

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-01/CONF.208/4  
Helsinki, 10 December 2001  
Original : English/French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-fifth session**

**Helsinki, Finland  
11 - 16 December 2001**

**Report of the Rapporteur of the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of  
the Bureau, Helsinki, Finland (7-8 December 2001)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<b>Annexes</b>	
<b>I.</b>	Opening of the Session	1	
<b>II.</b>	Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable	1	<b>I.</b> List of Participants 49
<b>III.</b>	State of Conservation of Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	1	<b>II.</b> Speech of the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Henrik Lilius 57
<b>IV.</b>	Examination of Nominations of Cultural and Natural Properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	42	<b>III.</b> Tribute to the Memory of Mr. Ferenc Németh, Director of the Secretariat of the Hungarian World Heritage Committee by the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Mr Francesco Bandarin 59
<b>V.</b>	Other Business	47	
<b>VI.</b>	Closure of the Session	48	

## **I. OPENING OF THE SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee was held in Helsinki, Finland, on 7 and 8 December 2001. It was attended by the following members of the Bureau : Mr Henrik Lilius (Finland), Chairperson of the Committee, Mr Francisco Javier Lopez Morales (Mexico) as Rapporteur, and Egypt, Greece, Hungary, South Africa and Thailand as Vice-Presidents.

**I.2** The Chairperson informed the members of the Bureau that due to air transport problems, Mr Francisco Javier Lopez Morales (Mexico) was unable to assume his role of Rapporteur for the opening session of the Bureau. The Chairperson informed that in accordance with Article 15 of the Rules of Procedure, the Representative of Egypt, Dr Gaballa Ali Gaballa, would assume the role of Rapporteur until the arrival of Mr Francisco Javier Lopez Morales, who took up his role as Rapporteur on 8 December 2001.

**I.3** The following States Parties to the Convention who are not members of the Bureau were represented as observers: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom.

**I.4** Representatives of the Advisory Bodies to the Committee : the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended in an advisory capacity. The full List of Participants is attached as Annex I to this report.

**I.5** The Chairperson opened the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee by welcoming the newly-elected Bureau members, the representatives of the Advisory Bodies, and the observers. He then reviewed the provisional agenda of the meeting. The Chairperson's speech is attached at Annex II to this report.

**I.6** At the end of his speech, the Chairperson paid tribute to the memory of Mr Ferenc Németh, Director of the Secretariat of the Hungarian World Heritage Committee, tragically killed in an accident the previous day.

**I.7** The Chairperson then invited the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Mr Francesco Bandarin, to make his preliminary remarks to the Bureau. The Director of the Centre, then paid a warm tribute to the memory of Mr Németh. The Director's speech is provided as Annex III to this report. On behalf of the Bureau members and all the participants to the meeting, the Chairperson thanked Mr Bandarin.

**I.8** The Head of the Hungarian Delegation thanked the Chairperson and the Bureau members for their condolences and tributes for their colleague.

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE**

**II.1** The Bureau adopted the Provisional Agenda and the Timetable (Document WHC-01/CONF.207/1) without any modifications.

## **III. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **PART I: Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for examination**

#### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **MINING AND WORLD HERITAGE**

**III.1** The Bureau recalled that the results of the technical workshop on World Heritage and Mining were reviewed by the last session of the Committee. It was informed that the proceedings of the workshop were published by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME), IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. In July 2000 a copy was sent to all Committee members and in November 2001 to all new Committee members for information.

**III.2** The Bureau also noted the change in the organization of the mining industry relating to the Global Mining Initiative's (GMI) decision to put in place a new organization. On 21 May 2001, the Board of Directors of the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) agreed to transform the organization into the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), to be based in London. ICMM has been given a broader mandate by the membership to focus principally on providing sustainable development leadership for the industry. An environmental scientist has been appointed the Secretary-General of ICMM in October 2001 and the inaugural meeting of the Governing Council of ICMM has been held on 24 October 2001 in London. Issues related to mining and biodiversity will continue to be a priority for this new organization. The membership comprises leading companies from the mining, metals and minerals industry (represented by their Chairmen/CEOs), as well as office bearers of regional, national and commodity associations.

**III.3** The objectives of ICMM are as follows:

- to initiate, conduct, promote and communicate research and analysis into the interaction of the world's mining, mineral and metal industries with the economy, the environment and communities;
- to seek to lead change within these industries by stimulating discussion and coordinating activities between and among member companies, others involved with the industry and the industry's regional, national, commodity and international associations;
- to develop and communicate a clear and authoritative position on global issues affecting the future of the mining, mineral and metal industries;
- to determine and promote global best practice performance standards within these industries;
- to maintain a high-level dialogue with government and inter-governmental bodies, non-governmental and community organisations, academic and professional institutions and other stakeholders.

**III.4** IUCN noted there are a number of initiatives underway at present relating to mining and the environment and reaffirmed its view that mining should not be permitted within World Heritage sites.

**III.5** The Bureau noted that following the creation of ICMM, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN will review the proposal for the establishment of a Working Group on World Heritage and Mining, as proposed by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session and will report back to the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee.

## **Africa**

### **Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

**III.6** The Bureau noted that two articles were published on illegal poaching in Cameroon, with particular mention of Dja Faunal Reserve.

**III.7** IUCN noted that such a situation can negatively impact protected area relations with local people. IUCN reported that, in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and TRAFFIC, the wildlife monitoring programme of IUCN and WWF, convened a technical workshop in Yaounde, Cameroon from 17-20 September 2001. The workshop, entitled "Links Between Biodiversity Conservation, Livelihoods and Food Security and the Use of Wild Meat", aimed to: forge functional links among the species conservation, food security/community development and commercial sectors in order to identify means to address conservation and development concerns linked to the unsustainable use of wild fauna for food; contribute to the process of identifying, prioritising and planning practical responses to address priority conservation and development concerns related to the use of wild fauna for food; and provide input to a GEF proposal related to the use of wild fauna to contribute to sustainable livelihoods in Central Africa.

**III.8** IUCN and the Centre noted that the UNESCO/FAO African World Heritage Forest Initiative (AWHFI) concept document, currently being developed for submission to the UNF Board for the July 2002 round of biodiversity grants, includes Dja Faunal Reserve. The Centre and IUCN observed with concern that the reports on poaching and logging, if accurately reported, suggest that it may be necessary to consider whether the site should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They acknowledged that the problem is due to a combination of factors including law enforcement, political commitment, cultural differences, resources, and food availability. In light of the recent Wild Meat workshop it is hoped that prompt and effective action will be taken by the State Party to address these damaging trends.

**III.9** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee welcomes the recommendations of IUCN, and calls upon the State Party to take urgent action to halt illegal poaching in the Reserve, and requests a full report from the State Party on this situation by 1 February 2002. This report shall be submitted for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the World Heritage Committee (June 2002), at which time it will decide on the need for a mission to the site. Furthermore, the Committee commends the chief executives of major European logging firms active in Central Africa, representatives from various conservation NGOs (WCS, IUCN, WWF) and officials from the World Bank and the European Union) for their initial efforts in bringing stakeholders together to tackle the environmental problems associated with logging operations. The code of conduct should be supported, and the Committee urges the CEO-AWG to strengthen its efforts to involve Asian companies in the work of the group and to undertake every effort to include all logging companies working in Cameroon."

### **Mount Kenya National Park/Natural Forest (Kenya)**

**III.10** The Centre and IUCN had received a letter from the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) noting that IUCN had requested KWS to nominate Mt Kenya World Heritage site for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger, and expressing opposition to the 'proposed de-listing of Mt Kenya World Heritage site'. The letter noted that the management of the site had recently been transferred from the Forest Department to the KWS with the aim of enhancing management and enforcement. The KWS reported that it had extended the boundaries of the site to include the natural forest, and was in the process of preparing an integrated management plan. IUCN had responded to the State Party by: clarifying its role as an Advisory Body; outlining the process involved in listing sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger; explaining the implications of inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and outlining the purpose of monitoring

missions and the need for such missions to be approved by the State Party. The Centre and IUCN noted that the delay in receiving an invitation from the Kenyan State Party for a monitoring mission appears to be related to a misunderstanding on what was requested by the Bureau in June 2001. The KWS was of the understanding that the request for a mission with the view to considering whether the site should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger constituted automatic inclusion in this List, as well as subsequent removal from the World Heritage List.

**III.11** The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee requests the State Party to invite a mission to the site as soon as possible to enable an independent assessment of the state of conservation of the World Heritage site."

#### **Banc d'Arguin National Park, Mauritania**

**III.12** The Bureau was informed that the issue of 23 June 2001 of the *New Scientist* included an article on Banc d'Arguin National Park. Entitled "Breaking the Banc: Africa's largest marine sanctuary is failing", the article describes the threat to the Park's fish stocks posed by 'tens of thousands of traditional fishermen' and 'hundreds of giant foreign trawlers' that fish at the edge of the Park boundary. The article puts most blame on the large international trawler consortiums, many of them European (the largest European vessel can hold 7,000 tonnes of fish and is dedicated full time to Mauritanian waters), who have the financial power to buy fishing rights from the Mauritanian Government. It notes that the trawlers have displaced traditional fishermen who are increasing pressure to be allowed inside the Park and the World Heritage site.

**III.13** The Centre and IUCN noted the importance of working with traditional fishermen to help address their concerns. A vital element of effective management of the coastal zone is the protection of key ecosystems such as those within the World Heritage site. The increasing involvement of international trawlers is a cause for grave concern as it can potentially negate such initiatives.

**III.14** In September 2001 the Park reported to IUCN that two pre-exploration permits for petroleum exploration within the Park had been signed by the Government of Mauritania. The Park is currently seeking to undertake an urgent assessment of the legal situation in Mauritania and its obligations under international conventions, including the World Heritage Convention, in order to halt the exploration and production permits. It is seeking assistance to undertake this assessment. The Park reports that the situation with the proposed road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott, which will pass close to the boundary of the Park, remains inconclusive.

**III.15** The Bureau welcomed the recommendations of IUCN and requested a report from the State Party by 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau. This report should address the following issues: the status of petroleum permits relating to oil exploration within the Park; threats to marine resources of the Park, and the status of the road between Nouadhibou and Nouackchott.

#### **Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)**

**III.16** The Bureau learned that an IUCN/Centre monitoring mission to the site was undertaken from 5 to 15 July 2001. The full mission report was provided as an information document WHC-2001/CONF.207/INF.7. As suggested in the report, IUCN and the Centre proposed that an aerial survey should be conducted as a matter of urgency. This survey should determine the number and distribution of giant eland in Niokolo-Koba NP's eastern part and the adjacent Faleme Hunting Zone. Because of the present low density of giant eland, a total coverage of the primary giant eland area in Niokolo-Koba NP is recommended. A sample count following standardised methodology could be undertaken in the remaining areas of Niokolo-Koba NP and the Faleme Hunting Zone.

**III.17** All National Park staff working in Niokolo-Koba or visiting the Park should be encouraged to record detailed giant eland information on standardised data sheets whenever possible. Observations should include standardised information such as date, habitat type, locality, group sizes and number of calves. Other regular visitors to Niokolo-Koba NP, such as tour operators, could also be encouraged to collect specific information on giant eland. It is desirable to protect a small number of giant eland outside Niokolo-Koba NP. The present six giant eland in Bandia Reserve could serve this purpose. No further captures and relocations of giant eland from Niokolo-Koba NP to areas outside the Park should be considered for the time being. A short field research project on giant eland should be considered for submission requesting support from the World Heritage Fund. This project should collect detailed population data, movements and habitat use. A one-year field project should be able to achieve the initial goals. Radio collaring of a few selected individuals would be essential to ensure that study animals could be reliably located.

**III.18** Effective law enforcement (anti-poaching operations) will remain of critical importance, not only as far as the survival of giant eland is concerned but also other species in the Park. It was proposed that the services of a specialist consultant be sought to consider various alternative law-enforcement strategies. This must be done in close co-operation with National Parks' authorities as well as community representatives in the Niokolo-Koba region. The project "The protection, reproduction and veterinary control of large antelopes, such as the Derby eland" proposed by the Tropical and Sub-tropical Agronomy at the ITSZ CZU in Prague, should be

reviewed by all key stakeholder groups. The project could play a major role in ensuring the survival of the giant eland.

**III.19** The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee endorses the recommendations of the IUCN/Centre mission, and requests the State Party to review the document and report back with an action plan for implementation of the recommendations by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002).”

### **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania)**

**III.20** The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Centre and IUCN had received a report of extensive and increasing domestic crop cultivation in the Ngorongoro Crater and wider Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), 97% of which constitutes the World Heritage site. A letter from the Centre was addressed to the Permanent Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania to UNESCO requesting verification of the situation with the Ngorongoro Conservation Area authorities. The same letter was copied to the Frankfurt Zoological Society that has undertaken projects in NCA. Concerns have been raised over the expansion and the negative impacts on wildlife and the Masai traditional pastoralism. Specifically the concerns raised relate to:

- Cultivation on very steep slopes;
- Growing pressure for alternative land use which has reduced most of the Masai's grazing lands, making Ngorongoro the last sanctuary with intact grazing land;
- Steady increase in residents in Ngorongoro, mainly through immigration from other areas;
- Changes in the agricultural practices of the Masai pastoralists.

**III.21** In response to the above report, the Conservator of Ngorongoro in his letter to the Centre dated 7 August 2001, noted that in 1995 the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority commissioned a team of experts to consider the issue of domestic cultivation. The study concluded that the cultivation practised by the Masai pastoralists was not a threat to conservation and pastoralism interests. It recommended cultivation carried out by non-Masai pastoralists should be halted as it posed a threat to the integrity of the Conservation Area. It also noted that increasing numbers of immigrants who might not abide by Masai relations and customs, could threaten the functioning of the Masai's social institutions which regulate land use.

**III.22** Further, the Conservator of Ngorongoro noted that the following actions have been enforced:

- Identification of immigrants and human and livestock census;
- Acquiring alternative land for cultivation outside the Conservation Area for resettling of immigrants and where domestic cultivation could be carried out;
- Follow up study to the 1995 study;
- Implementation of a DANIDA-funded project aimed at revitalising the livestock-based economy in order to ensure that cultivation remains secondary to livestock;
- Continuing the grain importation scheme to help the resident population gain access to grain at cost price, and therefore discourage crop cultivation.

**III.23** The Frankfurt Zoological Society expressed concern that “without a decision from the government, cultivation will continue and threaten not only one of the world's most famous wildlife areas but also one of the last grazing lands for the Maasai cattle”.

**III.24** IUCN noted that the serious encroachment and destruction of the highland forests at the northern edge of the site continues. IUCN noted further that cultivation, even at a very low level, excludes use of the area by larger wildlife species in the long term, and that only a very small percentage of the NCA is suitable for cultivation because of rainfall, soil and slope conditions.

IUCN also noted that:

- the Ngorongoro Conservation Area was separated from the Serengeti and gazetted as a multi-use conservation area, hence sustainable use such as grazing is allowed;
- Limited subsistence cultivation was allowed in the early nineties due to food shortages, declining livestock and population growth. This alone was not a serious threat. What has become a serious threat is the commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers, and this is what needs to be addressed urgently;
- There is some disagreement about the impact of the Masai practising agriculture within the NCA. There is the possibility that Masai agriculture (distinct from traditional pastoralism or livestock rearing), is also negatively impacting on the site;
- The management of the NCA requires more effective scientific guidance.

**III.25** The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee requests the State Party to provide a report on the encroachment situation in the northern section of the World Heritage site and on the impacts of commercial farming introduced by immigrant farmers on the integrity and values of this World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Committee.”

## **Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania)**

**III.26** The Bureau was informed that the Centre and IUCN had received several reports concerning the proposed Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric Project (ENP) in Kenya, and its potential impacts on the Serengeti and Mara ecosystems. The State-owned Kenya Electricity Generating Company is proposing to build three dams along the Ewaso Ng'iro River that would generate 180 MW of electricity and which would cost 350 million dollars by the time of completion in 2007. This scheme, if implemented, would link the Mara River system through a 3.5 km tunnel with the upper drainage of the Ewaso Ng'iro (south) River, thus reversing the Mara's flow into the Ewaso Ng'iro River, finally draining into Lake Natron in the east instead of Lake Victoria in the west.

**III.27** There have been a series of Environmental Impact Assessments and discussions on the ENP which have held its implementation up. Potential impacts, if implemented, include downstream effects on Lake Natron in Tanzania (possible extension to the proposed Rift Valley Lake Reserves World Heritage site) and potential ecological impact on the Serengeti National Park. IUCN has received a report by the Frankfurt Zoological Society, which noted potential impacts of the project, if implemented, on the conservation of the Serengeti National Park:

- The main feature of the Serengeti Ecosystem, which extends across several protected areas, including the World Heritage site, is the wildebeest migration. Wildlife numbers in this system are controlled by the dry season rainfall (and consequent grass availability) in the Mara River system. Presently, the Serengeti Migration consists of approximately 1.2 million wildebeest and 200,000 zebras. This was an important feature at the time of the inscription of this site.
- If the Mara River were to dry up, most of the wildlife migrants would perish and the Serengeti Migration would collapse irreversibly. There is concern that though the ENP makes allowances for maintaining some water flow in the Mara River, even during severe droughts, these drought times would also produce the worst power shortages in Kenya. Consequently, there would be unpredictable pressure on the demand for channelling all available Mara water into the Ewaso Ng'iro Hydroelectric project.
- Even under normal climatic conditions the project might endanger the Serengeti World Heritage Site and impact tourist revenues in Tanzania and Kenya. In June 2001, Tanzania National Parks, together with the Frankfurt Zoological Society and the Australian Institute for Marine Science developed an ecological model to test the possible impact of the Amala weir water diversion project on the Serengeti Migration

(*Modeling the Impact on the Serengeti Ecosystem of the Proposed Amala Weir Water Diversion Project in Kenya*, Gereta, E., Wolanski, E., and Borner, M., 2001.).

It is understood that the East Africa Community has discussed this issue and the proposal has effectively been dropped for the time being.

**III.28** IUCN has been notified that WWF East Africa Regional Office is commencing design of a *Mara River Catchment Basin Initiative*. This will focus on conserving the Mara River Catchment's unique biodiversity; ensuring the maintenance of natural functions by balancing the supply and demand of biodiversity products, and developing alternative livelihoods for communities. As part of the Initiative's preliminary phase, WWF has recently commissioned a report on the hydrology of the Kenyan side of the Mara River, in order to consider the land use changes and impacts of these on the flow and quality of the River. IUCN noted that the Serengeti National Park is one of the field sites for the *Enhancing our Heritage Project* funded by the UNF. IUCN considered that there is merit in the State Parties of Kenya and Tanzania establishing a joint committee through the Commission on East Africa Cooperation arrangement to undertake further in-depth studies on the entire catchments of the Ewaso Ng'iro, Lake Natron, Mara River systems.

**III.29** IUCN noted that the Serengeti is not only a World Heritage site and Biosphere Reserve, it is also the main tourist attraction in Tanzania, a country where tourism revenue is the largest foreign exchange earner. It also noted that the very reason that the Serengeti is a World Heritage site - the wildebeest migration, could be potentially threatened by any future implementation of the ENP. IUCN recognised that any negative impact on the dry season range of the wildebeest has potentially major ramifications for the very criteria on which the Serengeti listing is based. IUCN also noted that the Mara River is habitat for riverine forest containing many rare forest birds and other fauna, and upon which large populations of crocodiles and hippopotamus depend. It is clear that there is a high element of risk in the diversion of water from the Mara. The Mara diversion cannot be considered in isolation, it must be considered in the context of other ecological problems such as rapidly changing land use and deforestation in the catchments, as well as the impacts of climate change. Most serious ecological/environmental problems arise because of a complex combination of factors. In such cases, IUCN believes that the precautionary principle must be applied to avoid any actions that increase the risk of the Mara drying up.

**III.30** The Bureau noted that the ENP project has been discussed by the East African Community and has been abandoned for the time being. The Bureau noted the potential impacts of any implementation of the ENP scheme on the Serengeti World Heritage site and requested

that it be kept informed of developments by the State Parties of Tanzania and Kenya.

