Fund. In this connection, he noted that the financial situation was critical and would be a dominating topic of debate for the Committee at this session. Mr. Batisse finally stressed that recent debates within Unesco have shown the continued interest of all Member States in the smooth and successful implementation of the Convention.

10. In commenting on the report of the representative of the Director General, Mr. G. Whitlam, of Australia, indicated that it was gratifying to note the continued expansion of the Convention and described efforts which the President of the Australian Unesco National Commission and he himself had made to encourage the ratification particularly of countries of S.E. Asia and the Pacific.

11. Taking the floor as an observer, Mr. Bakri, Chairman of the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture noted the critical situation of the World Heritage Fund and indicated that a special meeting was to be held to study means to generate income to this Fund and to the support of culture in general.

VI. REPORT OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

12. Mr. da Silva Telles (Brazil), Rapporteur of the previous Bureau, presented the report of the eighth session of the Bureau held on 4-7 June 1984. He furthermore presented a report of the complementary meeting of the Bureau which had taken place on 29 October prior to the eighth session of the Committee itself. This complementary Bureau meeting aimed first of all at considering the conclusions of a group of experts brought together by ICOMOS to study the criteria applicable to historic towns and secondly examining the nominations of the historic centres of Quebec, Canada (N° 300) and of Salvador, Brazil (N° 309) in the light of these conclusions. It was attended by Mrs. Vlad-Borrelli (Chairperson), the representatives of Algeria, Australia, Guinea and Norway (Vice-Chairmen), Mr. A. da Silva Telles, Rapporteur, as well as the representatives of ICOMOS. The representatives of Bulgaria, Cyprus and Senegal attended as observers.

13. The Bureau examined the conclusions of the Meeting of Experts to Consult on Historic Towns which met in Paris from 5 to 7 September 1984 and which was organised by ICOMOS. While commending ICOMOS for the work it had accomplished and adopting the proposed methodology, the Bureau suggested that several amendments might be made to this document, which was intended for wide distribution as a set of guidelines. Moreover, at the proposal of the representative of Guinea, the Bureau laid particular stress on the point that in the selection of towns for inclusion in the World Heritage List, the more general values of renown and cultural representativity should be considered, in so far as possible, along with the technical criteria defined by the experts. Since the selection of a town for inclusion in the World Heritage List called for a common conservational effort by its inhabitants,

the latter must be closely associated with -any decision upon which the future of the property in question depended.

14. After examining the ICOMOS report and the recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee adopted the following text:

*[4]

'Article 1 of the Convention provides for the inclusion in the World Heritage List of "groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science".

Groups of urban buildings eligible for inclusion in the World Heritage List fall into three main categories, namely:

- i towns which are no longer inhabited but which provide immutable archaeological evidence of a past; these generally satisfy the general criterion of authenticity and can be easily managed;
- ii historic towns which are still inhabited and which, by their very nature, have developed and will continue to develop under the influence of socio-economic and cultural change, a situation that renders the assessment of their authenticity more difficult and any conservation policy more problematical;
- iii new towns of the twentieth century which paradoxically have something in common with both the aforementioned categories: while their urban organization is clearly recognizable and their authenticity is undeniable, their future is unclear because their development cannot be controlled.

The assessment of towns that are no longer inhabited does not raise any special difficulties other than those related to archaeological sites in general. The general criterion of the uniqueness or exemplary character of a town has been used to make decisions regarding cultural properties that are clearly representative of a specific urban type or structure and contain dense concentrations of monuments. Examples include Timgad (Algeria), Mohenjo-Daro (Pakistan) and Machupicchu (Peru). Sometimes as in the case of Cyrene (Libya) and Kilwa Kisiwani (Tanzania) the decisive criterion has been the town's important historical associations.

It is important for urban archaeological sites to be listed as integral units.

A cluster of monuments or a small group of buildings is not adequate to suggest the multiple and complex functions of a city which has disappeared; remains of such a city should be preserved in their entirety together with their natural surroundings whenever possible.