## **Asia and the Pacific**

### **World Heritage Properties of Australia**

#### **Great Barrier Reef (Australia)**

**III.31** The Bureau was informed that on 10 September 2001 the Australian Government released a scientific report addressing the effect of land use activities on water quality in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. The report - *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* - recommends specific end-of-river pollution targets for 2011 for all 26 catchments adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef. The Plan was prepared by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) at the request of the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council and the Commonwealth Minister for Environment and Heritage. A scientific working group reviewed available data and existing national water quality guidelines, prioritised catchments according to the ecological risk presented to the Reef, and recommended minimum targets for pollutant loads that would halt the decline in water quality entering the reef. The Plan is available on the GBRMPA web site at: <http://www.gbrmpa.gov.au/> The Plan notes that over the last 150 years, the sediment load has increased by 300-900%, phosphate by 300 –1500%, total nitrogen by 200-400%, respectively and that pesticide residues are now detectable in sub-tidal sediments. For the 2001-2011 decade, the plan proposes the reduction of sediment by 38%, nitrogen by 39%, phosphorous by 47%, and chlorophyll by 30-60%, respectively. It is also proposed to reduce the detectable levels of heavy metals and pesticides.

**III.32** The Plan recommends that the targets be incorporated into relevant plans under the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and the Natural Heritage Trust. For catchments not covered under the NAP, the report recommends that the State Government prepare, and submit to the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Council, integrated catchment management plans that set out the action required to meet the water quality targets. The Plan suggests specific actions, notably a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory measures that need to be taken to improve the quality of water entering the World Heritage site including:

- Reforms to ensure that all environmentally significant activities in the catchments are subject to proper environmental impact assessment and approval processes and that conditions are attached to ensure activities are carried out in a manner that protects and improves water quality
- Promotion of 'constraint mapping' for current and future agricultural development
- Protection and rehabilitation of catchment areas at risk such as freshwater wetlands and riparian vegetation

- Establishment and enforcement of standards for sewage, wastewater and storm- water discharge from coastal developments to watercourses
- Promotion of environmental management plans for agricultural activities, which promote farming practices that minimise downstream impacts
- Promotion of full compliance to Industry Codes of Practice, and
- Initiation of public and catchment specific education programmes about the connectivity between land use and the impacts on the Reef.

**III.33** WWF-Australia has estimated that the cost of a significant restoration programme to mitigate pollution and to clean up the waters flowing into the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) would be in excess of AU\$300 million. It has identified the following actions as key to success: (i) an immediate and permanent moratorium of land clearing in the GBR catchment; (ii) urgent legislative protection for coastal freshwater wetlands; (iii) all agricultural activities to be regulated under the Queensland Environment Protection Act 1994; (iv) fertiliser and pesticide use to be licensed; (v) legislative discharge limits for acid sulphate soil to be set; and (vi) a major GBR catchment riparian re-vegetation and wetland restoration programme to be designed and financed.

**III.34** IUCN had noted that the *Great Barrier Reef Catchment Water Quality Action Plan* initiative directly addresses one of the major issues raised in the ACIUCN report on the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, relating to the need for more effective catchment management in lands adjacent to the Park.

**III.35** The Observer of Australia noted that since the report has come out only recently, the Bureau should not yet urge specific actions to implement the Action Plan. Time should be given for the Australian authorities to consider relevant measures for implementation of the Plan. A meeting concerning the measures to be taken will take place shortly. Australia agreed to report back soon after the meeting.

**III.36** The Bureau commended the State Party on the release of the Water Quality Action Plan, setting targets for improvements and the recommended actions to achieve the targets. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide regular reports to the Committee on the implementation of the Water Quality Action Plan as well as on the implementation of the Focused Recommendations and Framework for Management adopted for the site by the State Party and ACIUCN in 1999.

#### **Fraser Island (Australia)**

**III.37** The Bureau noted that on 30 April 2001, a 9-year boy was killed by dingoes on Fraser Island. This was the first recorded death in Australia by dingoes of a human over 1 year of age. This death prompted a re-evaluation of the risk posed to humans by dingoes and a re-assessment



of the management strategies outlined in the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy (March 2001). The revised Strategy is now with the Queensland Government awaiting approval.

**III.38** Immediately following the incident, the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS) undertook a cull of 31 dingoes to reduce the immediate risk to people from habituated dingoes that were frequenting areas heavily used by people. This cull was a one-time operation. A Risk Assessment Report (*Risk Assessment: Risk to humans posed by the dingo population on Fraser Island, EPA, May 2001*) was commissioned by the Queensland Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Risk Assessment provides direction for the immediate management of dingoes on Fraser Island and provides site-specific management recommendations. As such, it is complementary to the draft Fraser Island Dingo Management Strategy. The Risk Assessment outlined some previously unused management options at particular sites, including: (a) fencing of campgrounds and recreational areas; (b) active deterrence of animals in the vicinity of popular visitor areas; (c) restriction on taking of food to certain locations; and (d) time restrictions for visitors at some sites. Additional island wide management approaches recommended include: (i) limiting visitor numbers using a variety of approaches; (ii) significantly increasing fines and penalties for feeding dingoes; (iii) enhancing public education and awareness programmes; (iv) increasing enforcement through additional ranger presence; (v) increasing monitoring and research on the dingo.

**III.39** The need for consultation with the Island's residents, tour operators, the Fraser Island Community Advisory Committee, native title claimants and the Island's World Heritage Area Management Committee on appropriate limits and mechanisms is emphasised in the Risk Assessment Report. IUCN has received expert advice that the impact of the cull is unlikely to have any adverse impacts on the long-term viability or survival of the dingo population. The Fraser Island dingo population is of great relevance and high importance to the status of Fraser Island as a World Heritage site. Although the Fraser Island dingo population is not 100% pure, Fraser Island represents the best opportunity to establish and maintain a self-sustaining population of wild genetically pure dingoes.

**III.40** Elsewhere in Australia, and other range countries in Asia and Africa, most populations are, or will soon be, predominantly hybrid. The IUCN Canid Action Plan lists the dingo as a threatened species. With the 2nd edition of the Plan currently in preparation, the conservation status of the dingo is under review and may be upgraded to endangered.

**III.41** Fraser Island does not have an exclusive Plan of Management, rather, it is catered for in the Great Sandy Region Management Plan (GSRMP). The GSRMP covers

the Great Sandy Region National Park, of which Fraser Island is a part, and also adjacent marine areas and some lands outside the protected area. Released in 1994, it was prepared as a regional conservation plan with input from numerous government departments. It does not have statutory status. The GSRMP is about to undergo a detailed review. The process will involve substantial stakeholder and community input and is scheduled for completion in March 2003. The review is explicitly considering a specific management plan for the Fraser Island World Heritage property, as well as a commitment to new legislative requirements for the World Heritage site.

**III.42** On the 27 July 2001 the Queensland Government announced the allocation of an extra AU\$1.75 million towards the management of Fraser Island. AU\$1 million has been earmarked this financial year for dingo management on the Island; the other AU\$750,000 is to be spent employing eight permanent rangers for the Island. The Observer of Australia informed the Bureau that the Development Strategy has been recently released and that a copy of it will be provided for the Secretariat.

**III.43** The Bureau commended the State Party/QPWS on the Risk Assessment and the draft Dingo Management Strategy and welcomed the State Party's consideration of a variety of options including the imposition of visitor limits. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide further information on the visitor management strategy as it is developed. The Bureau welcomed the review of the GSRMP and its explicit recognition of Fraser Island as a World Heritage area requiring special management plans and legislative frameworks to protect the World Heritage site for perpetuity.

#### **The Sundarbans (Bangladesh)**

**III.44** The Bureau was informed of details of the Government of Bangladesh plans to explore "Block 5" of the Sundarbans Reserve Forest for oil and gas. Shell has publicly declared that it has no plans for exploration activities in the Special Reserved Forest (SRF). The World Heritage site comprises three sections of the SRF at the coastal edge. Shell has furthermore acknowledged the following:

- The Sundarbans is also a Ramsar site. The Ramsar Convention has confirmed that the Ramsar site is synonymous with the SRF and does not extend beyond the SRF;
- Shell will carry out extensive environmental and social studies and stakeholder engagement before conducting any activities elsewhere in Block 5;
- As regards the socio-economic impact zone outside the northern peripheries of the SRF, Shell will be discussing the implications of oil and gas exploration with the Ministry of Environment and Forest;
- Shell recognizes that one of the main objectives of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) -Government of

Bangladesh Sundarbans Biodiversity Conservation Project (SBCP) is to reduce the poverty level of the 3.5 million people living in the impact zone and provide them with alternative livelihood options in order to encourage them to leave the forest;

- By providing economic activities, and in the case of successful exploration of clean gas, Shell can add value to the objectives of the SBCP and be a party to providing sustainable development opportunities in the region;
- Shell-Bangladesh is aware of the need to consider the potential indirect impacts on the SRF of any of its future activities. Such activities, whether inside the socio-economic impact zone, or elsewhere in Block 5, will be continued only after full environmental and social impact assessments and in consultations with all stakeholders;
- The current phase of the project consists of exploration only. If hydrocarbons are discovered and it is decided subsequently to develop them, further EIA and SIA studies will be undertaken, together with continuing stakeholder consultations.

**III.45** On 20 September 2001, Shell convened its first workshop in Dhaka to share information about the ensuing work programme, oil and gas exploration and emergent issues and questions. It distributed briefing papers to stakeholders and invited responses and discussion. A web site has been launched with updated information on Shell's activities in Bangladesh: <http://www.shell.com.bd>

the project and its potential impacts on the site for review at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

### **Kaziranga National Park (India)**

**III.52** The Bureau noted that the State Party had not yet provided the report requested before 15 September 2001 as requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001. The Centre intends to organize an IUCN/Centre mission to Manas Wildlife Sanctuary in Assam, India, in February 2002, and that mission could visit Kaziranga National Park as well.

**III.53** The Bureau reiterated its request, that the State Party submit a report on major management issues and welcomed the possibility of the IUCN/Centre mission visiting this site during its visit to Assam, India in February 2002. The Bureau recommended that an up-to-date state of conservation report on the site be submitted to its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

### **Komodo National Park (Indonesia)**

**III.54** The Bureau was informed that the State Party had submitted a report on the state of conservation of the site using the format prescribed in the periodic reporting brochure and this report has been reviewed by IUCN. The Bureau learned that:

- The 25-year Management Plan for the site was completed in June 2000. The Plan comprises the expansion of the Park, to include an extension at Gili Banta and a connection to Gili Mota. The proposed extensions will add 504 square kilometres to the area of the Park, 479 sq.km. of which will be marine habitat. The new Park would therefore comprise 27% terrestrial and 73% marine areas. The proposed extension is based on the high level of coral and fish diversity and associated aesthetic value and the importance of areas providing migratory corridors for cetaceans.
- The plan also includes a new zoning system for the Park, dividing the Park into 7 zones covering both marine and terrestrial environments as follows: core zone; wilderness zone with limited tourism; tourism zone; traditional use zone; pelagic use zone; special research and training zone; and traditional settlement zone. Regulations have been formulated for each zone. A map of the Park is being completed and will be disseminated widely.
- According to the ongoing coral reef and fish monitoring programme conducted by The Nature Conservancy of USA (TNC) and Park personnel, a slow recovery, i.e. 2% increase in hard coral per year, has been occurring around Komodo since 1996. Eight demersal fish spawning grounds have been identified within the Park waters. As a consequence, the Park has applied regulations to prohibit demersal fish exploitation during the spawning season.

- In the terrestrial sector, forest fires occur frequently, largely due to human activities during the dry season. Deer poaching has been a significant threat to the integrity of the Park, with poachers using fire to herd deer. Park patrols involve local police, navy and army personnel, as Park rangers are not equipped with firearms.
- A floating boat patrol, equipped with communication systems to allow contact with Park headquarters, has been added to the law enforcement programme. Overall, the incidences of dynamite and cyanide fishing and deer poaching have declined significantly with improved and intensified patrolling.
- Park regulations prohibit anyone from entering the Park without a permit, except local people practicing traditional fishing. Despite this prohibition, illegal entry by fishermen originating from other islands continues to be a major issue.

**III.55** TNC has been working on an innovative management scheme for the Park, involving the private tourism sector and the Government of Indonesia (GOI) in a partnership to establish sustainable financing for the Park. IUCN has been playing a supportive role and providing some technical input, in co-operation with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) which is helping to support the project. The Indonesian Government formally wrote to the UNESCO Office in Jakarta, Indonesia, requesting UNESCO's views on the joint TNC/GOI/tourism sector initiative. The establishment of a tourism concession is seen as a sustainable financing mechanism to be tested within the framework of the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan and has been supported by IUCN and UNESCO. The need to closely monitor the work of the concession and all other projects designed to support the implementation of the 25-year Management Plan has however been stressed by all stakeholders.

**III.56** The Bureau welcomed the several initiatives to strengthen protection of the site and acknowledged the important contributions that TNC, IFC, GEF, the tourism sector and other partners are making towards the long-term conservation and sustainable financing of Komodo National Park. The Bureau noted with concern that the illegal entry of outsiders from other islands continues and invited the GOI to consider providing increased resources for patrolling the marine environment of the Park, especially in the light of the recent extension to the marine component of the Park. The Bureau recommended that the State Party provide, by 1 February 2002, a status report on the establishment of the tourism management concession and a timeframe for nominating the extensions to the Park for inclusion in the World Heritage site, to enable the Bureau to review the information at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

## **Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)**

**III.57** The Bureau was informed of the following steps taken by the WWF Office in Irian Jaya: (i) institutional strengthening of three local NGOs to develop skills in Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA), project planning and monitoring, identification and development of alternative income sources, community organisation, advocacy and communications; (ii) promoting community-based approaches to natural resources management by documenting traditional practices of the three main ethnic groups using the Park's resources; (iii) identifying alternative sources of income in order to minimise community dependence on forest resources; (iv) encouraging the recognition of community rights and knowledge and enhancing community participation in site management; and (v) co-operating with Park management to develop an overall management plan as well as plans for the utilisation of various management zones.

**III.58** WWF-Indonesia has financed a range of activities up to the year 2001 and is in the process of submitting proposals for financing a number of new initiatives for the period 2001/2002 and beyond. The Bureau noted the following issues identified by WWF as requiring immediate attention:

- Organisation of an integrated planning workshop bringing together all concerned parties;
- Building transparent relationships amongst NGOs, ethnic communities, private sector and the Government;
- Establishment of an institution with multi-stakeholder representation for management of the area; and
- Financing programmes targeted to research, communities and institutional development and the overall long-term planning and development of the site.

**III.59** The US\$ 30,000 grant approved by the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau will be used for the organisation of a series of strategic planning workshops involving the participation of all stakeholders. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Australian Government has approved AU\$ 250,000 for capacity building for the management of the site. The Delegate of Australia expressed the interest of his Government to work together with the Indonesian authorities, IUCN and the Centre to implement the capacity building project.

**III.60** The Bureau noted the variety of support that is becoming available to the site for strategic planning, capacity building and NGO and community support initiatives. However, recommendations from these activities need to be implemented to ensure a positive impact on the conservation of this site. Hence, the Bureau encouraged relevant donors to support the implementation of recommended priority actions and to co-ordinate their activities. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to

work through its partners, particularly the UNESCO Office, Jakarta and the IUCN Asia Regional Programme and IUCN/WCPA Vice-Chair for Southeast Asia to promote co-ordinated development and execution of projects and activities in support of Lorentz. The Bureau recalled that in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee made at the time of the site's inscription in the World Heritage List in 1999, a IUCN/Centre mission to the site is due in late 2002. The Bureau recommended that a full status report on the conservation of the site and the planning of its future management be submitted to the twenty-seventh session of the Bureau in April 2003.

## **Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia)**

**III.61** The Bureau learnt that the State Party is considering a proposal to enlarge Mulu World Heritage site to include Gunung Buda. The proposal however, is raising concern amongst indigenous groups and the wider conservation community because of the reported lack of inclusion of indigenous peoples and their claims in the decision to extend the Gunung Mulu World Heritage site. The recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples in Sarawak has been upheld by the historical legal decision on Rumah Nor. On the 12 May 2001, the High Court of Sarawak upheld the customary rights of the Iban village Rumah Nor when it found that the Borneo Paper and Pulp company, which had begun logging the forest claimed by the villagers, did not have the right to destroy Rumah Nor's rainforest.

**III.62** Following this decision, the people of Gunung Buda lodged a claim with a land tribunal seeking an injunction to the rule that they should have a share in the management of the Gunung Buda area. The Government argued against this on the grounds that there was no properly surveyed boundary of their claimed lands, and so the claim was denied. Thus the indigenous peoples are opposing the inclusion of Gunung Buda in the Gunung Mulu World Heritage site.

**III.63** The Bureau recalled that when it referred the nomination of Gunung Mulu to the State Party at its twenty-fourth session it had sought, amongst others, "...assurance that the new management plan addresses issues relating to local peoples' use of and benefits from the Park as well as the new contractual arrangements for management of the Park...". The Committee, when it inscribed the site on the World Heritage List at its last session in Cairns, Australia, had suggested that the "...authorities be encouraged to review additions to the site for their World Heritage potential when the gazetting process is completed".

**III.64** The Bureau was also informed of three on-going initiatives aimed at enhancing management of Gunung Mulu National Park:

- Implementation of the Plan for Management of the Park - This plan was reviewed as part of the

evaluation of the nomination of the site. Current status includes examination of options for contracting out management of the Park to the private sector, while overall regulatory responsibility remains with the Ministry of Forestry, Department of National Parks of Sarawak. The Plan of Management for the Park has been drafted in a manner that supports this possibility;

- Community development for areas outside the Park; this initiative aims to develop options for better planning and development around the Park boundaries, particularly in the Mulu area, including issues of land title, planning processes etc. This initiative could enable locals to manage better, and benefit from, the opportunities that come with World Heritage listing;
- Preliminary drafting of a project concept to secure international assistance with capacity building for management of the Park - to focus on staff capacity and skills development.

**III.65** The Bureau welcomed the possibility of the extension of the Park and noted with satisfaction the initiatives to improve site-management and staff capacity building. The Bureau however, invited the State Party to give due consideration to the involvement of indigenous peoples and other local communities in planning and implementing decisions regarding the extension of the site, and to seek their full co-operation in its management and in extending the site to include Gunung Buda. The Bureau recommended that the State Party provide a report, before 1 February 2002, on the results of its negotiations with indigenous communities for review by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

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

**III.66** The Bureau was informed that in response to its request at its twenty-fifth session in June 2001, the State Party has submitted a report, dated June 2000, entitled: "Environmental Impact Statement (EIA) for the Jagatpur Madi 33 kV Subtransmission Line Project". The report states that the transmission line will pass through approximately 6km of the Park and World Heritage site between Dhruvbaghat and Bankatta, and through 500 metres and 1,000 metres of buffer zone forests at the same two locations. The project foresees the erection of eleven-metre high concrete poles and the stringing of lines. It will be aligned along the existing Hulaki road and hence require the clearing of a two-metre wide corridor. In total, 331 trees of endangered species - *Shorea robusta*; *Acacia catechu*, *Bombax ceiba* and *Cedrella toona* will be removed. The EIA has not yet been approved by the Government of Nepal.

**III.67** According to the report, loss or alteration of habitat, construction disturbances to wild fauna, likely hunting and poaching by project workers, decline in water quality associated with erosion and silting, pollution from temporary workers' camps, and bird deaths from collision with the transmission lines are foreseen as negative

impacts. Mitigation measures proposed include: reforestation of two hectares of community land near the Park with the guidance of the Park authorities; a Community Forest Support Programme in three locations to be implemented in conjunction with Park authorities; an Environmental Awareness for Conservation Programme (EAC) to be implemented by NGOs, and a Habitat Management Programme to be implemented by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife.

**III.68** The Kasara Bridge is under construction over the Rapti River that constitutes the northern boundary of the Park and World Heritage site. No EIA was conducted for the project. Due to budget uncertainties and restrictions, the road will require a few years for completion. The road will pass through the Park and World Heritage site, but will partly follow the current designated Public Right of Way to Madi Village. The alignment from Kasara Bridge to the public right of way has not been decided. One option is to follow the Park/World Heritage site periphery along the Rapti River for 3-4 km.

**III.69** The Bureau learnt that the provision of electricity will help reduce the need for kerosene for lighting and firewood for cooking, the two major sources of the local population, and also provide a source of fuel for lodges and hotels in the area. This should have a positive impact by reducing the amount of wood collected from the Park. Nevertheless, the Bureau was concerned about the impacts associated with the construction of the transmission line and road within the World Heritage site and noted the IUCN position that similar threats have prompted Danger Listing in other cases.

**III.70** The Bureau noted that the State Party has not yet approved the plan to construct the transmission line through the Park and urged the State Party not to proceed with the plan to construct this line and seek alternatives that would have minimal impacts on the integrity of the Park. The Bureau noted that the Kasara Bridge and the associated road along the northern periphery of the Park might be a less impacting option to improve transport in the region. The Bureau recommended that the State Party take into due consideration these suggestions and inform the Centre of its decision on the proposed transmission line and the routing of the road and provide a detailed report on the status of the projects by 1 February 2002, for consideration at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

#### **Sinharaja Forest Reserve (Sri Lanka)**

**III.71** The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session in November 2000 it had requested the Centre and IUCN to monitor developments with regard to the resolution of the dispute over land reclaimed by the Forest Department that had previously been leased to a private company. The private enterprise concerned, Sinharaja Plantations Organic (PVT) Ltd., has written to the Director of the Centre raising preliminary objections against the reacquisition of land released earlier by the

Government for organic tea farming. In October 2001 the enterprise informed the Centre that it has placed the action of the Conservator of Forests to reclaim the land before the judiciary of Sri Lanka in order to claim compensation. The enterprise has requested the Bureau to refrain from arriving at any decisions concerning the parcel of land that it claims until the question has been settled legally.

**III.72** The Bureau took note of the fact that the Forest Department of Sri Lanka and the Sinharaja Plantations Organic (PVT) Ltd., have entered a legal process regarding the 62 hectares parcel of land advised by IUCN to be outside of the World Heritage area. The Bureau requested IUCN to monitor the outcome of the legal process and report on their implications for the conservation of the site to the twenty-seventh session of the Committee in 2003.

#### **Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

**III.73** In accordance with the request of the twenty-fourth extraordinary session of the Bureau in November 2000, the Ha Long Bay Management Department (HLBMD) submitted the sixth annual progress report on the conservation, management and promotion of the Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area. The Bureau learnt that IUCN reviewed the report and has expressed broad support for the efforts of the HLBMD to manage this extremely complex World Heritage site located in an intensive economic development zone.

**III.74** The Bureau noted that the project proposal for the Institutional Capacity Building of the Halong Bay Management Department, prepared by IUCN-Vietnam, HLBMD and the Quang Ninh Provincial Authorities, has been widely circulated and finalised in close collaboration with relevant institutions and the Province. The proposal is currently being shared with potential donors. The UNESCO *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, financed by UNDP, has been completed and a final 135-page report on the feasibility study and a video have been transmitted to the Centre by the UNESCO Office in Vietnam on 17 October 2001. IUCN served as a member of the Steering Committee of this Project. Discussions have been held in collaboration with the Eco-Museum project and the Institutional Capacity Building project. The final proposal of the *Ha Long Bay Eco-Museum Feasibility Project*, envisages the development of an "Ecomuseum Hub" in the vicinity of Ha Long Bay and the design and elaboration of a variety of interpretation packages based on themes identified in the study.

**III.75** The feasibility study follow-up places strong emphasis on the establishment of a project team of Vietnamese staff of the HLBMD supported by two international facilitators. Intensive capacity building and skills transfer, particularly in the fields of planning, data collection and integrated interpretative management of the area are proposed. A comprehensive analysis to develop strategic partnerships between the Ecomuseum and key

stakeholders has been undertaken and a number of thematic areas for collaboration have been identified. For example, a theme on the fishing traditions of Ha Long will directly involve floating fishing villages, terrestrial fishing communities, boat builders and major institutions such as the Viet Nam Institute of Oceanography, the Institute of Marine Products and local authority agencies such as the provincial Fisheries Department.

**III.76** The Bureau learnt that tourism has increased by 135% between 1997 and 2000 and is a critical management issue at this site. The Bureau noted IUCN's satisfaction with the fact that the direct management and control of the caves has been brought under the authority of HLBMD, and the expectation that this would ensure appropriate measures to present the caves, control tourism and minimise impacts. The Feasibility Study's effort to propose a "Ecomuseum Hub" and an Interpretative Management Plan aim to spread the visitor resources in and outside of Ha Long Bay and thereby support the intensity of visitation to the World Heritage site without reducing the number of tourists visiting the broader region. The feasibility study estimates that total cost of the development of the "Ecomuseum Hub" and other interpretation theme products is likely to cost US\$ 17 million over a 4-year period. The Quang Ninh Province has committed US\$ 3 million and intends to seek other funds from external sources.

**III.77** During a visit to Japan in early October 2001, a representative from the Centre met with officials of the Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA). These officials confirmed that the Environmental Management of Ha Long Bay continues to be one of the priority projects of JICA and that discussions with the Government of Vietnam are underway in order to implement the Environmental Management Plan as soon as possible. The Delegate of Japan informed that more information regarding the JICA assistance will be provided at the Committee session.

**III.78** The Bureau commended HLBMD efforts to conserve the site and acknowledged efforts of the State Party to support the development of a range of projects to address management issues at the site. Given the considerable international interest in the site, the Bureau urged the HLBMD to continue and strengthen its efforts to co-ordinate projects in order to ensure optimal use of resources and skills available via HLBMD's association with IUCN and UNESCO Offices in Vietnam and other partners. The Bureau reiterated the recommendation made at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session regarding the early implementation of the recommendations of the JICA/Government of Vietnam Environmental Management Plan for Ha Long Bay and invited the State Party to submit by 1 February 2002 a progress report on what has been achieved in this regard for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

## Latin America and the Caribbean

### **Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

**III.79** The Secretariat informed the Bureau that no invitation was received to carry out a mission to Los Katios following the twenty-fourth session of the Bureau. The Bureau learnt that an IUCN representative had visited Bogota, Colombia, in November 2001. IUCN noted that the Special Administrative Unit for National Parks of Colombia is increasingly implementing management activities in the area, and that it works with local communities to enhance their support of management activities.

**III.80** The Bureau acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party towards the conservation of this site and recommended that it invites a field mission to the site when appropriate.

### **Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)**

**III.81** The Bureau was informed that a progress report was received on 10 October 2001 from the Director of the Charles Darwin Research Station noting the implementation of a number of programmes aiming to enhance the institutional capacity of the Park Administration. The report also noted the status of regulations concerning tourism, fisheries and quarantine, as well as progress achieved in the preparation of the Strategy 2010 for the Sustainable Development of the Islands.

**III.82** *Galapagos Special Law:* On 18 September, 2001, Ecuador's Constitutional Court voted in favour of the Galapagos Special Law, following a day of public inquiry held in response to a lawsuit brought forward by the Association of Industrial Tuna Fishermen (ATUNEC), which challenged the Special Law's constitutionality. The final decision of the Constitutional Court of Judges - eight votes in favour and one abstention - represents an important achievement in the continued efforts to protect the Galapagos Islands under the regulations of the Special Law. Since its approval in March 1998, the Galapagos Special Law has faced continued attacks, primarily from the industrial fishing sector based in continental Ecuador, which seeks fishing rights inside the Galapagos Marine Reserve (proposed in entirety as an extension to the World Heritage site). The Special Law granted exclusive fishing rights in the Marine Reserve to artisanal fishermen and calls for a system of quotas and zoning to control fisheries. However, the Special Law can only be fully enforced after all the regulations and by-laws on key management issues such as fisheries have been approved. According to information received, dated 19 September 2001, two of the key regulations (on tourism and fisheries) are likely to be approved by the President's Office by the end of November. The third regulation on quarantine, introduced species and agriculture is in the process of local consultation. The fourth regulation, which covers Environmental Management and pollution issues, is the

least advanced. The President of Ecuador visited the site in November 2001 and reiterated the Government's support for the declaration of the Marine Reserve as a World Heritage site.

**III.83** *Enforcement and Control of the Marine Reserve:* Earlier in 2001, the vessel *Sirenian*, owned and operated by the environmental NGO Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, commenced a five-year tour of duty to help the Galapagos National Park Service clamp down on illegal commercial fishing operations within 40 miles of the Islands. This collaborative operation, given a favourable ruling by the Ecuadorian Court, is the first conservation patrol of the Galapagos by a foreign vessel officially supported by the Ecuadorian Government. A loan by the Inter-American Development Bank for US\$ 10 million has been approved for enforcing controls in the Marine Reserve. Logistical assistance and institutional strengthening are the two most important elements of this project. Galapagos National Park hopes to purchase four more boats and a helicopter to cover the whole area. At the moment, the Park possesses two vessels, ten speedboats, twelve wooden boats and personnel of 50 to patrol the 133,000 km<sup>2</sup> marine area. Despite the assistance of the Ecuadorian Navy, this is clearly not sufficient. Only 5% of entrance fees to the GNP are directed towards controlling the Reserve.

**III.84** *Illegal shark fishing:* Destructive shark fishing, where the shark fin is cut from the live shark and the mutilated animal is dumped back into the sea, continues in the Galapagos Marine Reserve due to the high demand for shark fins for the Asian market. The fishing techniques used also negatively affect other species, including marine birds. During 2001, 22 fishing boats were caught, 5,600 shark fins confiscated and 3,000 pounds of meat seized. According to the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, half the boats caught fishing illegally in the Galapagos were not punished. But progress on this matter has been made: Canela II, a Costa Rican long liner caught fishing out of the port of Puntarenas, was confiscated by the Local Court of Galapagos and the order was upheld by the Court of Appeal. This is a legal precedent, as never before in Ecuadorian legal history has a fishing boat been confiscated for illegal fishing.

**III.85** *Sea Lion Poaching:* On the 16 July 2001, fifteen (11 male and 4 female) mutilated sea lion - *Zalophus wollebaeki* - corpses were discovered on La Loberia Beach on San Cristobal Island. This is the first time such action has been reported in the Galapagos Islands. The Charles Darwin Research Station, the Galapagos National Park Service and a veterinarian of the Araucaria Foundation undertook autopsies of nine of the animals. The autopsy report makes the link between the incident and the increasing demand from Asian markets for the male genitals of sea lions and seals for use in traditional medicine, as aphrodisiacs and amulets.

**III.86** *Invasive Species Eradication Programme:* In early 2002, the Charles Darwin Research Station and the Galapagos National Park Service will commence a five-year programme to combat invasive species. Funding of US\$18 million is being provided over six years from the United Nations Foundations and GEF, while other sources are estimated to amount to US\$19 million. Biologists and Park staff will use a combination of measures to remove some alien species, make a dent in other populations, and bolster controls to keep other exotics out of the Islands.

**III.87** *Tourism:* Progress has also been reported on the *SmartVoyager* certification programme, a joint initiative of the Rainforest Alliance and Conservacion y Desarrollo (C&D) of Ecuador. The programme aims to give a “green seal” of approval to tour boats operating in the Galapagos Archipelago that meet certain environmental and social criteria. Full details of the certification programme can be found at: <http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/programs/sv/objectives.html>

**III.88** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee, recognising the continued and increasing threats posed to the marine and terrestrial flora and fauna of the Islands, urges the State Party to make all efforts to finalise the specific regulations under the Special Law and enforce them as soon as possible. The Committee commends the ruling by the State Party's Constitutional Court to uphold the Galapagos Special Law. It also commends the Ecuadorian Government for supporting the “Sea Shepherd” patrols in the Galapagos Marine Reserve, as well as efforts to protect the marine ecosystem in the Reserve. The Committee also commends the *Smart Voyager* initiative, given the nature of tourism visitation to the Galapagos and the impacts of tourism on the fragile environment and in light of the proposed Marine Reserve. It believes that consideration should be given to promoting similar schemes in other World Heritage sites. The Committee furthermore notes that the sea lion incident demonstrates the need to enhance the capacity of the Park to reinforce patrolling and control of the Islands."

#### **Sian Ka'an (Mexico)**

**III.89** The Bureau was informed that IUCN received a report informing that land on the strip of dunes between the ocean and the coastal lagoon of Sian Ka'an was being advertised for sale by a real estate agent in the town of Akumal. While this is consistent with State Party law and regulations on protected areas that maintain ownership of private lands, including the right to sell those lands, the rapid escalation of tourism development in the area since the mid 1980's is of considerable concern.

**III.90** However, in the framework of the UNF “Linking biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism at World Heritage sites” project, it is noted that most of the beachfront is in private hands. This has been the case since the Reserve's conception. The management plan has set a policy that private lots can be sold, but not divided, limiting tourism development within the Reserve. The management plan for the site also sets a moratorium on further construction on the private land until the preparation of the Ecological Land Use Plan has been finalised for the site. Authorities wish to fix tourism regulations in the near future to try to raise the quality of tourism and to control its growth. These initiatives will be complemented by a new one from the Sian Ka'an authorities on a transferable development rights strategy to deal with all the beachfront holdings. The authorities hope to identify receiving areas and remove the density (development potential) from critical portions of the World Heritage site, while compensating property owners in those areas.

**III.91** IUCN has received notification from the Municipality of Solidaridad, Playa del Carmen, State of Quintana Roo, Yucatan Peninsula, of a scientific gathering planned for 5-10 November 2001. The event – “*RIVIERA MAYA ECO'01: Safeguarding the Fragile Ecosystems of Solidaridad*” is being convened with the aim of developing integrated programmes that consider protection, conservation, recovery and management of the areas unique biodiversity on a sustainable basis. The Municipality of Solidaridad, which includes part of the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve, expects the construction of approximately 80,000 hotel rooms in the Municipality in the next 10-15 years, associated with a 24% annual population growth. Currently, the area receives 5,500 tourists a day. IUCN believes the transferable property rights strategy holds some promise for reducing development pressures, and if successful, may have the potential to be applied in other World Heritage sites. IUCN therefore acknowledged the innovative attempt by the Park authorities to find a solution to the development problems facing the site, and requested the State Party to provide more information on the strategy.

**III.92** The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a report on the impact of increased tourism development on the World Heritage site and strategies to address negative impacts. It also requested a report on progress achieved with the revision of the management plan for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002.

#### **Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

**III.93** The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the Ministry for the Environment had sent a letter to the Centre dated 19 September 2001 that was transmitted to IUCN for review. This letter noted that, following one of the recommendations from the UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site in 1999, a “Participatory Long-Term Action Plan” for the site has been developed. The letter also noted the



interest and commitment of the State Party to participate in the UNF-financed project “*Enhancing our Heritage: monitoring and managing for success in World Natural Heritage sites*”. Information was received at IUCN that INPARQUES, in charge of administration for Canaima National Park, is facing serious financial difficulties, that are negatively affecting the protection of the site. Deforestation and rubbish dumping around tourist camps within the Park has also been reported. According to information received, tension between indigenous communities, the Federation of Indigenous People of the Bolivar State (FIEB) and national authorities remains high with regard to the issue of the power line project. IUCN stated that the 1999 mission provides for the framework of action. The assessment of the Action Plan is needed and the capacity of the management agency should be reviewed.

**III.94** The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a comprehensive report on the conservation of Canaima National Park, including measures taken to enhance the capacity of INPARQUES to effectively protect and manage this site. The Bureau urged the Venezuelan Government to provide a report on the implementation of all recommendations of the UNESCO/IUCN 1999 mission by 1 February 2002.

## **Europe and North America**

### **Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)**

**III.95** The Bureau noted that IUCN reviewed the “*Background to Management Guidelines for Bialowieza Forest*”, an outcome of the Technical Working Group (TWG) created within the framework of the *Bialowieza Forest Project*. IUCN noted that the *Guidelines* document is the result of a trial process for establishing a decision-making procedure concerning the future of the Forest, its social functions, and the protection of natural values of primeval forests. The TWG is the only forum assembled to date that has included representatives of a wide range of stakeholders and has involved intensive consultations within the communities affected by management of the Forest. The *Bialowieza Forest Project* is supervised by the Ministry of Environment and supported by Danish Co-operation for the Environment in Eastern Europe (DANCEE). The objective of the Project is to achieve a sustainable approach to the management of the Forest, ensuring the protection of natural values and supporting development of local communities.

**III.96** The Bureau commended the efforts of the TWG and the Bialowieza Forest Project to bring all stakeholders together to create a common vision for the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide regular progress reports in relation to the implementation of this project.

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

**III.97** The Bureau noted that the Ministry for Environment and Water submitted a report on the conservation status of Pirin National Park, which was reviewed by IUCN. The report included the following information on the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) developed for the Bansko ski zone within the site: The TDP passed all the Environment Impact Assessment procedures under Bulgarian Law. It was later submitted to the High Expert Ecological Council (HEEC) of the Ministry for Environment and Water that requested changes and protection measures. The final version of the TDP is 818.46 ha, with ski runs and facilities occupying 99.55 ha of this area. The TDP aims to upgrade an existing ski zone, the most significant element of which is a cable car. It is considered to greatly reduce the negative impacts associated with crowding, traffic congestion, and rundown facilities. The development aims to ensure the achievement of one of the major goals of the National Park, namely encouraging ecotourism and generating income for the local people. The Management Plan for the Park is to be developed with financial assistance from the ongoing Bulgarian-Swiss Biodiversity Conservation Programme. This is expected to be completed in 2001. On 12 July 2001, the sitting of the three-member High Administrative Court of Bulgaria ended with a rejection of the BALKANI Wildlife Society appeal against the decision of the Ministry of Environment and Water to grant permission for the TDP.

**III.98** Furthermore, the Bureau noted that the State Party invited a UNESCO/IUCN mission to the site. IUCN also received a Brief from the “Save the Pirin Campaign”, a coalition of over 30 Bulgarian NGOs opposed to the development. IUCN noted the State Party’s belief that “the only solution to the problem of the sustainable development of the Pirin NP is to bind the goals of the Park to the interests of the local people”, and that the TDP offers this opportunity. IUCN acknowledged that it is important that local populations benefit, where possible, from World Heritage designation. IUCN noted that any development in the World Heritage site must be carefully planned to minimise environmental impacts. IUCN questioned whether the TDP project in Pirin National Park could be considered to promote ecotourism and whether it is compatible with World Heritage status. It also noted that the total area covered by the TDP is 818.46 ha, whereas the current proposed ski runs and facilities cover less than 100 ha. This is a substantial increase.

**III.99** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes the concerns over the Territorial Development Plan (TDP) which it anticipates will lead to further incremental development within the remaining larger area. It requests the State Party to ensure that tourism development does not take place in the remaining TDP area in the future. The Committee

urges that the mission invited by the State Party be carried out as soon as possible.”

### **Gros Morne National Park (Canada)**

**III.100** The Bureau noted that following its request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning the site, which was reviewed by IUCN. The report noted that logging in the Main River watershed near Gros Morne National Park has not commenced. Parks Canada is working with the forestry company and provincial government to ensure that the proposed harvesting regime takes into account potential impacts on the World Heritage values and the ecological integrity of the site. The Bureau thanked Parks Canada for the report provided and requested the State Party to inform the Centre as soon as new developments occur.

### **Nahanni National Park (Canada)**

**III.101** The Bureau noted that following its request, the Canadian authorities provided a report concerning potential impacts of increased mining activity in the region surrounding Nahanni National Park World Heritage site. IUCN noted that a study is currently underway to determine preferred boundaries for three adjacent areas which are proposed as additions to the Park; that the Deh Cho First Nations have proposed that the Park Reserve be expanded to include part or all of the South Nahanni River watershed and that the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA) governs land and resource use in the Nahanni area and that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board has authority. The areas potentially affected by this activity are within the watershed of the South Nahanni River. In two cases, the areas potentially affected are in one of the three candidate areas that are identified as proposed additions to the Park Reserve.