In the case of inhabited historic towns the difficulties are numerous, largely

owing to the fragility of their urban fabric (which has in many cases been seriously disrupted since the advent of the industrial era) and the runaway speed with which their surroundings have been urbanized. To qualify for inclusion, towns should possess architectural interest and should not be considered only on the intellectual grounds of the role they may have played

in the past or their value as historical symbols under criterion (vi) of the Guidelines. To be eligible for inclusion, the organization of space, structure, materials, forms and, where possible, functions of a cultural property should essentially reflect the civilization or succession of civilizations which have prompted the nomination of the property.

*[5]

Four categories of towns can be distinguished:

1) Towns which are typical of a specific period of culture, which have been almost wholly preserved and which have remained largely unaffected by subsequent developments. Here the property to be listed is the entire town together with its surroundings, which it is essential to protect as well. Examples include Ouro Preto (Brazil) and Shibam (Democratic Yemen).

2) Towns that have evolved along characteristic lines and have preserved, sometimes in the midst of exceptional natural surroundings, spatial arrangements and structures that are typical of the successive stages in their history. Here the clearly defined historic centre takes precedence over the present-day outskirts. Examples include Cuzco (Peru), Berne (Switzerland) and Split (Yugoslavia).

3) "Historic centres" that cover exactly the same area as ancient towns and are now enclosed within modern cities. Here it is necessary to determine the precise limits of the property in its widest historical dimensions and to make appropriate provision for the management of its immediate surroundings. Examples include Rome (Italy), the old city of Damascus (Syria), and the Medina of Tunis (Tunisia).

4) Sectors, quarters or isolated units which, even in the residual state in which they have survived, provide clear evidence of the character of a historic town which has disappeared. In such cases surviving areas and buildings should be adequate as an indication of the former whole. Examples include the Islamic district of Cairo (Egypt) and the Bryggen district in Bergen (Norway).

Historic centres and ancient districts should be listed only where they have

a large number of ancient buildings in a sufficiently good state of preservation to provide a direct indication of the characteristic features of a town of exceptional interest. Proposals regarding groups of isolated and unrelated buildings which allegedly represent, in and of themselves, a town whose urban fabric has ceased to be discernible should not be encouraged.

However, proposals could be made regarding works that occupy a limited space

but have had a major influence on the history of town planning, such as the squares of Nancy (France) and the Meidan-e-Shah square in Ispahan (Iran).

In such cases, the nomination should make it clear that it is the group of

monuments that is to be listed and the town is mentioned only incidentally as the place where the property is located. Similarly, if a building of clearly universal significance is located in severely degraded or insufficiently representative surroundings, it should, of course, be listed without any special reference to the town. Examples include the Mosque of Cordoba (Spain) and the Cathedral of Amiens (France).

It is difficult to assess the quality of new towns of the twentieth century. History alone will tell which of them will best serve as examples of contemporary town planning. The files on these towns should be shelved until all the traditional historic towns, which represent the most vulnerable part of the human heritage, have been entered on the World Heritage List.

*[6]

In conclusion, under present conditions, preference should be given inclusion in the World Heritage List of small or medium-sized towns, which are in a position to manage any potential growth, rather than the great metropolises, which cannot readily provide files that will serve as a satisfactory basis for their inclusion as complete units.

In view of the effects which the inclusion of a town in the World Heritage List could have on its future, this should remain a limited measure.

Inclusion in the List implies that legislative and administrative measures must first be taken to secure the protection of the property and its environment. Informed awareness on the part of the population concerned, without whose active participation any conservation scheme would be impractical, is also essential.

Unesco should be kept informed, through regular reports by competent authorities, of the current situation of cultural property that is protected under the World Heritage Convention.'

15. Consideration of nominations N°s 300 and 309

Noting that ICOMOS had been unable, between 7 September and 28 October 1984, to process the nominations of Quebec (N° 300) and Salvador (N° 309) in accordance with its normal procedure, the Committee decided to defer the consideration of those nominations until the 1985 session of the Bureau.