**III.102** The Bureau noted that Parks Canada is concerned that the number and location of the proposed developments could result in cumulative impacts on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, including changes to water quality, habitat fragmentation, changes to wildlife movement and resulting impacts on biodiversity. Parks Canada is continuing to work in the processes established under the MVRMA and De Cho Process to address its concerns. It is continuing efforts to expand the Park Reserve into the three candidate areas identified and to work with other jurisdictions towards a comprehensive conservation regime for the balance of the watershed.

**III.103** The Bureau noted the importance placed by Parks Canada on the issue of cumulative impacts from proposed mining near this World Heritage site and the measures underway to solve or minimise this problem. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a progress report on the implementation of the MVRMA and De Cho Process by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

### **Caves of the Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst, (Hungary/Slovakia)**

**III.104** The Bureau was informed that IUCN reviewed reports concerning the preparation of a new version of the mining law by the Slovak Ministry of Economy. The new law is believed to remove or weaken the present restrictions on mining operations in protected areas. The reports also claimed that mining companies are seeking to open new limestone mines in the Slovak Karst, and claims the granting of limestone exploitation licenses by the Slovak Government is imminent. SOSNA, a Slovak environmental NGO, has proposed to the Slovak Minister of Environment the re-categorisation of the Slovak Karst from a Protected Landscape Area to a National Park and the development of local sustainable tourism and biological farming.

**III.105** The Delegate of Hungary informed the Bureau that the issues raised concern only the Slovak part of this transboundary site.

**III.106** The Bureau commended the State Party on the process of changing the status of the Protected Landscape Area of Slovensky Karst to that of a National Park. This will complement the adjacent Aggtelek National Park in Hungary and, in doing so, facilitate more cohesive and equivalent management of the two sections of the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide an update on the proposed revisions to the mining law and specific implications for the World Heritage site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

### **Aeolian Islands (Italy)**

**III.107** The Bureau was informed that IUCN received reports of legal proceedings taken to oppose the implementation of the Landscape Territorial Plan for the Aeolian Islands. The Plan (Piano Paesistico delle Isole Eolie), which was prepared by the Superintendent of Culture and Environment on behalf of the Sicily Region, which is fully responsible for the management of the World Heritage site. It covers the seven Islands in their entirety. The main goals of the Plan are to preserve the natural condition of volcanic bodies, structures and coastal areas and to establish clear rules and criteria to guide human interventions in relation to the landscape of the Islands. The Bureau also noted that it is understood that the Mayors of two of the four townships on the Islands – Lipari and Leni - have opposed the Plan and have requested the Court to deliver a judgement in order to cancel the Plan. A group of non-governmental organisations is supporting the Sicily Region's Plan in Court. If the Plan is not implemented, it is understood that the rules regarding conservation, new constructions and general human activities on the Islands will be decided on a case-by-case basis by the different City Councils. The NGO Italia Nostra, has reported that these Councils have stated their intention to increase by at least 4 times the

present level of tourist accommodation. IUCN noted the actions of Italia Nostra in support of the Landscape Territorial Plan, which is particularly important given its significance as the only (potential) plan governing the World Heritage site. IUCN also noted that at the time of nomination, the State Party mentioned its commitment to the preparation of a separate management plan for the World Heritage site, to be placed within the Landscape Territorial Plan.

**III.108** The Observer of Italy confirmed that there was a court decision on 4 December 2001 which is not yet public, but that it is hoped to be available soon. Collaboration with the Region is already underway and new information may be provided at the time of the Committee session.

**III.109** The Bureau expressed its concern to the State Party on the local government opposition to the Landscape Territorial Plan, noting that the inscription of the site was partly based on the existence of this Plan. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the implications the court action has on the preparation of a Management Plan for the World Heritage site. It also requested that information be provided to update on: progress in development of the Management Plan; the protective and educational/interpretative actions undertaken for the site, and proposed development plans, particularly with respect to tourism on the Islands, how such tourism development may affect the World Heritage site and how it will be dealt with within the Landscape Territorial Plan and Management Plan. The Bureau requested that this information be provided by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

### **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)**

**III.110** The Bureau noted that the State Party invited a UNESCO-IUCN mission to this site following the recommendation from the twenty-fourth session of the Committee. The mission took place from 25 August to 3 September 2001. A Representative of IUCN and the Director of UNESCO-Moscow Office, representing the World Heritage Centre, conducted the mission. The Bureau furthermore noted the full report of this mission contained in information document WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.8, and reviewed all information as stated in the working document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It noted in particular the series of recurrent problems and new potential threats that IUCN believed are seriously threatening the integrity of this site, including:

- inadequate implementation of the Federal Baikal Law,
- the frequent violations of the *Federal Law on the Protection of the Environment* and of the *Federal Law on Environmental Impact Assessments* in relation to logging activities, illegal hunting, over fishing and development/infrastructure,

- that there is still no overall management plan for this site, as requested by the Committee at the time of inscription, and
- the abolishment of the Baikal Commission, an intergovernmental body comprising federal and regional authorities as well as scientific institutions, in 2000;
- an increase in illegal poaching and logging
- decline of the Baikal Seal population
- that the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM) continues to be a serious threat to the integrity of this site
- pressure on the forests of the Lake Baikal region.

**III.111** In addition to these recurrent problems, the Bureau expressed concern about a number of new potential threats to the integrity of this site including a project to develop a gas and oil pipeline to China which was confirmed and that the Government of the Republic of Buryatia has granted a license to Buryat Gas Company. A number of Bureau members noted that no indication was received from the State Party concerning the inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As the Russian Federation is now a member of the World Heritage Committee, this question will be raised at the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

**III.112** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

“The Committee notes that little substantial progress has been achieved towards enhancing the protection of Lake Baikal, and addressing issues repeatedly raised by the Committee, and that there are new emerging threats that pose unprecedented risks to the integrity of this site. The Committee therefore decides to inscribe Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee notes that this should be viewed as a positive measure to attract international support to enhance the capacity of the State Party to deal with the complex issues related to the conservation of this site.

The Committee furthermore notes the following as key milestones in assessing future progress:

- (1) Development and enforcement of all related regulations and by-laws required for the *Federal Baikal Law* to become fully operational. These regulations and by-laws should be developed through a participatory and transparent process involving local people and all key stakeholders dealing with the protection and management of this site.
- (2) Development and implementation of an integrated management plan for the whole Baikal region, with emphasis on the protection of the World Heritage site. Priority should be given to develop an adequate ecological zoning of this site to enforce the *Federal Baikal Law*. This plan needs to include a comprehensive monitoring system on the state of

Lake Baikal. Adequate human and financial resources are required to ensure its long-term implementation.

- (3) Development and implementation of adequate institutional and co-ordination mechanisms for implementing the *Federal Baikal Law*, its regulations and by-laws. This could take the form of a renewed Baikal Commission or a similar institutional arrangement that would enhance co-ordination between federal and regional authorities while involving also NGOs, scientific institutions and other stakeholders.
- (4) Development and implementation of a comprehensive programme to adequately address the pollution problems affecting this site, giving particular priority to the case of BPPM, but also including other sources of pollution that are affecting the integrity of this site.
- (5) Detailed consideration of various scenarios for the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill, including total phasing out of the Mill. This requires a long-term strategy and must be associated with the development of alternative livelihoods for local people as the BPPM is the main source of employment in the region.

In addition, the Committee requests that the State Party provides an urgent response by 1 February 2002 in relation to these issues, particularly on the development of a gas and oil pipeline to China, and the potential impacts of this project on the integrity of this site, as well as the proposed oil and gas exploration in the Selenga Delta. The Committee furthermore requests the World Heritage Centre to undertake all possible efforts to encourage the World Bank, GEF, UNF, and other relevant international donors to provide urgent support, in the form of soft loans, grants and projects, to enhance the State Party efforts to address the complex conservation and development issues facing Lake Baikal."

#### **Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation)**

**III.113** The Bureau noted that the situation in and around the Bystrinski Nature Park (BNP) remains uncertain: The Kamchatka Park Service has appointed a new Park Director, however there has been little progress in dealing with threats to the BNP as the Park is receiving no financial support from the Government. Legal uncertainties continue: the boundaries of the BNP are not officially defined, and zoning of the BNP remains incomplete. This situation constrains the Park Director in monitoring hunting, preventing poaching and forest fires, and controlling tour operator activities within the BNP without authorization. Indigenous populations have expressed concern.

**III.114** The Bureau noted that gold mining operations have started at Manuch, following an unannounced change

to the boundary of the BNP. The mine is 5km from the 'new boundary' of the Park in the south-eastern section, or approximately 12km inside the boundary of the BNP as inscribed by the World Heritage Committee. Neither the Forest Service, the Park authorities, nor leaders of local indigenous communities were informed of the mine development. IUCN also informed the Bureau of a report that a road is planned connecting Esso, in the centre of the BNP, with Palana, the capital of Koriak Autonomous Region. The road will bisect the Park, and no monitoring or control programmes have been outlined. IUCN noted that this road will open up large areas to poaching and hunting and in the light of the extremely limited capacities of Park authorities and the Forest Service, the potential for major impacts on the Park are high.

**III.115** The Bureau noted that IUCN has been working with local and indigenous communities in Esso and Anavgai in the Bystrinski Nature Park within the framework of the CIDA-funded project "*Building partnerships for forest conservation and management in Russia*". The project aims to build partnerships with local communities for the development and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) such as mushrooms, berries, herbal teas and medicinal plants, thereby improving livelihoods and conserving the forest.

**III.116** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the Committee:

"The Committee notes with concern threats to the Bystrinsky Nature Park and notes conflicting reports relating to the gold mine operation and its relationship to the World Heritage boundary. The Committee requests the Centre to work in consultation with the State Party to prepare a mission to the site to review the state of conservation including the issues noted above and to ascertain whether a case exists for inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger."

#### **Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)**

**III.117** The Bureau was informed that IUCN reviewed a copy of the State Party periodic report for the Western Caucasus prepared following the June 2001 Bureau meeting. The report mentions that illegal trespassing continues to be significant, largely related to the proximity of tourist centres and hostels to the preserve's boundaries. Furthermore, there has been a weakening of conservation controls over the last 5-10 years, with an absence of such controls in the Lagonaki Plateau and Fisht-Oshtensky Massif, which are popular areas for trekking and mountaineering. In September, IUCN received reports that the Court of Adygea intended to exclude part of the Western Caucasus Zapovednik (the World Heritage site) to allow for tourist development and the construction of a road.

**III.118** IUCN noted a number of issues of concern, including the tourism and ski facilities development, as well as illegal hunting. Concerning the proposed road, IUCN noted that in an official letter at the time of the inscription it was stated that: *“The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of the Republic of Adygea informs you that at the present time the authorities of the Republic of Adygea are considering a new route for the Maikop-Black Sea Coast highway, avoiding the Caucasus Natural Reserve and other specially protected territories, including the Caucasus nomination. The above-mentioned activities are being carried out for the purpose of execution of the order by President of the Republic of Adygea Dzharimov. So the insinuations that the Adygean authorities have tried to build the highway right through the Caucasus State Natural Biospheric Reserve have no grounds.”*

**III.119** The Bureau furthermore noted that the issue of the road through the Lagonaki Plateau was discussed at the time of inscription of this site and that assurances of the State Party to abandon this route was key to the site being inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the developments mentioned-above, and specifically the status of the removal of areas from the site and the status of the road by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

#### **Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)**

**III.120** The Bureau noted that following the UNESCO-UNDP mission to the site information was received in August 2001 from the UNESCO Moscow Office of support for an international consultant to provide expertise to the Republic of Altai with regard to the road project. The Russian authorities, through the Vice Head of the Section of Especially Protected Natural Territories, informed the Centre that the Federal Road Fund agreed to finance the preparation of technical and economical grounds (TEG) for the road project, carried out by the Omsk Academy of Architecture and Construction, which will review the three variants of the proposed highway. At present, this has not been considered by the Government of the Republic of Altai.

**III.121** The Bureau noted the need for an international consultant to assist the Government of the Republic of Altai in the issue of the revision of the road project and encouraged the authorities to submit a well-defined international assistance proposal. Such a project should be reviewed and carried out in close consultation between the State Party, IUCN, the Centre and the UNESCO Moscow Office.

#### **Doñana National Park (Spain)**

**III.122** IUCN informed the Bureau about a number of issues concerning the site: the Expansion of the Port of Seville up the Guadalquivir River and outside the World

Heritage site, a project funded by sea shipping subventions of the EU, the National Park Management Plan still under discussion, the decline of the Iberian lynx and the imperial eagle population, the Rocío Pilgrimage, twice a year, involving large numbers of pilgrims walking through the Park to El Rocío village at the northern boundary of the Park, grazing at the site, and the impact of road building outside the Park. Furthermore, there are issues of illegal water extraction and the Restoration Plan for Aznalcollar Mine. Another concern lies with the funding for the required restoration works, as Apirsa has declared bankruptcy, and Boliden Ltd has denied responsibility.

**III.123** Concerning the Project Doñana 2005, IUCN noted that progress continues to be slow despite the importance of this project. In May 2001 the Project established its Scientific Board, however there has been little scientific input into the Project's activities. A new co-ordinator for the project has been appointed and it is expected that this will help to speed up project implementation. The report from the State Party notes that some of the recommendations from the October 1999 Seminar are still to be acted upon, for example, in relation to: coordination; definition of public riverine domain; watershed restoration; promotion of sustainable agriculture; development of pilot projects; and prospective studies.

**III.124** The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the results of the 2nd International Meeting on the Hydric Regeneration of Doñana (Huelva, 26 - 28 November 2001). The Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention, representatives of UNESCO, and IUCN participated. Both the representatives of the Ramsar Bureau and the World Heritage Centre also participated in the meeting of the Patronate of the Park chaired by the Minister for the Environment. It noted the Doñana 2005 project is probably the most ambitious wetland environmental regeneration project currently underway in Europe. The participants of the Conference reviewed progress and made a number of specific recommendations for the improvement of the implementation of the project. Furthermore, it was recommended that the Ramsar Convention meeting scheduled to be held in Valencia, Spain in November 2002 should be an occasion for a review of the regeneration of Doñana. The Bureau was furthermore informed of an information note on the situation of Doñana National Park prepared by the Spanish authorities and received by the World Heritage Centre, that reviews a number of issues indicated by IUCN and stating that the site has a management plan since 1984, currently in its 2nd revision, and that grazing remains a concern. At the same time the efforts to alleviate the consequences of the mining accident have to be acknowledged. The information was provided to IUCN for review.

**III.125** The Observer of Spain informed the Bureau that both IUCN and the Centre were involved in the Doñana 2005 review and that new information was just provided by the States Party to the Centre. He stated that there was no need for Danger Listing of this site.

**III.126** The Bureau commended the State Party on the *Doñana 2005* initiative, which provides an excellent framework for integrated land management. The Bureau noted that a number of concerns have been raised in relation to the integrity of this site. Accordingly, the Bureau requested the State Party to provide a full report on the threats to the site, and on how they will be addressed, by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

#### **St Kilda (United Kingdom)**

**III.127** The Bureau noted that the report provided by the Scottish Executive was transmitted to IUCN on 18 September 2001 for review. It recalled that the Committee proposed that the boundaries of the site be expanded to include the marine area and the management plan be revised. The authorities informed the Centre that they would be targeting a submission date in time for the twenty-sixth session of the Committee. IUCN commended the State Party on the research and surveys, and for maintaining the moratorium on the issuance of new oil licenses nearer to the site than those already in existence. IUCN requested that details of the risk assessment process to be put in place be provided along with the draft management plan as soon as possible and noted the collaboration of a number of organisations in the process of delineating the proposed new boundaries of the site. It encouraged the State Party to include in the revised management plan strict prohibition of all oil, gas and other exploration, in both the site and the buffer zone.

**III.128** The Bureau commended the State Party for the progress report provided and requested the authorities to submit a report by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to complete the new boundary identification as soon as possible so that work can commence in earnest on the management plan. It requested the State Party to clarify the role and involvement of the site authorities in the decision-making process for issuance of licenses in the site, in the buffer zone and outside the buffer zone. The Bureau also welcomed the outcome of the consultation meetings held as part of the preparation of the management plan. The Bureau reminded the State Party that any revised nomination dossier for cultural values and revised boundaries should be submitted by the deadlines established by the Committee.

#### **Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom)**

**III.129** The Bureau noted that the Centre received a number of letters, notably from the National Trust, raising concerns with regard to commercial development in the area surrounding the site, and the private sale and redevelopment of a complex for visitor facilities. These letters were transmitted to the State Party for comments

and to IUCN for review. IUCN noted that the Department of Environment announced that it would bring forward proposals for the production of a management plan for the entire Causeway Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which includes the World Heritage site, later this year. IUCN noted that major development, including the re-development of the visitor centre, should be considered in the context of such an integrated management plan and must be compatible with its status as a World Heritage site.

**III.130** The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that concerning the visitor centre and related development proposals, a decision was taken on 4 December 2001 not to sell any land. Furthermore he stated that the management plan for the World Heritage site is under preparation.

**III.131** The Bureau requested the State Party to provide a report on the situation of the site by 1 February 2002 for consideration by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau, to include progress with the production of the management plan for the Causeway. The Bureau expressed its concern with piecemeal development in and around the site, in the absence of such a plan.

#### **Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America)**

**III.132** The Bureau noted that a report on this site would be presented to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

#### **General debate**

**III.133** The Delegate of Greece noted that a number of issues come up regularly, such as mining, tourism and infrastructure development, and the authority of different administrative levels. Rather than treating these issues only on a case-by-case basis, general policy frameworks should be developed with regard to these issues. The Chairperson noted that this is a very good suggestion that would enable the revision of problems common to many World Heritage sites in a more systematic manner.

**III.134** The Representative of IUCN stated that a general policy framework is a good starting point to review site-specific cases. For a number of themes this process has commenced, as in the case of mining and World Heritage. The World Parks Congress, scheduled in September 2003, would be another occasion and an opportunity to discuss these issues in a broader context.

**III.135** The Delegate of Thailand underlined that such a general debate would not prevent the discussion of specific problems of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites.

## MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) HERITAGE

### Kakadu National Park (Australia)

**III.136** The Bureau noted that reports concerning the proposal to develop the Jabiluka uranium mine relevant to the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park have been received since the twenty-fourth session of the Committee (Cairns, 2000). Complete details of information presented to the Bureau are contained in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10 (see pages 29 - 32).

**III.137** The Bureau noted that new information on the status of the Jabiluka mine site had been received from the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC) on 4 December 2001 following a site inspection on 16 November 2001. The report refers to significant environmental concerns regarding the "Standby, Environmental Management and Planning phase" and calls for prompt and appropriate rehabilitation at Jabiluka. More specifically, the report raises concerns that social, cultural and environmental issues are apparently regarded as secondary to cost considerations in the development of the Jabiluka mine. The GAC consider the current regulation and indefinite use of contaminated water to irrigate the Jabiluka mine site as unacceptable. Other reported concerns include reference to the management of the mineralised stockpile and contamination of groundwater. The GAC report has been provided to the State Party, IUCN and ICOMOS for review and comment.

**III.138** The Bureau was informed that the State Party had written to the Centre on 26 November 2001 advising of continuing progress in reestablishing dialogue between the State Party and the Mirrar Traditional Owners. As a part of that dialogue, the State Party has proposed that the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation (GAC) consider a process for cultural mapping at Jabiluka based on the *Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter*. The GAC have agreed to give their consideration to this process.

**III.139** The Delegate of Thailand referred to the fact that members of the Bureau and the Centre had received reports and information directly from non-governmental organizations in Australia. He suggested that the proper procedure would be, in the first instance, for discussions to take place between the NGOs and the State Party. The representative of the Centre assured the Bureau that all reports on the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park had been transmitted to the State Party to verify the source and content of the reports. In responding to the Delegate of Thailand, the representative of IUCN highlighted the importance of inviting a representative from the conservation NGO community to join the newly established Independent Science Advisory Committee (ISAC).

**III.140** The Representative of ICOMOS noted that with the current pause in development of the Jabiluka uranium

mine and with the price of uranium dropping worldwide, a reprieve to a previously intractable problem had been found. He noted that a process for cultural mapping of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease was being developed by the State Party in consultation with the GAC. He reported that Australia ICOMOS would be involved in this process and was willing to make contributions in the form of seminars and discussions.

**III.141** The Chairperson commented that progress to resolve cultural issues at Kakadu had, to date, not been adequate. He therefore welcomed the possibility of serious discussion and progress in developing a process for cultural mapping with the involvement of ICOMOS. He emphasized the need to consider in this case both intangible and tangible heritage values.

**III.142** The Delegate of Greece commented on the reluctance of Traditional Owners to divulge information on secret sites. In response, the representative of ICOMOS outlined the need to devise a culturally appropriate process of cultural mapping. He informed the Bureau that ICOMOS had begun work on the preparation of guidelines for cultural mapping of places of importance to indigenous peoples. The representative of the Centre informed the Bureau that in a report dated 13 November 2001, the GAC had noted that the Mirrar had already provided culturally sensitive information regarding the Jabiluka area on numerous occasions. The Mirrar remain opposed to providing further information as part of the development of the Jabiluka Project. As stated in the GAC report, "In the interests of advancing dialogue with the Australian Government on the protection of cultural heritage at Kakadu, the Mirrar, however, are willing to examine a process of cultural mapping removed and separate from the management/development of the Jabiluka Project."

**III.143** The Observer of Australia noted that the pause in the development of the Jabiluka uranium mine, until at least 2009, had been beneficial in providing the opportunity to improve the dialogue with the Mirrar. According to the mining company, development of the mine would not proceed without the consent of the Traditional Owners. He noted that the protection of the cultural values of Kakadu National Park required good consultation and dialogue with all Traditional Owners in the Park, and that the Mirrar was one of some 25 clan groups. In this regard, discussions were ongoing in the Kakadu National Park Board of Management on the protection of cultural values. He noted that Aboriginal people formed the majority, and chaired the Park Board of Management. He emphasized that the process of cultural mapping at Jabiluka would need to be one in which all parties, including the Mirrar Traditional Owners, would have confidence. In relation to the new information referred to by the Centre, the Observer of Australia, in support of the observation made by the Delegate of Thailand, noted that his authorities would be able to respond more quickly to any issues if they were raised

directly with them. Direct contact in this manner would help resolve any issues.

**III.144** The Bureau noted that new information is available concerning the reestablishment of dialogue with the Mirrar Traditional Owners and scientific/technical issues relating to water management and rehabilitation of the Jabiluka mine site. The Bureau requested the State Party, Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre to consult during the few days prior to the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee to develop a new proposed decision to the Committee. Therefore, the Bureau transmitted the state of conservation report on Kakadu National Park to the Committee for decision.

### **Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

**III.145** The Bureau noted that IUCN has provided the Centre with information on two development proposals relevant to the state of conservation of this site.

**III.146** The *Basslink project* to construct an electricity connector between Tasmania and the Australian mainland could change the operating regimes at the current Gordon River Hydro Electric Scheme, including changes in the utilisation of the turbines (both number of turbines and the time of their activation) and associated water release. The Gordon River Hydro Electric scheme is entirely within the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA). When this site was inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Committee had expressed concern about the impacts of the Gordon power scheme on the Gordon River. The Committee had imposed a set of conditions including monitoring of riverbank erosion and the health of the meromictic lakes that are key features of this site. IUCN has expressed concerns that the proposed project may impact the meromictic lakes, inter-tidal zone and riparian vegetation and lead to increased seepage erosion and loss of mid-tidal macro-invertebrates and snag habitat.

**III.147** The second project concerns a proposed ecotourism resort at Planters Beach, Cockle Creek East. The resort will comprise a lodge, 60-80 accommodation units, an 800-metre extension of the current road into the Park, a jetty, walking tracks, spas, a tavern, 92 car park spaces and four bus bays. The proposed location of the resort is within the boundaries of the South West National Park, but outside the World Heritage site. It is however within the area covered by the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan of 1999 (TWWHAP). Therefore, for the development project to proceed, the Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment had proposed that the WHA Plan be amended to allow for addition of a new 'Visitor Services Site'. The proposal and proposed amendment to the WHA Plan were publicly announced and submissions called for in April 2001.

**III.148** The Centre reported information from the State Party, received on 26 November 2001, which emphasised

that assessments of both development proposals were underway. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of the *Basslink project* is under preparation and will be assessed as part of the Combined Assessment and Approvals Process by a Joint Panel comprising representatives of the Commonwealth, Victorian and Tasmanian Governments. The proponent of the project has prepared an Integrated Impact Assessment Statement (IIAS) and invited public comment; the Joint Panel will take into account the revised IIAS in its assessment of the proposed *Basslink project*.

**III.149** The Cockle Creek East development proposal has been considered under the Commonwealth's Environment and Biodiversity Conservation Act of 1999. On 5 October 2001, the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the World Heritage values of the Tasmanian Wilderness Heritage Area and therefore does not require approval under the Act. However, the proposal is being assessed under the Tasmanian State Legislation and under the provisions of the *New Proposals and Impact Assessment Process of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan 1999*.

**III.150** The Australian Observer noted with regret the fact that IUCN reports on the two projects were not transmitted to the concerned authorities in his country for comment prior to their inclusion in the working document WHC-01/CONF.207/3 in accordance with normal procedure. He stressed the need for the Centre to request the State Party for information and verification on all reports on the state of conservation of properties.

**III.151** The Bureau noted that processes for the assessment of the environmental impacts of the two projects were currently underway. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit detailed status reports on both projects, including outcomes of any EIAs prepared for these projects, to the Centre before 1 February 2002. These reports would enable the Bureau to undertake a comprehensive review of these two projects in relation to the conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area at its twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

### **Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)**

**III.152** The Bureau noted the report on the state of conservation of Tongariro National Park concerning the management of the ash build-up at Crater Lake, Mount Ruapehu contained in Working Document WHC-01/CONF.208/10 (page 33).

**III.153** IUCN emphasized that eruptions within the Crater Lake are a regular and ongoing natural feature. IUCN considers that proposed engineering works to manage the ash build-up at Crater Lake might establish a precedent within Tongariro and other national parks. IUCN



recommends that natural processes be allowed to function and measures be implemented to protect both public safety and infrastructure. ICOMOS recalled that the mountains of Tongariro National Park are sacred to the Maori and that a culturally appropriate solution needs to be found to the management of the ash build-up.

**III.154** The Bureau was informed that a representative of the State Party was expected to attend the twenty-fifth session of the Committee. The Bureau therefore decided to transmit the state of conservation report of Tongariro National Park to the Committee noting that new information may be provided.

#### **Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey)**

**III.155** The Bureau noted that preliminary reports on the state of conservation of this site received by IUCN are worrying. The reports note that the limestone cliffs are becoming discoloured and, despite the authorities prohibiting visitors from entering the travertines and the placement of signs explaining the fragility of the site, many visitors continue to enter the travertines. In addition, the collection of pieces of limestone are being taken as souvenirs. Few guards patrol the site, and there is little or no law enforcement.

**III.156** The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a report on the situation of the limestone cliffs, and on the overall management of the site before 1 February 2002 for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

#### **Europe and North America**

##### **Historic District of Québec (Canada)**

**III.157** As requested by the Bureau at its twenty-fifth session, ICOMOS undertook an evaluation mission to the site (15 to 21 October 2001). Following this mission, ICOMOS made the following recommendations:

- the Point-à-Carcy port project is acceptable so long as it serves as a port-of-call and an arrival port, but not as a homeport;
- There should be strict noise and traffic control during loading and unloading periods;
- The planned second phase of the project should be implemented as soon as possible, so as to make the quay available to the general public;
- Immediate consideration should be given to the conversion of the Champlain Maritime Station into a terminal for departing and arriving cruise ships;
- The boundaries of the World Heritage site should be adjusted so as to include the entire Pointe-à-Carcy esplanade;
- An urban plan for the area must be agreed upon in association with the Municipality;

- The three-member commission should be strengthened by the appointment of a non-Canadian expert;
- The Port Administration of Québec should provide the World Heritage Committee with a synthesis of the project as it stands, following modifications over recent years.

**III.158** The Bureau took note of the information provided by ICOMOS and requested that the full report of the ICOMOS expert mission be transmitted to the State Party. The Bureau requested the State Party to provide, by 1 February 2002, a report on the activities undertaken for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

##### **City-Museum Reserve of Mtskheta (Georgia)**

**III.159** The Bureau noted that the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission, for the UNDP-SPPD project for the *Study and Development of a Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia*, identified the following serious problems at the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, the most significant monument of the City of Mtskheta:

- the construction of two large underground storage areas, irreversible and disproportionate to the monument;
- the on-going construction of a new bell tower right over the original gate of the wall enclosing the cathedral grounds;
- the behaviour of the Cathedral in the case of an earthquake will be difficult to predict due to past and current works carried out in the immediate vicinity of the monument;
- the erection of additional constructions in concrete and aluminium, at a short distance from the Cathedral, entirely changing the external appearance of the walls of the courtyard.

**III.160** The Bureau invited the Georgian authorities to request an ICOMOS-UNESCO evaluation mission to the site to ascertain the state of conservation and notably the progress of the ongoing and future work. This mission should also identify corrective measures and solutions to establish appropriate protection and management mechanisms for the Cathedral. The Bureau requested the State Party to prepare a report on the state of conservation of the site comprising up-to-date information on all the restoration and construction projects at the site, before 1 February 2002, for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002. This report should be reviewed by the evaluation mission to the site.

##### **Classical Weimar (Germany)**

**III.161** During its last session, the Bureau had requested the German authorities to prepare a progress report on the road project foreseen in the vicinity of the Tiefurt Castle and its Park at Weimar, presenting the adopted mitigation measures. In response to a question from the Delegate of

Thailand, the Observer of Germany indicated that the authorities were still awaiting the report from the Municipality of Weimar.

**III.162** The Bureau requested the German authorities to present a progress report, by 1 February 2002, for examination at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **Hanseatic City of Lübeck (Germany)**

**III.163** In July 2001, the Secretariat learnt of a construction project in the centre of Lübeck. Following discussions and reservations expressed by ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and the German authorities, concerning the proposed height and architectural style of the buildings, an extensive report was sent to the Secretariat on the construction project by the Mayor of Lübeck on 12 September 2001. According to this report, the current buildings (post office building and townhall) which are located in the area of the construction project, have no national heritage character and are not considered worthy of protection. The height of the two new buildings will be compatible with the other buildings in the street/square and will therefore not have a negative visual impact on the World Heritage site. The modern architecture of the new buildings provides a neutral framework for the town hall. Following examination of this document, ICOMOS had informed the Secretariat that, in their view, the style and the height of the proposed new buildings on the market square are inappropriate to the ensemble of the site and proposed that another solution be found which is more compatible with the existing buildings surrounding the open area and the particular skyline of Marienkirche and the Petrikerche.

**III.164** The Observer of Germany remarked that the authorities of the city and notably the conservator, were in favour of this project, which whilst being a contemporary construction and a new element in the architectural landscape, respected the historical structure of the City.

**III.165** The Chairperson proposed that a working group comprising the International Committee of Historic Towns and Villages (ICHTC) of ICOMOS, and the local and national authorities be set up and meet in Lübeck to identify appropriate solutions. The Delegate of Hungary, Chairperson of the ICHTC, stated that this was not a unique case and that the results of a working group could serve as a basis for a study on historic city centres that face these situations.

**III.166** The Bureau requested that the working group meet as soon as possible in Lübeck to identify appropriate solutions. The Bureau requested that the report of the working group be submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the Committee (June 2002).

#### **Roman Monuments, Cathedral of St Peter, and Church of Our Lady, Trier (Germany)**

**III.167** The Bureau, at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session, requested the German authorities to formulate and implement planning regulations that will ensure the long-term preservation of the archaeological remains in this area. At the request of the Minister of Culture of the Land Rhenanie-Palatinat, ICOMOS undertook a mission to the site on 23 – 24 September 2001 to assess the state of conservation of the site. The ICOMOS expert noted that the Roman Amphitheatre is well conserved, however, there is a conservation problem notably connected with the water table, concerning the important Roman remains revealed at the site of the former brewery. In general, the ICOMOS mission noted damage to the Barbara Baths, Porta Nigra and the Imperial Baths caused by bad weather, deficiencies in staffing, a shortage of maintenance personnel to monitor state of conservation of structures, and inadequate on-site interpretation. Furthermore, the ICOMOS expert identified two potential extensions to the existing site which are: the Viehmarkt, where extensive rescue excavations have revealed substantial remains of a large Roman thermal establishment and the Simeonstift, the history and location of which are intimately linked to those of the Porta Nigra. The ICOMOS mission recommended:

- A major project for the study and re-excavation of the Barbarathermen, followed by scientific conservation and the implementation of a management plan, should be initiated without delay;
- A scientific study of the extent and nature of degradation of the stones of the Porta Negra, followed by the implementation of appropriate conservation measures;
- Serious consideration should be given to the appointment of additional security and maintenance personnel at the archaeological sites;
- Projects should be undertaken to improve the interpretation and signage at the archaeological sites;
- Consideration should be given to the nomination of the Viehmarktthermen and the Simeonstift as extensions to the World Heritage site, subject to the opening to the public of the Viehmarktthermen and appropriate changes so as to improve its presentation.

**III.168** The Observer of Germany thanked ICOMOS for its mission and recommendations. However, he indicated that the problems raised by this mission only concerned two or three monuments at the site, which comprised nine in total. He also emphasized that the improvement projects which concerned notably the conservation and the signage at the site had been entrusted to a private company. He also indicated that all the monuments at the site are open to the public, including those that ICOMOS had suggested to be included in the extension. With regard to the question of the extension of the site with other monuments, the Observer of Germany informed the Bureau that as the work foreseen at the Collegiale St

Simeon had not commenced, the Ministry deemed it too early to request an extension.

**III.169** The Representative of ICOMOS underlined that a management plan existed for some of the monuments but that for others there was no information provided regarding this point. Several delegates emphasized the importance of an integrated management plan encompassing all the monuments at the site. The Chairperson proposed that a management plan for each site be established and that coordination between these plans be ensured.

**III.170** The Bureau took note of the ICOMOS mission report and information provided by the State Party. The Bureau requested the German authorities to continue to implement the necessary measures for the establishment of appropriate management plans for each monument and to ensure coordination between these plans. It also requested the State Party to pursue its efforts in the framework of the conservation and presentation of the site, and to provide a detailed report on the implementation of these measures for examination by its twenty-sixth session in April 2002.

#### **Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

**III.171** The Bureau had requested the German authorities to collaborate with ICOMOS in the assessment of the Havel waterway improvement project and to submit a report for examination by the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. Through the German National Committee of ICOMOS a report was prepared by Stiftung Preussischer Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg which calls attention to the threat the project will cause to the buildings located at the Havel waterfront. Notably, the Heilandskirche in Sacrow and the Maschinenhaus Park Babelsberg could be adversely affected by the project.

**III.172** The Bureau took note of the concerns raised by ICOMOS and the Stiftung Preussischer Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg regarding the negative impact of the Havel waterway improvement on the landscape on each side of the river. The Bureau also noted that the State Party had informed of the delay in the project and that an official decision would not be taken before 2004. In this context, the Bureau requested the German authorities to undertake all necessary measures to ensure that the values of the World Heritage site be taken into consideration in the framework of the official urban planning public process and the ICOMOS be invited to participate actively in this process. The Bureau requested the State Party to prepare, by 1 February 2003, a detailed report comprising updated information on the status of the project for examination by its twenty-seventh session in April 2003.

#### **Acropolis, Athens (Greece)**

**III.173** After examination of information provided by a group of residents on a 32-metre high building proposal, in the vicinity of the Acropolis, ICOMOS informed the

Secretariat that it considered the project unacceptable due to its proximity to the World Heritage site. This construction would significantly block the view from certain points, and cause adverse visual impact on the site. The Bureau noted that numerous protests had been made complaining about this project, notably by NGOs, the Department of Architecture of the University of Athens and by the Directors of Institutes of Nordic Countries in Athens, whose buildings are located within the perimeter of the building project. The Secretariat was also informed that the 3rd Department of Antiquities of Athens had undertaken archaeological research at the site where the construction is foreseen because of recent discoveries of archaeological remains.

**III.174** By letter of 29 November 2001, the Permanent Delegation of Greece, informed the Secretariat that the land area upon which the building would be constructed is outside of the buffer zone of the Acropolis site and also outside the historic centre of the city of Athens. The Delegation had also informed that the building licence granted for the project was provisional mainly because the area falls under the archaeological jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture and that since September, the 3rd Department of Antiquities of the Ministry has been carrying out excavations at the site and that remains have been found. The Delegation added that the building licence was dependent upon the results of the ongoing excavations.

**III.175** After examination of this information, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it was satisfactory to have confirmation that the parcel of land was under the archaeological jurisdiction of the Ministry and that the excavations had been undertaken. However, ICOMOS noted that the main objection to this project was the size of the proposed building that was considered as possibly causing negative visual impact on the World Heritage site.

**III.176** The Delegate of Greece emphasized that the jurisdiction applied to the site concerned by the project was clear and that this was outside of the buffer zone and the World Heritage site. She furthermore informed that the responsible Ministry was anxious to protect the site and its visual aspect. She mentioned that, in this framework, the law forbade constructions above a certain height. The Delegate of the State Party furthermore, reaffirmed that no building licence had yet been granted and that this would only be done in accordance with the results of the excavations undertaken.

**III.177** ICOMOS remarked that the principal concern remained the height, 32 metres, of the proposed building, and that this would constitute a new emergence in the landscape. The Chairperson remarked that it would be useful to carry out a visual impact study. The Bureau took note of the building construction project adjacent to the World Heritage site. The Bureau requested the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed of the evolution of this project.

### **Historic Centre of Naples (Italy)**

**III.178** The Bureau noted that the Italian authorities have taken action to halt the demolition of 27 ancient buildings in the Historic Centre of Naples and congratulated the State Party for protecting the World Heritage values of the site.

### **The Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russian Federation)**

**III.179** At the request of the State Party, an ICOMOS/UNESCO (UNESCO Moscow Office) mission assessed the impact on the site of a proposed oil extraction operation. The ICOMOS expert visited the Lithuanian part, while the UNESCO Moscow Office representative (ecology specialist) had discussions with the Russian side (including the Lithuanian Consulate and World Ocean Museum in Kaliningrad, Russian Federation). Both experts obtained similar information. The UNESCO Moscow Office received documentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the project. The D-6 Krakovskaya oil deposit is located at a depth of 27 – 30m in the Baltic Sea shelf, 22km off the coast of the Curonian Spit. In 1985 the USSR established that the environmental aspects of the project were not safe and that the existing technology could not ensure a safe oil exploitation. In August 2000 the company Lukoil announced that work would commence. The Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs repeatedly requested official information on the project from the Russian Federation. However no reply was received. During a boat visit of the area, the mission noted that construction work is being carried out on the platform and that the construction will be completed by 2002. While the platform has no visual impact on the World Heritage site, ICOMOS considers the potential impact of an oil spill as immense. In case of accident, the wind and sea currents would drive the oil spill in the direction of the Baltic shores of Lithuania, the Spit and as far as Latvia. The recommendations of the ICOMOS mission are:

- An environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be carried out, by either a joint Russian-Lithuanian team of experts or by an independent international consultancy;
- The Russian company should allow Lithuanian experts access to the technical data relating to safety provisions;
- The two countries should collaborate in the preparation of a risk-preparedness programme.

**III.180** The Bureau took note of a fax received on 7 December during its session from the UNESCO National Commission of the Russian Federation informing that neither the State Committee for Ecology or its successor, the State Committee for Natural Resources had agreed to any mining exploration projects. ICOMOS emphasized that the mining exploration was located at no great distance from one of the most fragile cultural landscapes inscribed on the List and that the risk of an oil spill was

high. If this happened, the impact on the site would be great.