VII. TENTATIVE LISTS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES

16. As regards cultural properties, the Secretariat informed the States Parties that the Committee would like to receive the tentative lists of cultural properties of all States Parties wishing to submit subsequent nominations. Jordan and Libya have sent their tentative lists to the Secretariat, supplementing those already received from Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Lebanon, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United States of America.

17. The representative of ICOMOS pointed out that the establishment of such lists appeared to be easy for prehistoric properties, whereas, for other types of properties, the lists which have been received include properties

that are more of national, rather than universal, value. ICOMOS suggested that the properties included in the national lists should be grouped under various themes likely to give rise to international consensus, as those lists help ICOMOS not only to understand the States Parties' perception of their own heritage, but also to determine whether the tentative lists of other countries do not include some other property of the same type that better meets the criterion of outstanding universal value. ICOMOS, which conducts its thematical comparison work, felt that it was therefore necessary to obtain the lists requested: it could thus determine which properties, of those on these lists were most likely to be included, eventually, on the World Heritage List.

18. The Secretariat stressed the importance of a feedback between ICOMOS and the States Parties after receiving the tentative lists, so that the latter

*[7]

can be informed of ICOMOS' reaction and proceed with the nomination of their properties or with further elaborating their own selection criteria.

19. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany commented on the beneficial effect that such a dialogue could have for Federal States. indeed, it might help persuade the local authorities that are responsible for drawing up their own part of the tentative list to apply strict selection criteria.

20. As concerns tentative lists of natural sites, the representative of IUCN noted some differences between the needs for evaluation of cultural and natural properties and suggested that indicative lists of natural properties were not absolutely indispensable for IUCN to evaluate natural nominations. In 1982, IUCN had prepared a publication on the "World's Greatest Natural Areas" listing properties that in their view might be considered to be of World Heritage quality. This document was being updated to incorporate sites for which further information had been gathered or to include new sites which had been recently discovered. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany welcomed the compilation of the IUCN indicative inventory, particularly as it guided the identification of natural properties in countries with a federal system of government. The representative of Turkey noted that the Turkish authorities responsible for natural heritage had drawn up an indicative list of natural properties which might be considered for the World Heritage List although the IUCN inventory had not identified these. The representative of IUCN agreed that the inventory was incomplete and that national indicative lists would greatly help IUCN to improve their inventory. In this connection, the Committee noted that Bulgaria and France had just submitted tentative lists of natural properties, which supplement those received from Brazil, Canada, Italy, Portugal, USA and Turkey.

VIII. MIXED CULTURAL/NATURAL PROPERTIES AND RURAL LANDSCAPES

21. The Rapporteur, Mr. Chabason, brought up the question of mixed cultural/natural properties and particularly of rural landscapes, which meet criterion (iii) for natural sites as "exceptional combinations of natural and cultural elements". Mr. Chabason described three types of problems connected with such properties. The first was the question of identification of exceptionally harmonious, beautiful, man-made landscapes as epitomized by the terraced rice-fields of S.E. Asia, the terraced fields of the Mediterranean Basin or by certain vineyard areas in Europe. In this respect, criterion (iii) would have to be expanded to facilitate the identification of such properties. The second question concerned the evolution (equilibrium, transformation and regression) of such living landscapes in a similar manner as the evolution of historic towns. The third problem concerned the integrity of such landscapes which are seldom protected under national jurisdiction and require the concerted effort of the various land-owners and land-users in order to maintain their characteristics.

22. Finally, Mr. Chabason felt that the operational guidelines of the Convention did not give sufficient guidance to States Parties regarding such "mixed" properties and suggested that, on the occasion of the next Bureau session, ICOMOS and IUCN call a meeting of a group of experts, including geographers, to elaborate a working framework for the identification and nomination of such properties.

*[8]

23. Several States Members of the Committee expressed their agreement with Mr. Chabason's analysis and proposals. In particular, the representative of Italy described the difficulty of maintaining the traditional agricultural practices of the land around a given cultural monument. She also referred to the First World Conference on Cultural Parks, organised by the U.S. National Parks Service at Mesa Verde on 16-21 September 1984 and at which there had been a long debate on how to define a "cultural park".