**III.181** The Bureau took note of the information provided by the ICOMOS expert and the report on the mission of August 2001. It thanked the Lithuanian authorities for their efforts to ensure the protection of the Curonian Spit. In view of the urgent situation, the Bureau requested the State Party of the Russian Federation to submit a report before 1 February 2002, on the project concerning the Russian part of this transboundary site and on technical data relating to safety provisions, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session in April 2002. Furthermore, the Bureau requested that the environmental impact assessment be carried out, without delay, jointly by a Lithuanian-Russian team of experts and that the outcome of this study be communicated to the Bureau, at its next session.

### **City of Luxemburg: its Old Quarters and Fortifications (Luxemburg)**

**III.182** Following a meeting between the Delegation of Luxemburg, the Chairperson, the Secretariat and the Representative of ICOMOS, the Bureau was informed that awaiting the opinion of the Secretary General of ICOMOS, the examination of this site would be referred to the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee.

### **Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta)**

**III.183** The Bureau, at its twenty-fifth session, requested the State Party to inform the Committee on progress of actions undertaken following damage caused by vandalism that occurred in April 2001. A report on the restoration project of the Megalithic Temples was sent by the Permanent Delegation of Malta to the Secretariat on 18 October 2001. This report informed that a strategic restoration plan had been prepared by the Department of Museums and implemented during May to July 2001. It also informed that security measures had immediately been undertaken following the acts of vandalism, as well as a general reinforcement of security at the site. The report also contained information concerning ongoing and long-term protection and conservation projects for the Megalithic Monuments.

**III.184** The Bureau took note of the information contained in the report and expressed its satisfaction as to the speed with which the remedial actions had been undertaken and for the conservation and protection measures established to protect all the Megalithic Temples of Malta. The Delegate of Greece noted that, in these cases, appropriate measures should be undertaken to combat vandalism.

### **Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

**III.185** The Bureau noted that a site visit to Auschwitz under the leadership of the Chairperson of the World

Heritage Committee, Mr Peter King, took place on 1 and 2 July 2001, to assess the issues relating to the management of the site and the establishment of a buffer zone. The full mission report was presented to the Bureau as Information Document WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.6. The Bureau was also informed that it was sent to the Polish authorities for review and comments.

**III.186** The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the mission covered the management of the World Heritage site, its buffer zone (including the 300 to 1000 m silence zones), related sites, government responsibilities and local communities, as well as management planning and financial issues. The report contains very specific recommendations for each of these issues, including those for the International Group of Experts.

**III.187** The Bureau noted that as a result of the site visit, discussions with the Polish authorities and concerned parties were held in a constructive atmosphere to achieve progress with regard to the protection of the site and confidence for the overall future management in consultation with all stakeholders. The mission in particular acknowledged the commitment by the Polish Government to the preservation of the World Heritage site. However, the need for a policy for the conservation and overall management of the surroundings incorporating a coherent silence and protection zone, an appropriately zoned buffer area and satisfactory long-term protection or integration of the area between the two camps was emphasized. The excellent quality of management at the World Heritage site and the commitment and dedication of the staff of the museum was noted. However, a number of issues were identified: social and commercial development, private property rights in neighbouring areas, longer term suitable investment, appropriate tourism and education programmes, inventory of related sites, co-ordination between the different levels and a dialogue between the city of Oswiezim and the village of Brezinka. The mission also recommended that the terms of reference and structure for the work of the International Group of Experts and the formation of two sub-committees, one on museology and conservation and the other one on urbanism and planning be determined as soon as possible. This will enable the International Group of Experts to proceed with the work on an on-going basis.

**III.188** The Bureau was informed of a letter received from the Deputy Secretary of State of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Administration of the Republic of Poland dated 5 December 2001, informing the Centre that he had taken over the responsibility for the implementation of the Auschwitz Government Strategic Programme. This Programme will be continued for the period 2002-2006. The authorities furthermore invited UNESCO to undertake a further visit in the second half of 2002. Concerning the discotheque, the regional governor has now reversed the decision and refused to grant permission to operate the facility.

**III.189** The Observer of Israel commended the Secretariat for the excellent support and underlined that the mission obtained very positive views concerning the management of the site. He informed the Bureau, however, that a number of issues remain to be solved, including the discotheque, the supermarket and the work and structure of the International Group of Experts. He requested that this be followed very closely, as steps need to be taken to ensure the work, structure and timetable of the International Group of Experts. As no technical assistance request was received from the Polish authorities, his Government would provide an amount of up to US\$ 20,000 for the actions required.

**III.190** The Observer of Poland reconfirmed the appreciation of his Government for the mission and its findings. He stated that his Government was pursuing juridical procedures with regard to the discotheque and the Carmel Convent. Concerning the technical assistance request, he informed the Bureau that this is now under consideration and that the function, structure, competence and terms of reference of the International Group of Experts required clarification. He confirmed the conclusions of the report and informed the Bureau that the complexity of different Government levels should be acknowledged. He assured the Bureau of a close follow-up of all matters with UNESCO.

**III.191** The Bureau adopted the following decision for transmission to the World Heritage Committee for action:

“The Committee takes note of the report of the site visit to Auschwitz Concentration Camp and its surroundings and thanks the Chairperson, Mr Peter King, for his great commitment concerning this site. The Committee urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission as soon as possible and requests the authorities to provide a report by 1 February 2002 with details on the status of the implementation of the recommendations and a timeframe.”

#### **Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania)**

**III.192** The Bureau noted the information contained in the Working Document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It also noted the information provided by the State Party that underlined that the special programme including the "Dracula ParK" project, as well as the creation of an Interministerial Committee for its monitoring, had been approved by the Government in July 2001, launched in November 2001 and for which the implementation is foreseen for May 2002. The Bureau also took note that the first phase of this project comprised a feasibility study, that the complex envisaged is located 6 Km from the town centre and will be constructed on a vast area and a rehabilitation and revitalisation of the town of Sighisoara was foreseen thanks to the income from the "Dracula Park".

**III.193** The Bureau took note of the view of ICOMOS who considered that although such a project would permit an increase in tourism in the region where the economy is weak, its impact could have a negative effect on the values for which Sighisoara was inscribed on the World Heritage List. This would include the alteration to the visual integrity of the historic town itself, even if the project is located at a distance of 6 Km, and the effects of mass tourism on the World Heritage site and its immediate surroundings.

**III.194** The Observer of Germany emphasized that the area covered by the project was foreseen to be sixty hectares and that there was a risk that the town would become the focal point of an amusement park on the lines of a "Disneyland". He thought that the authenticity of the town would be greatly threatened by a project of this kind. He also recalled paragraph 56 of the Guidelines that invited States Parties to inform the Committee of all construction projects that could modify the value of the property.

**III.195** The Delegate of Hungary indicated that this was a serious problem which concerned a project involving mass tourism and which would be very different from that generated by the town itself. He emphasized that there was no question of preventing tourism but that one must be prudent. He also noted that the proximity of the Park to the town was very dangerous. He suggested that another location be found for the construction of the Park.

**III.196** The Representative of ICOMOS indicated that the distance separating the Parc project from the town was 1.5 Km as the crow flies, that the impact on it would be vast and that a large number of elements of the Park would be visible from the town. He also indicated that a cablecar project existed to link the Park to the town. He finally mentioned that ICOMOS was not against a project that could generate income for the region, but he strongly recommended that another location for the project be found as far away from the town of Sighisorara as possible.

**III.197** After this debate, the Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee notes with concern the building project for an amusement park in the vicinity of the site, and which could have a negative impact on the integrity and the ensemble of the site. The Committee notes with disquiet the information provided by the State Party and notably the fact that the Romanian authorities had already approved the project as well as the implementation of the special programme foreseen for May 2002. The Committee urgently requests the State Party to undertake the projected environmental impact study as soon as possible; it informs the State Party that assistance could be granted for this purpose. Furthermore, the Committee strongly encourages the

State party to explore all other possible solutions for an alternative location for the construction of this amusement park. The Committee requests that a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission be undertaken to the site as soon as possible and that a report on the mission be presented at its twenty-sixth session (June 2002)."

#### **Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)**

**III.198** The Bureau took note of the information contained in the World Document WHC-01/CONF.207/3. It also took note that a request for emergency assistance from the State Party to hold an international workshop at the site had been received by the Centre and was approved on 14 October 2001 for a total amount of US\$ 29,540. This workshop would also include the elaboration of a workplan for the safeguarding of the site.

**III.199** The Delegate of Finland underlined that the site has been facing permanent and continual problems since its inscription, notably with regard to the conservation work, management and security measures. He proposed that given an increasing number of wooden churches are being inscribed on the World Heritage List, or were being proposed for inscription, a network of experts and responsible persons at the different sites could be created to respond to different problems. He also recommended that in the future, direct assistance from the Committee to the responsible person at the site be proposed.

**III.200** Recalling the structural problems encountered at the site, the Representative of ICCROM indicated that a multidisciplinary conservation plan had been adopted for the site in 1995 but that it had never been implemented. He supported the proposal of the Delegate of Finland and informed that ICCROM would provide assistance, recommending, however, that this approach be global and that all questions affecting the site be treated.

**III.201** The Representative of ICOMOS commended the Delegate of Finland for this proposal. He indicated that the services of the International Committee for Wood and Vernacular Architecture of ICOMOS were at the disposal of the Committee for the study suggested by the Delegate of Finland.

**III.202** After this debate, the Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

"The Committee takes note of the information provided by ICCROM and thanks the authorities of the Russian Federation for having initiated the process to ensure the protection of the site. In view of the alarming state of conservation of the site, the Committee requests the Secretariat to work in close collaboration with the authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies with regard to the international workshop on conservation measures for Kizhi Pogost. Furthermore, the Committee requests the State Party to provide a

detailed update of the situation, by 1 February 2002, and requests the Centre to provide a full report on the results of the workshop, in collaboration with the authorities of the Russian Federation and the Advisory Bodies, for its twenty-sixth session in June 2002."

#### **Spišský Hrad and its Associated Cultural Monuments (Slovakia)**

**III.203** In June 2001, ICOMOS received information that a travertine quarry below Drevenik, on the south-western edge of the inscribed site, was operational and that quarrying was going ahead. The permit is of limited duration and is scheduled to end in 2002. ICOMOS considers that the main threat to the site comes from the blasting operations, and to a lesser extent, from the large quantity of dust produced by extraction and transportation.

**III.204** The Bureau took note of the report provided by ICOMOS and requested the Slovakian authorities to provide a report on the situation by 1 February 2002, for examination by the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

#### **Route of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)**

**III.205** The Bureau took note of the reservations made by ICOMOS concerning the dam project that represents a threat for a part of the Route of Santiago de Compostela. It expressed its concern with regard to the impact of the dam which risks flooding a part of the Route of Santiago de Compostela and requested the Spanish authorities to study all alternative solutions to avoid any negative impact on the values and integrity of the World Heritage site.

**III.206** The Observer of Spain informed the Bureau of progress achieved with ICOMOS on this question following the recommendation formulated by the Bureau during its twenty-fourth session. He indicated that after the meetings to be held between representatives of the national and regional governments and ICOMOS-Spain representatives, information would be updated and sent to the Centre. He also indicated that research would be carried out to establish the true trail of the Route to its source. He informed the Bureau that the national and local Governments would do nothing to endanger the historical integrity of the Route.

#### **Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites (United Kingdom)**

**III.207** The Bureau noted the information received from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport of the United Kingdom emphasizing that in order to improve the site's setting, the Government proposes to remove two roads from the immediate vicinity of the monument. In this regard, it is proposed that the A303 road run through a 2km tunnel near the stone circle, whilst the other road (A344) should be closed and converted to grass. It is also proposed that the present rather poor visitor facilities and car park should be removed and that a new visitor centre

(with car parking and interpretative facilities) should be build a short distance away, outside the site. However, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport underlined in its letter that all these proposals will be subject to examination under normal planning procedures and that full consideration will be given to the overall archaeological and environmental implications. ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that it was in full agreement with the proposals and that the cut-and-cover tunnel is a feasible project that will not cause any damage to the archaeology and the environment on the site.

**III.208** Concerning Silbury Hill, part of the World Heritage site, the Secretariat has been informed by numerous letters that the site was threatened by collapse. The State Party informed the Centre that the present problem has been caused by the collapse of the filling of a vertical shaft. In May 2000, a squared-shaped hole about 1.8m wide opened up to a depth of just over 10m. This was covered immediately with a scaffolding cover. However, before any plan could be implemented further collapse occurred. Under these circumstances, English Heritage decided to commission a seismic survey, but this was delayed due to the fact that the Hill was situated within an area infected by Foot and Mouth Disease. The State Party informed the Secretariat that appropriate action is being taken to repair Silbury Hill and safeguard it from further damage. Furthermore, ICOMOS informed the Secretariat that the existence of the pit at the top of the Hill had been known for many years and it was not considered a threat to stability until it began to widen under the impact of the unusually heavy rainfall earlier this year. ICOMOS is of the opinion that both the technical and archaeological problems are being addressed as matters of urgency and that the long-term future of the monument is not threatened.

**III.209** The British Ministry of Culture has informed the Secretariat that the seismic survey commissioned for Silbury had been carried out, and that its results which are presently being analysed, will be transmitted to the Centre together with proposals for the restoration of the monument, as soon as possible.

**III.210** The Bureau noted the information transmitted by the State Party concerning the planning and the protection of the site of Stonehenge. The Bureau also noted the views of the State Party and ICOMOS on Silbury Hill which is part of the World Heritage site. It requested the State Party to work in close consultation with the Centre and ICOMOS regarding the planning and protection of the site and to present a progress report to the Bureau at its next session in April 2002.

## Arab States

### M'Zab Valley (Algeria)

**III.211** The Secretariat informed the Bureau on the findings of the mission sent to the M'Zab Valley in September 2001. The expert reported on the adverse impact on the built and natural environment of the site of the significant socio-economic changes, which occurred in the Valley over the past decades. As adequate protective legislation is lacking, the report stressed the need to urgently provide assistance to the Algerian authorities in establishing appropriate protective mechanisms for the various *ksour*. In this respect, the Secretariat also informed the Bureau of the requests for International Assistance submitted by the State Party of Algeria, currently under review, for the organization of training activities and for technical co-operation, aimed at improving the management of the site.

**III.212** The Bureau invited the State Party to co-operate with the Centre in the elaboration of a Development and Safeguarding Plan for the M'Zab Valley. The implementation of International Assistance, based on international experience and respecting the local artisan traditions, for on-the-job training on conservation techniques should also be initiated.

### Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria)

**III.213** The Secretariat confirmed to the Bureau that, according to recent information received orally from the Director of the Algerian Heritage Department, the site has not been particularly affected by the torrential rains of November 2001. The Bureau was also informed on the findings of the expert mission sent to the Kasbah of Algiers in September 2001.

**III.214** The expert reported on the worrying deterioration process and lack of maintenance affecting the site, due to the progressive replacement of the original population with inhabitants of poorer condition from the countryside, combined with the absence of a protective legislation. Further to the abrogation of the old law by the new 1998 legislation, the development of a new Safeguarding Plan was entrusted to local urban planning firms by the authorities. This Plan, however, has not yet been completed. Further to the expert mission, the State Party submitted two requests for International Assistance, currently under review, for the organization of training activities, aimed at improving the management of the site.

**III.215** The Bureau invited the State Party to co-operate with the Centre in the elaboration of a Development and Safeguarding Plan for the Kasbah of Algiers, and in the implementation of the International Assistance for training activities on conservation techniques and management of the built heritage.

### Archaeological Site of Tipasa (Algeria)

**III.216** The Secretariat reported on the findings of a visit to the site, carried out last September by an international expert, in preparation for the Emergency Assistance approved by the Bureau at its last session of June 2001. During this visit, the problems raised in the Periodic Report submitted by the State Party were reviewed and detailed terms of reference for the team of international experts identified.

**III.217** A major concern is the Safeguarding and Presentation Plan for the site, prepared in 1992 with support from the Committee, which apparently is not implemented. As a result, new buildings have been constructed within the buffer zone, while the threats deriving from erosion and salt winds are not yet under control. Another issue is the impact on the site of over 140,000 visitors per year, mainly schools from the nearby city of Algiers, which is causing damage to the fragile archaeological structures.

**III.218** The Bureau recommended to the Algerian authorities to implement without delay the 1992 Safeguarding and Presentation Plan, to reduce pressure on the site. Furthermore, the Algerian authorities were invited to keep the World Heritage Centre fully informed of any project or development concerning the site of Tipasa, and submit all studies for approval before their implementation.

### Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)

**III.219** The Secretariat informed the Bureau on the findings of the ICOMOS mission to Cairo in August 2001, to evaluate the current restoration projects, and reported on the mission headed by the Director of the World Heritage Centre in September 2001.

**III.220** On the major restoration campaign presently being implemented in Cairo, with a total of 150 interventions foreseen within a period of eight years and 48 monuments currently under restoration, the ICOMOS report emphasized a number of issues of concern. The main remarks concerned the need to strengthen co-ordination among the various institutions involved in the rehabilitation of the site; the importance of adopting a comprehensive Master Plan with clear land-use and building regulations; the necessity to ensure a compatible use and proper management mechanisms for restored monuments; and the overall issue of the varying quality of the projects and work being executed, with a tendency towards 'complete restoration', as opposed to conservation of signs of age and patina that has resulted from wear and tear.

**III.221** In addition, the report stressed the need for a larger public awareness of the objectives of the restoration campaign, and for specific training on conservation for the professional staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities,



mostly composed of archaeologists, architects and engineers, taking into account the unprecedented scale and number of restoration projects.

**III.222** The Secretariat then informed the Bureau of a series of specific actions, to be partially funded through the Egyptian Funds-in-Trust at UNESCO, that the WHC and the Egyptian authorities agreed to implement together, in order to address the above issues. These actions include:

- An International Seminar on the conservation of Historic Cairo, with multi-disciplinary planning workshops focused on specific projects, to be organized in early 2002. Periodic reviewing seminars of the current projects will also be held;
- The establishment within the premises of a restored monument, of a permanent Information Centre on Historic Cairo World Heritage site and current conservation efforts;
- The preparation of a Conservation Manual, with technical specifications and detailed descriptions of the types of work most commonly required for the conservation and maintenance of historic buildings within the city of Cairo.

**III.223** The Delegate of Egypt thanked the Secretariat and ICOMOS for their co-operation, but strongly protested about the leakage of the ICOMOS mission report to the Egyptian press that occurred before its official transmission to the Egyptian authorities, and the letter written by the ICOMOS President to the First Lady of Egypt, Madam Suzanne Mubarak, which he claimed, referred in an exaggerated manner, to the poor state of conservation of Historic Cairo. On this latter point, he requested an official apology from ICOMOS. The Egyptian Delegate also expressed some reservations on the content of the ICOMOS report, and stated that the Egyptian authorities were not provided the opportunity to review it thoroughly with the Centre and ICOMOS. Recalling that Historic Cairo has over 600 listed monuments, he questioned the completeness of the evaluation made by ICOMOS and the conclusions contained in the report. He then reiterated the Egyptian authorities' readiness to continue co-operating with UNESCO and the WHC, in addition to the initiatives mentioned above, to ensure the appropriate monitoring of the site. Finally, the Delegate of Egypt expressed the wish that the future denomination of the site be, from now on, "Historic Cairo", to better represent its composite, multicultural heritage.

**III.224** The Bureau commended the State Party for its great efforts towards the rehabilitation of Historic Cairo, for co-operating with the Centre in monitoring the state of conservation of the site, and particularly for supporting the three above-mentioned actions in collaboration with the WHC. The Bureau also encouraged the State Party:

- to improve co-ordination among concerned institutions within Historic Cairo and to elaborate a

comprehensive institutional framework which would ensure a better management of the site;

- to institutionalise the trend, recently emerged, whereby appropriate and compatible functions for non-religious buildings and future management mechanisms are determined, before starting any restoration works on a monument;
- to ensure consistency in the quality of all restoration works, in compliance with recognized international standards;
- to invest, as a matter of urgency, adequate resources towards the capacity-building in the area of architectural conservation for the staff of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, to enable a more effective management of the restoration campaign;
- to continue the periodic monitoring of the restoration works, in close consultation with the WHC.