24. Mr. Batisse recalled that the spirit of the World Heritage Convention was to place both the cultural and natural heritage on an equal footing. Accordingly, there should not be a polarisation towards either "culture" or "nature" although there had perhaps been such a tendency in the past as States Parties had initially nominated the properties which clearly met either the cultural or natural criteria. In this respect, the representative of ICOMOS emphasised the influence of the natural environment on the cultures which have built the monuments of World Heritage quality. In his opinion, however, the role of the Convention was not to "fix" such landscapes but rather to conserve their harmony and stability within a dynamic, evolutive framework. IUCN recalled that one of the eight types of "protected area" recognised by their organisation was the "protected landscape" which included,

for example, the national parks of the United Kingdom which consist essentially of man-modified and man-maintained landscapes. He warned, however, that care should be taken in the identification of such landscapes to ensure the nomination of only those properties of outstanding universal value. IUCN was to discuss the topic of "mixed" World Heritage properties at the IUCN General Assembly to be held in Madrid on 2-14 November 1984. Accordingly, the Committee requested IUCN to consult with ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) to elaborate guidelines for the identification and nomination of mixed cultural/natural rural properties or landscapes to be presented to the Bureau and the Committee at their forthcoming sessions.

IX. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

25. The Committee examined the nominations to the World Heritage List, taking account of the Bureau 's recommendations and of the evaluations of ICOMOS and IUCN for each property. The Committee decided to enter 23 cultural and natural properties on the World Heritage List which are presented in List A below . The Committee decided to defer a decision on four nominations presented in List B below. Finally, the Committee decided not to inscribe the eight properties presented in List C below.

*[9]

A. Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Contracting State having submitted the nomination of the property in accordance with the Convention	Ident. No.	Name of property	Criteria
Argentina	291	Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis	C (iv)

Under this name, the Committee decided to include jointly in the World Heritage List, along with Sao Miguel das Missoes, in Brazil (which is already included), the four missions nominated by Argentina, i.e. San Ignacio Mini, Santa Ana, Nuestra Senora de Loreto and Santa Marla la Mayor. It considered it would be desirable that certain missions located in Paraguay and Uruguay also be included in the World Heritage List, so that the whole group of monuments might provide a representative illustration of the Jesuit missions of the Guaranis. The Committee took this opportunity to invite the governments of Paraguay and of Uruguay to adhere to the World Heritage Convention. In addition, the Committee drew the attention of the authorities concerned to the necessity of protecting the surroundings of the missions.

Argentina	303	Iguazú National Park	N (iii) (iv)
-----------	-----	----------------------	--------------

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the Argentine authorities firmly intend to expand the area of the Park and to complete the management plan in

conformity with IUCN's recommendations. The Committee was furthermore glad to be informed by the representative of Brazil that the contiguous Iguazu National Park, on the Brazilian side of the river, would be nominated by the end of 1984 so that both parks could constitute next year a transfrontier World Heritage Site.

*[10]

Canada (i) (ii) (iii)	304	Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks	N
--------------------------	-----	----------------------------------	---

The Committee requested the Canadian authorities to consider adding the adjacent Provincial Parks of Mount Robson, Hamber, Mount Assiniboine and Kananskis to this property. Furthermore, the Committee agreed to incorporate the Burgess Shale site in this property, which henceforth would not be separately indicated on the World Heritage List. Finally, the Committee decided that the site be designated as the "Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks" to specify the precise boundary of the property within the entire chain of the Rocky Mountains.

Colombia	285	Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena	C (iv) (vi)
----------	-----	--	-------------

Noting that the monuments and architectural ensembles included in the List were located within the unique natural setting of the bay of Cartagena, the Committee also recommended that the bay be given the best protection possible.

Germany (Fed. Rep. of)	288	The Castles of Augustusburg and Falkenlust at Bruhl	C (ii) (iv)
Holy See (i) (ii) (iv) (vi)	286	Vatican City	C
India	246	The Sun Temple, Konarak	C (i) (iii) (vi)
India (iii)	249	Group of Monuments at Mahabalipuram	C (i) (ii) (vi)

*[11]

Lebanon	293	Anjar	C (iii) (iv)
---------	-----	-------	--------------

The Committee wished that strict protection be given not only to the intra-muros vestiges but also to the building with a central courtyard extra-muros in the east which had been brought to light. It also suggested that the surroundings of the site, where a modern village was being developed, be strictly protected.

Lebanon	294	Baalbek	C (i) (iv)
---------	-----	---------	------------

Spain (i) (iii) (iv)	314	The Albambra and the Generalife, Granada	C
-------------------------	-----	---	---

The Committee expressed the wish that, as indicated by the Spanish authorities, a large protection zone will ensure that the visual environment of this property will not be harmed by modern constructions.

Spain (ii) (iv) (vi)	316	Burgos Cathedral	C
-------------------------	-----	------------------	---

Spain (i) (ii) (vi)	318	Monastery and site of the Escorial, Madrid	C
------------------------	-----	---	---

The Committee called the Spanish authorities' attention to the importance of strictly protecting the natural environment which is inseparable from this monument.

Spain	320	Parque Guell, Palacio Guell and Casa Mila, in Barcelona	C (i) (ii) (vi)
-------	-----	---	-----------------

United States of America	307	The Statue of Liberty	C (i) (vi)
--------------------------	-----	-----------------------	------------

United States of America N(i) (ii) (iii)	308	Yosemite National Park	
---	-----	------------------------	--

In response to the Bureau's request on clarification of the status of the proposed dam constructions in proximity of this property, the Committee noted that the authorities had assured that the implementation of such proposals was highly unlikely. The Committee nevertheless requested to be informed by the American authorities of any developments in this respect which could affect the Park. It also noted with interest that the relevant authorities had the intention to implement a programme to reduce the impact of tourism.

*[14]

Zaire	280	Salonga National Park	N (ii) (iii)
-------	-----	-----------------------	--------------

The Committee requested the Zaire authorities to proceed as soon as possible to prepare and implement a management plan for the Park with due regard to creating an appropriate corridor linking the two sectors of the National Park.

Zimbabwe	302	Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas	N (ii) (iii) (iv)
----------	-----	---	----------------------

The Committee requested to be kept informed by the Zimbabwean authorities of the possible construction of a new dam on the Zambezi at Mapata Gorge. The Committee also requested the Zambian authorities to consider nominating the

adjacent Lower Zambezi National Park in order to eventually constitute a joint inscription on the World Heritage List.

B. Deferred nominations

Bangladesh 321 The Historic Mosque City of Bagerhat

The Committee decided to defer the inscription of the property until the authorities of Bangladesh had given the assurances which the Bureau had requested at its eighth session with regard to: - the highway which is now planned to traverse this site and which could be re-routed as suggested by ICOMOS; - the elaboration of a preservation and management plan along the lines of the conclusions of the Unesco mission which took place in 1983.

*[15]

Bangladesh 322 Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur

The Committee decided to defer the inscription of this property until the Bangladesh authorities had given assurances concerning the application of the measures proposed by the same Unesco mission, particularly with a view to avoiding the installation of mining industries in the proximity of the monastery.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 287 Prehistoric Rock-art Sites of Tadrart Acacus

The examination of this nomination was deterred at the request of the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Lebanon 297 Sidon

The Committee deferred the examination of this nomination pending a response from the Lebanese government to the Bureau's request to nominate only the Sanctuary of Echnon.

C. Nominations not to be considered for inclusion in the World Heritage List

Costa Rica 106 National Archaeological Park of Guayabo de Turrialba

The Committee considered that in its current state, this site did not fulfil the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List. A new nomination could be presented in the event that the excavations (which will no doubt need to be continued for a considerable time) produce results of exceptional universal interest.