#### **Abu Mena (Egypt)**

**III.225** The Secretariat reported on the findings of a visit to the site, headed last September by the Director of the World Heritage Centre. A land-reclamation programme for the agricultural development of the region, funded by the World Bank, has caused in the past ten years a dramatic rise in the water table. The local soil, which is exclusively clay, is hard and capable of supporting buildings when in a dry state, but becomes semi-liquid with excess water. The destruction of numerous cisterns, disseminated around the city, has entailed the collapse of several overlying structures. Huge underground cavities have opened in the north-western region of the town. The risk of collapse is so high that the authorities were forced to fill with sand the bases of some of the most endangered buildings, including the crypt of Abu Mena with the tomb of the Saint, and close them to the public. A large banked road, moreover, was built to enable movement within the site. The Supreme Council of Antiquities is trying to counteract this phenomenon by digging trenches, and has enlarged the listed area in the hope of lowering the pressure of the irrigation. These measures, however, have proved to be insufficient, taking into account the scale of the problem and the limited resources available.

**III.226** The Delegate of Egypt explained that, while the constant need for arable land in the country (only 6% of its territory) totally justifies this irrigation scheme, an appropriate drainage mechanism had not been provided at the time of the project, thus causing the rise in the ground water level. He then recalled that a large Monastery, visited by thousands of people every week, lies east of the site, adding to the problem. Conscious of the gravity of the situation, the Delegate of Egypt thanked the Centre for its support and expressed his agreement on the proposed inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Chairperson commended the positive attitude of Egypt for this important step which, he recalled, is aimed exclusively at assisting the State Party in identifying and implementing the necessary corrective measures for the safeguarding of the values of the site.

**III.227** The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for examination by the Committee at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee decides to inscribe Abu Mena on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requests the Egyptian authorities to co-ordinate with all the competent national institutions and the Centre, in view to rapidly identify the necessary corrective measures to ensure the safeguarding of the site.”

#### **Tyre (Lebanon)**

**III.228** The Bureau was informed of the recent decisions taken by the Lebanese authorities, specified in an official letter from the Director-General of the Antiquities Department to the Centre on 5 October 2001, on the proposed Tourism Marina project and Urban Master Plan.

**III.229** A Feasibility Study on the Tourist Marina project was to evaluate three possible options: 1) the rehabilitation and up-grading of the existing Tyre Port; 2) the extension of the existing Tyre Port; and 3) the construction of a new port in Mheilib, three kms north of Tyre. The Lebanese authorities have confirmed that the first option (rehabilitation and up-grading of existing port structures) will be retained, in line with the recommendations of the Centre. The latter, however, conditioned its approval to the accomplishment by the Lebanese authorities of the following:

- Full underwater survey inside the harbour;
- Limiting to the maximum of 30 the number of boats docking in the tourist marina;
- Using the marina project as an opportunity to upgrade the fishing port with the creation of amenities for fishermen and locations for the interpretation and presentation of the underwater heritage of Tyre.

**III.230** As concerns the Master Plan, the Department of Antiquities confirmed the listing and protection, within the territory of Tyre, of vast areas around the main archaeological sites. These areas will be mostly surrounded by agricultural land, with building coefficients limited to 5%. The definition of the land-use for all other areas belonging to the State will be frozen until completion of the archaeological survey.

**III.231** The Secretariat also informed the Bureau of a recent mission to Lebanon carried out by the World Heritage Centre, to review the scope of a proposed large World Bank Cultural Heritage and Tourism Development project, with a significant component for the site of Tyre (as well as for the World Heritage sites of Baalbek and Byblos). As the relevant documents are still under preparation, the Secretariat will inform the Bureau on the potential implications of this project for the site of Tyre and other Lebanese World Heritage sites at its next session, in April 2002.

**III.232** The Bureau commended the Lebanese authorities on the important decisions taken for the safeguarding of the World Heritage site of Tyre, and recommended that, prior to any building activity within the ancient port, in line with the provisions of the *Operational Guidelines*, reports and detailed projects be transmitted to the Centre for submission to the Committee. In relation to the proposed World Bank project, the Bureau invited the Lebanese authorities to continue co-ordinating with the Centre in its finalization and future implementation.

#### **Ksar Ait ben Haddou (Morocco)**

**III.233** The Secretariat recalled that a mission report dated August 2000 expressed strong concerns for the state of conservation of the site, and had formulated a number of urgent recommendations for its safeguarding. These recommendations included:

- Status of the site at the national level: finalising the listing process of the site, including private properties;
- Strengthening the capacities of the Centre for the Conservation and Rehabilitation of the Southern Kasbahs (CERKAS), responsible for the site;
- Creating a management commission for the site;
- Creating a working group to elaborate a Management Plan;
- Completing the Management Plan by the end of 2001.

**III.234** The report also recommended the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**III.235** The Bureau was also reminded that at its twenty-fourth extraordinary session, in Cairns, the Chairperson of the Committee made it clear that, should the proposed actions not be achieved by the end of 2001, the Moroccan authorities would submit a request for inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A report on the progress of the activities was also due for submission to the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Centre has so far not received such a report. During a private visit to Ksar Ait Ben Haddou carried out in August 2001, the same expert, author of the first report, found that the above-mentioned actions had not been completed and that a Management Plan for the site had not been prepared.

**III.236** The Bureau adopted the following recommendation for transmission to the Committee, for examination at its twenty-fifth session:

“The Committee, pending consultation with the State Party concerned, decides to inscribe Ksar Ait Ben Haddou on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and encourages the Moroccan authorities to submit a request of International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund, aimed to finalize a conservation and management plan for the site. The Committee, furthermore, requests the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2002, a report on the progress on the recommendations made in the report of August 2000”.

### **Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)**

**III.237** The Secretariat reported on the very worrying state of conservation of the site, which, despite the positive achievements of the 1986 International Safeguarding Campaign for the Old City of Sana'a, is presently affected by an uncontrolled urban development, in the absence of an adequate protective mechanism.

**III.238** The historical market area (*Souk*), which serves now a much larger community than it used to only ten years ago, is spreading outside its traditional borders towards the adjacent residential areas, with a significant impact on the lower levels' structure of these ancient buildings. Numerous new constructions are also being built within the walls of the Old City, using modern structures and materials. These constructions include several high-rise constructions, the height of which is in excess by several storeys, of the level of other parts of the Old City. On the other hand, most traditional houses are not properly maintained by the present inhabitants, mainly tenants who recently moved into the city from the villages, due to lack of financial means.

**III.239** The Bureau encouraged the Yemeni authorities to submit a request for International Assistance to the Committee, to enable the preparation of a comprehensive Safeguarding Plan for the Old City of Sana'a, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau, furthermore, invites the Yemeni authorities to consider the opportunity to take urgent measures in order to halt new constructions, modern additions or alterations within the traditional urban fabric of the Old City, until such a Safeguarding Plan has been prepared and adopted.

### **Africa**

No state of conservation reports. The state of the World Heritage in Africa, 2001, will be presented to the Committee.

### **Asia and the Pacific**

#### **The Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple Monastery, Lhasa (China)**

**III.240** The Bureau recalled that the state of conservation of the Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple of Lhasa had been examined by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session and again at the twenty-fifth session by the Bureau. The Bureau took note of the urban development, expansion of tourism related facilities, deterioration of architectural structures and mural painting conservation issues which continue to affect the world heritage values of the property.

**III.241** The Bureau was informed that a fact-finding UNESCO Mission was undertaken by a Centre staff with the Chinese authorities in November 2001. This mission noted with appreciation that the restoration of the

southeastern wall of the Potala Palace, which collapsed partially in August 2001 due to rainfall, was underway. Concerning the 35 meter high tower commemorating the "Peaceful Liberation of Tibet", the UNESCO Mission verified that the new construction was located outside the World Heritage protective zones, at the south end of the new Potala Square.

**III.242** The Observer of China expressed her Government's appreciation to the World Heritage Committee, its Bureau, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre for their continued concern and support for the conservation of Tibetan cultural heritage. In relation to the Bureau's request at its twenty-fifth session for information concerning policies for international co-operation for conservation programmes benefiting the World Heritage protected areas in Lhasa, the Observer of China assured the Bureau that the authorities wholeheartedly welcomed international co-operation, a policy consistent with the national "open door" policy. However, she informed the Bureau that Tibet is an autonomous region where all international co-operation activities must be undertaken with the request and support from the local authorities, involving local experts to the extent possible.

**III.243** The Bureau expressed its appreciation to the Chinese authorities for facilitating the UNESCO mission to the Potala Palace and Jokhang Temple in Lhasa in November 2001. Recalling its recommendation to the authorities to consider the organization of a mural painting conservation workshop, the Bureau noted with appreciation that the Central Government of China had decided to allocate approximately US\$ 25 million for the second phase of the Potala Palace Rehabilitation Project. This funding, expected to be utilized in 2002, would be allocated for the consolidation of the Norbulingka Gardens, the Saja Temple, as well as for the conservation of the mural paintings within the Potala Palace and Norbulingka Temple.

**III.244** The Bureau, assured by the Observer of China that her Government continues to support the work of the Lhasa Cultural Relics Bureau for the inventorying and mapping of the "construction restriction zones", nevertheless encouraged the Chinese authorities to consider requesting international technical assistance for supporting this important activity. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party to provide information on the progress made in the restoration of the collapsed wall for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian (China)**

**III.245** The Bureau recalled that the Committee had examined at its twenty-third session, the findings of the ICOMOS-ICCROM Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian in 1999, organized upon request for international assistance submitted by the Chinese authorities to improve the on-site museum. The Bureau noted that the 1999 mission noted the need to

establish a regular monitoring system and to enhance overall conservation and management of the site to mitigate ascertained or potential negative impact caused by uncontrolled tourism activities, uncontrolled mining and quarrying activities, and industrial pollution. The Bureau was informed that the Centre had not received further information concerning the measures taken to address the 1999 mission recommendations endorsed by the Committee concerning the elaboration of a comprehensive conservation and management plan.

**III.246** The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Bureau that during a recent mission, ICOMOS noted that the situation on-site had improved since 1999. The Representative of ICOMOS expressed his surprise to have been informed that UNESCO was organizing an *International Training Course on the Preservation, Conservation and Management of Zhoukoudian and Sangiran Prehistoric World Heritage Sites*, taking into consideration the dissimilarity of the two sites.

**III.247** The Observer of China informed the Bureau that the root cause for insufficient management and conservation at the Zhoukoudian property was the fact that the scientific agency designated at present was the Chinese Academy of Sciences, which does not have the administrative authority for comprehensively managing the site. She stated that her Government was currently considering taking necessary actions to transfer the administrative and managerial responsibility to the most appropriate government authority to ensure that the concerns of the Committee are addressed.

**III.248** The Bureau, noting with appreciation the new information presented by the Observer of China, requested the State Party to inform the Committee on the actions taken since the 1999 ICOMOS-ICCROM Joint Mission for examination at its twenty-sixth session, especially with regard to the establishment of a systematic low-cost monitoring system for the entire site. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to elaborate, in co-operation with the Centre, an international assistance request for the development of a comprehensive conservation and management plan for the site. Finally, the Bureau requested the Centre to assist the State Party in submitting a state of conservation report for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **Ajanta Caves (India)** **Ellora Caves (India)**

**III.249** The Bureau recalled that both Ajanta and Ellora Caves face long-term progressive structural deterioration due to the nature of the caves carved within overbearing cliffs. The Bureau was informed that the Indian authorities have been taking conservation and preventive measures to control the micro-climate within the caves, to increase the quality of visitor experience and simultaneously to decrease negative impact caused by tourists and pilgrimage activities. The Bureau also took note of the

needs identified by the national authorities to establish appropriate codes for the restoration and conservation of sculptures and wall paintings within the Caves.

**III.250** The Centre informed the Bureau that a Reactive Monitoring Mission by an international wall painting expert was taking place between 1-9 December 2001 following a request by the authorities to examine the state of conservation of the mural paintings. The main objective of this expert mission is to enable the national conservation experts to consider various conservation measures following international standards for long-term protection and presentation of the paintings.

**III.251** Finally, the Bureau was informed that the Centre was assisting the authorities in the organization of a conservation and management workshop to be undertaken in 2002 for the Ajanta and Ellora Caves, that would bring together all the concerned stakeholders to exchange views on conservation and management of these unique properties. The objective of the workshop would be to review and integrate the various tourism and site-enhancement development plans into a comprehensive conservation and development plan.

**III.252** The Bureau congratulated the Indian authorities for their efforts for the conservation, management and development of the Ajanta and Ellora Caves. The Bureau, noting the World Heritage Centre's continued assistance to the authorities in enhancing co-operation between the numerous national and international conservation and development activities, decided to examine further information at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

**III.253** The Bureau recalled that the Committee had:

- examined the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley in twenty-one sessions of the Committee and its Bureau since 1992;
- debated on the inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at each session upon examining the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Mission, the 1998 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Nepal Mission, and the reports submitted by the State Party on progress made in the implementation of the 16-point recommendation adopted by the Committee in 1993 and the 55 Recommendations for Enhanced Management and Time-Bound Action Plan for Corrective Measures adopted by the State Party in 1998;
- dispatched a High Level Mission in September 2000 headed by the former Chairperson of the Committee, and comprising the current Chairperson, the Director of the World Heritage Centre among others, for consultations with His Majesty's Government of Nepal at the highest level on the merits of the in-danger listing as a tool for conservation;
- noted the conclusion of the High Level Mission which stated that whilst the major monuments were in good

state of conservation, should no new measures be undertaken, the deterioration of the historic urban fabric will persist, irreversibly damaging the traditional architecture surrounding the public monuments, and consequently undermine the world heritage values of this unique and universally significant site;

- expressed its disappointment at the twenty-fourth session, that the State Party was not convinced of the constructive objectives of the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a mechanism for strengthening further political commitment and mobilizing international technical co-operation and greater awareness at both national and international levels, and underlined the need to ensure the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, its Committee and the World Heritage List, while effectively implementing the mechanisms provided under the Convention in safeguarding the World Heritage properties, especially when the threats are ascertained and the process in the loss of the world heritage values have already occurred; but,
- decided to defer inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until 2002 in view of the State Party's strong desire to avoid inscription on this List.

**III.254** The Bureau examined new information concerning:

- the demolition of the Saraswati Nani Temple within the World Heritage protected area of Patan Darban Square Monument Zone by the Guthi Samthan, the local guardians and owners of this public building; total reconstruction of the Temple reportedly using inappropriate new building material; removal and disappearance of the unique and exquisitely carved struts originally adorning this Temple. This Temple was included in the Kathmandu Valley Protective Inventory and figure in the 1979 nomination dossier submitted by HMG of Nepal;
- demolition of several historic buildings or illegal additions within the Seven Monuments Zones of Kathmandu Valley. A photo of an example of a typical illegal addition of a new floor with cantilevers to a historic building was shown.

**III.255** The Centre informed the Bureau that a progress report prepared by the Government of Nepal requested by the Committee was received on 8 December 2001. Neither the Centre nor the Bureau had sufficient time to examine the content of the report.

**III.256** The Observer of Nepal, headed by the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Civil Aviation, reiterated her Government's strong commitment to ensure the implementation of the 16 Recommendations of the 1993 Joint Mission, and the 55 Recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan resulting from the 1998 Joint Mission. She expressed her appreciation for the favourable response to requests for technical and financial assistance which the Committee and UNESCO had been providing for Kathmandu Valley since the 1970s. With regard to the

demolition of Saraswati Nani Temple, the Observer stated that the poor condition of the building necessitated demolition and reconstruction and assured the Bureau that traditional building material and techniques were being used.

**III.257** During the ensuing debate, the Delegate of Thailand sought clarifications on:

- whether the Heritage Conservation Unit for controlling development and preventing illegal alterations and demolitions of historic buildings as well as new constructions had been established;
- actions taken to implement the long-standing recommendation from 1993, repeated in 1998, to control illegal demolition or alterations within the World Heritage protected areas; and
- the application of existing legal provisions, rules and regulations which would prevent illegal development within Kathmandu Valley.

**III.258** The Chairperson underscored the complexity of the site, and emphasized that the principal cause of concern is the difficulty in conserving the historic urban fabric, as the public monuments are in generally good condition. He noted with appreciation, the efforts made by the Government authorities in raising awareness of the local communities, which was essential in reversing the deterioration process of the vernacular architecture surrounding the public monuments.

**III.259** The Deputy Director of the Centre informed the Bureau that since 1993, the main focus of UNESCO's support had been to build national capacities which started from support in strengthening protective legislation followed by over three years of on-the-job training in the establishment and enforcement of regulations concerning demolition and building permits, heritage resource mapping and inventory, as well as pilot conservation projects to demonstrate good practice, all financed from the World Heritage Fund and other extrabudgetary resources mobilized by the Centre. The Bureau was reminded of the information provided to the Committee in 1999 that the services of the trained development control officers had been terminated in 1999 by the then Director-General of Archaeology.

**III.260** The Delegate of South Africa, recognizing the continued difficulties encountered in Kathmandu Valley by the authorities, which was part of the realities of developing States, stressed the need for international solidarity. She suggested that the Centre support the Nepali authorities in addressing the challenges in urban heritage protection through establishing city-to-city co-operation with local authorities of developing countries.

**III.261** The Deputy Director recalled, for the benefit of the new members of the Bureau, that Kathmandu Valley had been the subject of a UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign since 1979, and had benefited from over US\$ 350,000 provided from the World Heritage

Fund and other sources mobilized by the Centre in institutional capacity building to enhance management for conservation. Regarding the city-to-city co-operation, the Bureau was informed that the Centre had brokered decentralized co-operation between UK local authorities (Chester and Bath) and several municipal authorities of the Kathmandu Valley and exchanges were initiated in 1999-2000. The Bureau was also informed that the European Union approved earlier this year under its EU-Asia Urbs Programme, a co-financing of Euro 500,000 for a project involving Chester and Patan. Another request is under preparation involving Bath (UK), Tours (France) and three small local authorities of Kathmandu Valley. Such activities aim at increasing the capacity of the authorities concerned in integrating conservation and management measures within the integrated urban and tourism development planning process.

**III.262** The Deputy Director drew the attention of the Bureau to the need to enhance development control and monitoring capacities at both the national and local levels, and the strong political commitment required to enforce the protective legislation to protect and conserve the privately-owned historic buildings located within the seven monumental zones of this site. She indicated that the multiplication of small-scale illegal operations which individually may not seem grave, has led to the transformation of the historic urban fabric even within the relatively small area of the protected zones surrounding the monuments. If allowed to continue, as tangibly demonstrated in the Baudhanath Monuments Zone, where 90 traditional buildings had been reduced to 15 by 1998, the World Heritage site of Kathmandu Valley will be reduced to a collection of public historic monuments decontextualized from its surrounding historic urban fabric.

**III.263** The Director of the World Heritage Centre drew the attention of the Bureau to the Committee decision at its twenty-fourth session:

- to allow two more years for the Nepalese authorities to further implement the corrective measures against urban encroachment and alteration of the historic fabric in the seven Monument Zones to safeguard its integrity and authenticity; and
- to review the state of conservation and decide on future actions to be taken by the Committee within the context of the Asia-Pacific Regional Periodic Reporting exercise in 2002.

**III.264** The Bureau recommended that another High Level Mission be undertaken prior to the finalization of the Periodic Report for the state of conservation of Kathmandu Valley. The Bureau recommended that the Committee examine the state of conservation of this property at its twenty-fifth session.