*[16]

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 301 Archaeological Site of Ptolemais (Tolmeita)

X. NOMINATIONS TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

26. The Committee examined four nominations to the List of World Heritage in Danger submitted by the States Parties concerned. The Committee noted the recommendations of ICOMOS and IUCN and made the following decisions:

Wieliczka Salt Mine (Poland)

ICOMOS provided the Committee with the information which the Polish authorities had given for this property. The Committee considered that there was insufficient geological information at present to evaluate the dangers facing this property. The Committee therefore decided to defer a decision on this nomination until more information had been obtained and expressed the wish that in the meantime the national authorities concerned ensure the necessary protection.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal)

The Committee was informed by IUCN that the immediate threat posed by the earthen dam upstream from this property had been removed since the recent rains had been sufficiently abundant to wash this temporary dam away. However, the longer term threat posed by the dam to be constructed down-stream still remained and still seriously jeopardised the future of this site. Taking IUCN's comments and recommendations into account, and the response of the Senegalese authorities to the Director General 's request, the Committee decided to inscribe Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania)

The IUCN representative presented the evaluation of the conservation status of this property which had regrettably continued to decline and noted that the Tanzanian authorities had recently responded positively to the request of the Director General to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Taking account of IUCN's observations, the Committee decided to inscribe Ngorongoro Conservation Area on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Garamba National Park (Zaire)

The Committee took note of IUCN's evaluation of this nomination and of up-to-date information on the very critical situation of the white rhinoceros population, now estimated to total less than 15 specimens, which means this sub-species is severely threatened. The Committee noted IUCN's observations and the positive response of the Zaire authorities to the Director General's letter and decided to inscribe Garamba National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

27. Mr. Batisse, on noting the Committee's decision to inscribe the 3 natural sites described above on the List of World Heritage in Danger, remarked that these inscriptions would constitute a test of the effectiveness of the

Convention on mobilising public opinion and solidarity to provide the important national or international support necessary for their preservation.

*[19]

XI. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND BUDGET FOR 1985

28. Mr. Batisse introduced the documents presenting the statements on mandatory contributions and voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund. He noted that several States Parties were still in arrears regarding their contributions, whether mandatory or voluntary, under the terms of the Convention.

29. Several States Parties, namely Australia, Bulgaria, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Spain and USA informed the Committee that they had made contributions since the date of the closure of the accounts or would soon do so.

30. Regarding voluntary contributions in particular, the Committee recalled that Article 16, paragraph 4 of the Convention, stipulates that these contributions "... shall be paid on a regular basis, at least every two years, and should not be less than the contributions which they (States Parties having opted for voluntary contributions) should have paid if they had been bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article." (mandatory contributions amounting at present to 1% of the annual contribution of States Parties to Unesco). In this respect the Committee appreciated the presentation of the statement on voluntary contributions, as had been requested by the Bureau at its eighth session.

31. The Committee reminded States Parties which had opted for voluntary contributions that, in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 4 of the Convention, they had the moral obligation to pay a contribution equivalent to at least 1%. The Committee therefore appealed to such States Parties to take the necessary measures to meet this objective. At the same time, the Committee requested all States Parties making mandatory contributions to pay any amounts in arrears at the earliest possible moment and asked the Secretariat to remind these States Parties, as appropriate.

32. The Committee took note that the financial situation of the World Heritage Fund was somewhat more optimistic than had been foreseen at the time of the eighth session of the Bureau due to the fact that certain contributions had been paid since that date and the Secretariat, in accordance with the request of the Bureau, had made substantial savings on the 1984 approved budget. The Committee noted that the actual amount of cash-in-hand at the time of its eighth session was estimated at approximately \$830,000, that is, not taking account of receivable mandatory contributions or imminent payments.

33. In the light of these considerations, the Committee decided to adopt the following budget:

*[20]

	US \$
I. Preparatory assistance and regional studies	60,000
II. Technical cooperation:	200,000
III. Training	150,000
IV. Emergency assistance	50,000
V. Promotional activities and information	70,000
VI. Advisory services:	
- ICOMOS:	65,000
- IUCN:	35,000

	100,000
VII. Temporary assistance to the Secretariat	90,000

Sub-total	720,000
Reserve fund	80,000
Contingencies 3%	24,000

Total	824,000 =====

XII. REQUESTS FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

34. The Committee noted that the total of the sums requested for technical cooperation greatly exceeded the allocation of \$200,000 which the Committee had approved for technical cooperation in 1985. The Committee decided, therefore, that for this year technical cooperation projects should not exceed \$20,000 each, and that no individual decisions would be taken on these requests before their further study and evaluation. The Committee asked the Secretariat to further consult with the countries concerned and with ICOMOS and IUCN as appropriate and to submit these requests directly to the Chairman of the Committee who, in accordance with paragraph 71 of the Operational Guidelines, had the authority to approve technical cooperation requests up to an amount of \$20,000. The Secretariat would then report on the Chairman's decisions at the ninth session of the Bureau in 1985.

35. The Committee took note that although such financial support appeared very modest in relation to the projects concerned, the World Heritage Fund should essentially play a catalytic role in assisting States Parties to procure the necessary funds to safeguard World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Fund should not be used for subventions of activities which normally should be supported at the national level, e.g. to cover the salaries of the personnel ensuring the protection of World Heritage properties or to cover the costs

of long-term training programmes. It rather should be used for specific, limited projects and to help the State Party concerned to more easily seek other sources of funds, including under bilateral cooperation agreements.

36. In this connection, the Committee requested the Secretariat, in consultation with ICOMOS and IUCN, to draw up a set of guidelines for technical cooperation and training requests, which should be relevant to the protection of properties on the World Heritage List and which should help States Parties to prepare their technical cooperation requests on the basis of established rules.

XIII. PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF PROPERTIES INCLUDED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE

LIST

37. The Secretariat informed the Committee of two activities being carried out since the sixth session concerning the management of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. One concerned the preparation of a "Handbook on Managing World Heritage" which deals with the preservation of these properties, ranging from general principles and legal considerations to practical means for carrying out a management programme. The outline was elaborated by an international group of experts during a meeting organised by ICCROM and ICOMOS in 1983 at the suggestion of the Secretariat.

38. The Secretariat and ICOMOS have furthermore started to prepare new World Heritage nomination forms which would facilitate the protection and management of cultural sites once inscribed on the World Heritage List. There will be several types of these forms. It is foreseen to use different forms for individual monuments and for groups of monuments. For each of these categories there will be first of all a basic form or simplified nomination dossier, which will allow an appreciation of the value of the property and to decide whether it is justified to proceed with further study. There will also be a detailed form providing a comprehensive description of the property which is an indispensable pre-requisite for its nomination to the World Heritage List. This form will provide information on the condition of the property, the threats which it faces and the protection afforded. It will be possible to update this information and thereby follow any changes in the conservation status of the property. The Committee expressed its agreement with these two initiatives.

39. The Committee took note of document SC/84/CONF.004/7 in which the Australian authorities, at the request of the Bureau at its eighth session, submitted a brief commentary on the judgement of the High Court of Australia regarding Western Tasmanian National Parks. The Committee agreed that the Tasmanian case gave an example of the strength of the Convention, particularly for States Parties having a similar system of Federal Government. The Committee requested the Secretariat to distribute this document to all the other States

Parties to the Convention.

40. The Representative of IUCN recalled that the Committee at its seventh session had encouraged the advisory non-governmental organisations to collect information through their contacts and to inform the Committee on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. IUCN reported to the Committee on four natural properties as follows:

*[22]

a) Simen National Park (Ethiopia)

IUCN reported that the National Park personnel had apparently abandoned this park and that the area has been in the hands of armed groups. Although the group had informally assured IUCN that no damage had occurred in the park, however, IUCN still did not possess precise up-to-date information on the conservation status of this site. The Committee requested the Secretariat to invite the Ethiopian authorities to supply all possible information on the subject.

b) Mount Nimba (Guinea and Ivory Coast)

IUCN recalled that the workshop supported by the World Heritage Fund to establish a research programme and an integrated management plan for this property had taken place at Mount Nimba in December 1983. The report of this

workshop had stressed that the property is under severe pressure from poaching.

The situation is further exacerbated by the lack of trained personnel and surveillance patrols. Considerable support had been already provided from the World Heritage Fund, including a financial contribution to the costs of constructing mountain shelters for the patrols. The representative of Guinea agreed that the situation was critical and the Committee requested the Secretariat and the Chairman of the Committee to draw the Guinean authorities' attention to the need to ensure the protection of this World Heritage property.

c) Tai National Park (Ivory Coast)

IUCN reported that this site was still under very serious threat due to poaching, gold prospection, tree-felling, and subsequent encroachment. The World Wildlife Fund had been discussing the means whereby international support

could be raised to mitigate the situation. IUCN noted that unless conditions

improved, this property might have to be recommended for inscription in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Secretariat to draw the attention of the Ivory Coast authorities on the need to ensure the protection of this World Heritage property.

d) Durmitor National Park (Yugoslavia)

IUCN informed the Committee that three of the republics of Yugoslavia planned

to construct a hydro-electric dam which would flood a large part of the Tara

River Canyon in Durmitor National park, and that the construction of a lead

processing factory threatened to pollute the area. The observer from Yugoslavia confirmed that these threats still exist and that meetings were being held in Yugoslavia to try to resolve the problem. The Committee requested the Secretariat to invite the Yugoslav authorities to keep it informed of the situation and to report to the Bureau at its next session.

XIV. PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

41. The Committee examined the report on promotional activities which summarised the work undertaken aiming at making the Convention and the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List better known to the general public and at generating income to the World Heritage Fund. The Committee

*[23]

noted that due to various reasons, the Secretariat had not managed to accomplish all the activities that had been planned but that this type of activity would be given priority in the near future.

42. The representatives of several States Parties expressed their interest in the ceremonies to inaugurate plaques commemorating the inscription of specific properties on the World Heritage List, at which the Director General of Unesco, or his representative, or the Chairman of the World Heritage Committee' were invited to attend. As the texts, design and material of such plaques were not always identical, the Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare guidelines on the preparation of these plaques, to be examined by the Bureau at its next session, with a view to obtaining a standard model which may be used by other States Parties as they so desired.

XV. DATE AND PLACE OF NINTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

43. In order to take various circumstances into account, the Committee decided to request its Bureau to fix the date and place of the ninth session of the Committee, in consultation with the Director General, and taking into consideration the possibility to hold this session at Unesco's headquarters.

XVI TRIBUTE TO MRS. INDIRA GANDHI

44. The Committee, hearing of the death of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, which had occurred a few hours earlier, observed a minute of silence in tribute to her memory.

XVII. OTHER BUSINESS

45. The representative of Panama informed the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's decision regarding requests for technical cooperation (paragraph 34 of this report), the Chairman had just approved a contribution of US\$20,000 towards the request for support for Darien National Park, plus another US\$6,000 for support to the training of the personnel of this park. On behalf of his government, he thanked the Committee for this assistance.

46. The representative of the Holy See recalled that the Unesco General Conference, at its 21st Session, had invited the Holy See to accede to the World Heritage Convention in order that the Vatican City could be nominated to the World Heritage List. He therefore expressed his satisfaction that this invitation had resulted in the inscription of the Vatican City by the unanimous decision of the Committee at this session.

XVIII. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

47. Mr. Carlos Gorostiza, Secretary to the Ministry of Culture of Argentina, congratulated the World Heritage Committee on the success of its work. The Governor of the Province of Misiones, Mr. Ricardo Barrios Arrechea, then invited all participants to visit Iguazu National Park and the Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis which had just been inscribed on the World Heritage List. After thanking all those who had contributed to the meeting, the Chairman, Mr. J. Gazaneo, then closed the session.