#### **Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal)**

**III.265** The Bureau recalled that it had regularly examined since 1999, the state of conservation of the Maya Devi Temple within Lumbini, a centre of pilgrimage for the international Buddhist community with a fragile archaeological site of historical significance. The Bureau noted that the property was the subject of four Reactive Monitoring Missions in 2000 and 2001, organized by the Centre at the request of the Bureau or the State Party. It was also recalled that an International Technical Meeting for the Conservation, Presentation and Development of the Maya Devi Temple took place in April 2001 with financial and technical support from the World Heritage Fund and UNESCO.

**III.266** The Bureau's attention was drawn to the findings of the two missions undertaken in July and September 2001 by a UNESCO international brick conservation expert. This expert witnessed the inundation of the Maya Devi Temple archaeological remains during the heavy monsoon period. It was found that the fluctuation of the water table was clearly eroding the archaeological remains of the Maya Devi Temple. The Centre informed the Bureau that since August 2001, an activity financed from the World Heritage Fund was being conducted by the national authorities and the University of Bradford (U.K.) to compile basic information to assess pilgrimage activities, environmental factors and to identify high or low-importance archaeological areas through non-destructive geophysical surveys.

**III.267** The Centre informed the Bureau that the situation called for serious remedial measures based upon careful assessment and analysis of the heritage assets and usage of the pilgrimage property, prior to the implementation of drainage and construction activities. The Bureau was informed that it was essential to plan intervention only after the completion of the non-destructive geophysical survey, environmental and visitation analyses were complete.

**III.268** The Delegates of Greece and Hungary, having reviewed the state of conservation of the property and noting the erosion of the archaeological remains, incoherent landscaping of the sacred garden, and serious drainage problems of the site, expressed their alarm for this endangered property which clearly required urgent conservation. The Delegate of Greece, drawing the attention of the Bureau to Article 6.1 of the World Heritage Convention, underscored the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate to protect this common heritage and called for consideration in the future for possible inscription of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegate of Thailand, sharing concern over the condition of the property, noted with appreciation the willingness of the Government of Nepal to collaborate closely with UNESCO, international experts and the World Heritage Committee in improving the state of conservation of the property. He therefore recommended continued consultation with the State Party

rather than immediately considering the inscription of Lumbini on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**III.269** The Representative of ICOMOS, the Delegate of South Africa, and the Observer of the United Kingdom underlined the importance for the authorities, international experts, and UNESCO to examine the results of the survey and base-line information analysis prior to the finalization of the plans for the drainage system, the designing of the “Golden Pavilion” shelter recommended by the April 2001 International Technical Meeting, the conservation of the Maya Devi Temple and planning of the pilgrimage circuit within the core zone of the property.

**III.270** The Observer of Nepal expressed her Government’s deep appreciation for the continued technical and financial support extended by the World Heritage Committee, international experts and the World Heritage Centre. She assured the Bureau that her Government was taking the appropriate steps in compliance with international conservation norms to ensure that all conservation and presentation interventions were planned after careful consideration of the long term impact such measures would have on the site. She appealed to the Bureau to take note of the political commitment of her Government to the appropriate management of this politically sensitive, religious archaeological site visited by thousands of pilgrims from the international Buddhist community.

**III.271** The Bureau, taking note of the information presented by the Secretariat and the national authorities, expressed appreciation to the Government of Nepal, the international experts, and UNESCO for closely co-operating to determine the most appropriate conservation method for the Maya Devi Temple and Lumbini World Heritage property. The Bureau commended the national authorities for the efforts made with UNESCO to compile and analyse information concerning the heritage assets and utilization of this property, necessary to elaborate the guiding principles for the conservation of this fragile but important pilgrimage site. Finally, the Bureau requested the State Party and the Centre to report to the Committee at its twenty-sixth session on the state of conservation of the site and the final plans for addressing the drainage problem, shelter options, and long-term presentation and conservation of the Maya Devi Temple.

### **Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)**

**III.272** The Bureau, recalling previous discussion concerning the state of conservation of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, examined new information contained in WHC-01/CONF.207/INF.5, the report of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission organized in September 2001 in close co-operation with the national authorities. The Centre informed the Bureau that the Philippine authorities had nominated the property for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and

requested international assistance to address the conservation issues facing the site.

**III.273** The Observer of the Philippines informed the Bureau that his Government welcomes and considers the inscription of the Rice Terraces of the Philippines Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger, not as a dishonour but on the contrary, as an essential tool for mobilizing effective, decisive and rapid intervention for addressing the threats facing an endangered World Heritage property. Referring to the letter dated 26 November 2001 from the Minister of Tourism and Culture and the Chairperson of the Banaue Rice Terrace Task Force addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Observer confirmed his Government’s desire for the inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**III.274** The Bureau was informed of the concurrence of the Government of the Philippines with the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission. In order to address the recommendations of this Mission, the Government of the Philippines was now taking steps to:

- Develop sustainable tourism;
- Establish a permanent and effective body to coordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the property;
- Involve all stakeholders including national government agencies, congressmen, provincial governors, representatives of municipalities, and private individuals in the re-evaluation and updating of the existing management plan for the protection of the site.

**III.275** The Observer of the Philippines underscored that the Rice Terraces was a living monument built 1,000 years ago by the genius of the indigenous Ifugao people. Drawing the attention of the Bureau to the recently adopted *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity* which encompasses the promotion and protection of indigenous cultures, the Observer of the Philippines expressed his Government’s hope that the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and its Bureau would favourably endorse the request for international assistance for addressing the conservation and management issues of this traditionally owned and utilized property. Underlining the need to take all necessary measures to reverse the rapidly deteriorating rice terraces, the Observer of the Philippines called upon the Bureau to support the international assistance as a matter of the greatest urgency.

**III.276** The Representative of ICOMOS, noting that this property was the first organic cultural landscape to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, drew the attention of the Bureau to the vulnerability of properties such as the Rice Terraces, where the relationship between human land-use and the environment is continuously evolving. He

underlined the importance of learning from the experience of the authorities in their efforts to overcome the difficulties faced in sustainably-managing the fragile cultural resources of this property.

**III.277** The Bureau recommended the following decision for adoption by the Committee:

“The Committee expresses its appreciation to the Philippine authorities for facilitating the September 2001 IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the World Heritage site of the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, as requested by the Committee at its twenty-fourth session in December 2000. The Committee examines the findings and recommendations of the IUCN/ICOMOS mission and notes with deep concern that:

- The Banaue Rice Terraces Task Force (BRTTF) and the Ifugao Terraces Commission (ITC) have tried to safeguard the property. However, the BRTTF lacks full Government support and needs more resources, greater independence and an assurance of permanence.
- About 25-30% of the terraces are now abandoned, which has led to damage to some of the walls. This has arisen because parts of the irrigation system have been neglected, which in turn is due to people leaving the area. The situation is also aggravated by the effects of pest species of worms and snails.
- Despite good planning, irregular development is taking place, which threatens to erode the heritage landscape.
- International assistance has so far not been mobilized to help the area.
- The World Heritage values may be lost unless current trends are reversed within 10 years (maximum).
- Little progress has been made in addressing the needs of tourism. For example, access from Manila and within the property remains poor.

The Committee therefore endorses the following recommendations made by the IUCN/ICOMOS mission:

- Establish a permanent and effective body to co-ordinate and lead efforts to restore and protect the Ifugao Rice Terraces.
- Develop a short and long-term strategy for support funding for the Rice Terraces, drawn from national and international sources and from tourism.
- Identify and implement a programme initiative to remedy past neglect of the rice terraces and ensure optimum prospects for future.
- Develop a sustainable tourism industry that supports the future conservation of the rice

terraces, placing priority on improving access to and within the site.

- Review existing management plans for further improvement.
- Establish an exchange programme with other World Heritage sites which share similar conservation challenges.

The Committee commends the positive reaction of the Philippines authorities towards the IUCN/ICOMOS mission recommendations and requests that they examine ways and means of implementing these recommendations.

Taking into due consideration the conservation challenges and threats facing the property, the Committee decides to inscribe the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee commends the Philippine authorities for nominating this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, demonstrating positive use of this important mechanism within the World Heritage Convention to mobilise international and national support to address the conservation challenges facing this site.

Finally, the Committee requests the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Bangkok Office to continue assisting the authorities in the elaboration of a long-term comprehensive management plan for the site. The Committee requests that a progress report on measures taken to elaborate the management plan and to enhance the conservation and development of the property be submitted for examination by the Committee at its twenty-sixth session.”

#### **Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)**

**III.278** The Bureau recalled that it had requested the Government of Sri Lanka to reconsider the proposed expansion of the Sigiriya airport which would impact negatively on the fragile structure of the monument, wall paintings as well as the flora and fauna of the natural reserves surrounding the property. The Centre presented updated information received from the Sri Lankan authorities by letter of 7 December 2001 to the Bureau. Accordingly, the Government of Sri Lanka had decided to accept the recommendations of the UNESCO Reactive Monitoring Mission, organized at the request of the Government authorities:

- Not to shift the operations from the Katunayake Airport to Sigiriya Airport;
- To continue using the present airstrip at Kimbissa only for light aircraft and not for military aircraft;
- To construct a military airport at a distance from the Sigiriya World Heritage property, in Habarana, where there are no archaeological sites nearby.

**III.279** The Bureau expressed its appreciation to the Government of Sri Lanka for its decision not to expand the



military airport within 2 kilometers of the Sigiriya, which would have negatively impacted upon the World Heritage property. In particular, the Bureau took note with appreciation of the commitment expressed by the Government of Sri Lanka to the World Heritage Convention. The Bureau welcomed with deep satisfaction, this decision taken by the authorities, despite the national security concerns, which demonstrates the importance attached to the safeguarding of this irreplaceable World Heritage site.

### **Latin American and the Caribbean**

#### **Brasilia (Brazil)**

**III.280** The Bureau was informed that, following its request at the twenty-fourth extraordinary session in December 2000, and in the light of the report submitted by the State Party, a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission took place from 5 to 9 November 2001. Twenty specific recommendations were formulated regarding legal framework, local and territorial Master Plans, specific issues related to the conservation and boundaries of the site.

**III.281** The Observer of Brazil noted with satisfaction the report on the state of conservation of the site of Brasilia. The Bureau noted the report of the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission. It supported the view of the mission that, although changes have occurred to the original concept of the core of the city, the *Plano Piloto*, the city maintains to date, the values on the basis of which the *Plano Piloto* was inscribed on the World Heritage List and meets the test of authenticity and integrity.

**III.282** The Bureau endorsed the conclusion of the mission that the city is in a critical phase of change and that this process of change needs to be guided with sensibility and vision and a profound understanding and recognition of the characteristics and values of the exceptional urban and architectural creation of Costa and Niemeyer.

**III.283** To this effect, it will be necessary to involve all relevant levels of authority, professional organizations and individuals as well as different sectors of society in a process that should lead to the preparation and adoption of a Master Plan for the protected area that fully recognises and ensures the preservation of the values of the city. The protective documents of 1987 (Federal District) and 1990/1992 (IPHAN) as well as the work accomplished by various inter-institutional working groups (*Grupo de Trabalho Brasilia*, 1980-1987; *Grupo de Trabalho Conjunto*, 1992-1995) should form the basis for the work that should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

**III.284** The Bureau requested the Government of Brazil to consider the report of the mission and its conclusions and recommendations and to submit a report on the response it plans to give to each of them by 1 February

2002. The state of conservation of Brasilia will be examined again at the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau.

#### **Colonial City of Santo-Domingo (Dominican Republic)**

**III.285** The Bureau was informed that World Heritage Centre had received information from the Cultural Heritage Office of the Dominican Republic about building activities in Santo Domingo. The State Party requested an ICOMOS advisory mission to discuss the building project. The mission was fielded in August 2001. During the mission, ICOMOS found that a private international hotel chain, acting under a concession given by the previous government of the State Party, was in the process of extending a pre-existing hotel use from three to five buildings, all of which have remnants that date from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the earliest settlement period. Original construction of the buildings is attributed to Nicolas de Ovando, founder of Santo Domingo.

**III.286** Conceptually, ICOMOS stated, that it was clear that the functional requirements of the proposed new use were incompatible with the existing layout of the buildings. The project's feasibility determinations require far more room than is available in the site. Space for the new functions was being created by incorporating and expanding two structures to the south, and by a massive three-storey deep excavation meant to accommodate partially underground construction (overlooking the river, and abutting the palisade, which is the natural edge of the city), as well as above-ground construction. The programmatic demands for new construction might overwhelm and distort the existing historic fabric in the southern portion of the site. In conclusion, ICOMOS found that damage had already been caused to the historic fabric as well as to the historic urban cultural landscape:

- a) Walls dating from the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> century were demolished in the two buildings being integrated in the hotel;
- b) Unrecorded archaeological material from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century was lost in the process of deep excavation;
- c) The massive excavation in the patio of the buildings had destroyed the last remaining natural part of the cliff facing the river.

**III.287** More damage could be caused by the infra-structural difficulties to be anticipated due to the location of the hotel. A further point raised by ICOMOS was the lack of a reliable legal framework for interventions in the historic district that protect the State Party's heritage effectively. In addition, the Bureau was informed that the Centre had received oral information from the Oficina de Patrimonio Cultural of the State Party that the hotel project has been temporarily halted and that the Oficina had expressed its will to give adequate follow-up to the advisory mission report.

**III.288** The Bureau commended the State Party on its initiative to request ICOMOS' advice. At the same time, however, it expressed its grave concerns about the damage already caused to the site through the building activities. It encouraged the State Party to take all possible measures to mitigate the impact of the project on the World Heritage values of the site. Furthermore, the Bureau advised the State Party to improve its heritage protection legislation to avoid comparable situations in the future. The Bureau requested the State party to furnish a report on the state of conservation of the property by 1 February 2002.

#### **Antigua Guatemala (Guatemala)**

**III.289** The Bureau was informed that, following a request by the State Party, an ICOMOS monitoring mission was carried out from 9 to 12 June 2001. The object of the mission was the proposed construction of a shopping centre in the historic town of Antigua. In fact, the project has been cancelled. However, the mission reported on cases of malfunction in the legislation, which are currently threatening the integrity of the city. The National authorities, very much aware of these problems, have announced that they plan to create a buffer zone, and to submit a request for international assistance for the preparation of a new legislation for Antigua. An emergency request following the earthquake damage is still pending.

**III.290** The Bureau commended the State Party for the measures taken to safeguard the World Heritage values of Antigua Guatemala by preventing the construction of a commercial centre within the boundaries of the site. It encouraged the national authorities to implement the recommendations made by the ICOMOS mission in June 2001, in particular the updating of the protective legislation and its Master Plan, which should include the definition of a buffer zone. Awareness-raising programmes are also to be encouraged. The Bureau furthermore encouraged the national authorities to work closely together with the World Heritage Centre concerning the points outlined above.

#### **Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama)**

**III.291** The Bureau was informed that, following its request at the twenty-fifth session, a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 3 to 11 November 2001, to report on the recurrent physical and management conditions of the site.

**III.292** The Bureau commended the State Party for the work already done in order to safeguard and protect the sites. It encouraged the national authorities to implement the recommendations made by the joint ICOMOS-UNESCO mission in November 2001. The Bureau highlighted the significance of the finalisation and implementation of management plans containing clear

structuring of tasks and responsibilities and their explicit distribution amongst the various stakeholders of both sites. It noted that the importance of community involvement at all stages of the process has to be stressed. Special attention should furthermore be given to the following issues:

- Definition of values (statement of significance);
- Definition of sites' borders and buffer zones;
- Clarification of land tenure within and around the sites;
- Harmonisation of planned projects in and around the sites;
- Systematic assessment of the sites' conditions;
- Preparation of the sites for rising number of tourists.

**III.293** The Bureau recognized the difficult financial and staffing situation of the National Institute of Culture (INAC) but encouraged INAC to valorise its leading role in the protection and promotion of the State Party's World Heritage sites. The Bureau requested the State Party to furnish a report on the state of implementation of the recommendations and the actions taken by 1 February 2002.

#### **Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru)**

**III.294** The Bureau was informed of the progress achieved in the maintenance and conservation work carried out at the site. The Observer of Peru also informed the Bureau that the Peruvian authorities would present to the Bureau, in April 2002, a detailed report on progress made in the Master Plan and that a request for international assistance had just been submitted to identify priority activities to be undertaken for the stabilisation and preservation of the site.

**III.295** The Bureau wished to acknowledge the great effort the State Party has made to submit a report on this site. However, it urged the State Party to deliver the reports in a timely fashion and in sufficient detail. The Bureau encouraged the national authorities to finalise and implement the Master Plan at the earliest possible date and furthermore encouraged the State Party to work closely together with the World Heritage Centre. The Bureau requested a detailed progress report on the actions taken at the site as well as on the progress in the elaboration and implementation of the Management Plan, to be submitted by 1 February 2002 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session.

#### **Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru)**

**III.296** The Bureau was informed of activities carried out since the earthquake. The State Party sent a report entitled "Evaluation of Damages in the Historical Centre of Arequipa following the 23 June 2001 earthquake and Draft Reconstruction Plan.

**III.297** The emergency assistance approved by the Bureau as its twenty-fifth session is fully implemented, with the

removal of rubble, the construction of a temporary roof for the Cathedral to protect it from rain damage, and the temporary stabilisation of the beams of the building. The first mission of an expert in rehabilitation and restoration was undertaken in July 2001 to assist the Municipality of Arequipa to revise the Master Plan in the light of the new situation, setting priority projects, defining a mechanism for the implementation of reconstruction and rehabilitation in the Historical Centre, and assisting the authorities in the formulation of a first project profile to be submitted to the IBD. A second mission, in August 2001, had as goal, the examination of the draft law for the creation of "The Reconstruction Fund for the Historical Centre and Monumental Area of Arequipa" and to "advise on the formulation of the emergency and urban reconstruction programme of Arequipa". Furthermore, the Bureau was informed that, following the earthquake, the management plan of the City has to be completely revised, that the creation of a management unit was still outstanding and that the Centre should carry out a mission at the beginning of 2002.

**III.298** The Bureau was also informed of the mission carried out by ICCROM who immediately sent two Chilean experts in June 2001 to assist the Municipality of Arequipa's conservation laboratory for the safeguarding of the movable objects from the damaged monuments. Assistance was also provided to the Municipality of Arequipa by the Italian Government, the Spanish International Co-operation Agency and the City of Paris.

**III.299** During the debate, the Observer of Peru, thanked the Bureau for the rapid response to the request for emergency assistance following the earthquake, and informed the Bureau of the content of the technical report that the Municipality of Arequipa had recently provided concerning the emergency work carried out for the consolidation of the Cathedral. He also informed that a reconstruction plan was under preparation in line with the Master Plan.

**III.300** The Bureau noted that the Observer of Peru would inform his national authorities of their recommendation to submit a request for emergency assistance for the preparation of a new Master Plan. It also noted the suggestions made by the Chairperson that the Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS contact the Embassy of Finland in Lima to ensure the implementation of the recommendations as well as the proposal made by the Delegate of Mexico to share experience gained by his country in the domain of risk preparedness.

**III.301** The Bureau wished to take note of the quick response given by the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM. It also noted that following the earthquake a new management plan will have to be developed taking into account the different social, economic, political and religious sectors. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to request technical assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the preparation of this new plan and recommended that

the Centre and ICCROM work jointly with national and regional professionals on risk preparedness activities. The State Party is requested to submit a report to the Bureau in 2003.

## **PART II Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List for noting**

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **Australian Fossil Mammal Sites (Riversleigh and Naracoorte) (Australia)**

**III.302** The Bureau was informed that IUCN had received several reports with regard to management problems of the Riversleigh section of this serial site. They pertain to the lack of infrastructure, such as on-site security and surveillance mechanisms, to deter vandalism or control tourism. Vandalism and theft are reported to have impacted one of the most important deposits - 'Burnt Offering Site'. The reports had also expressed concerns regarding the lack of interpretation, absence of a ranger station and visitor centre, and inadequate research funding to support increased interpretation and better conservation and management of the site. IUCN had noted that the management of Naracoorte and Riversleigh differ significantly, having different physical attributes and being the responsibility of different states; however, there is a Scientific and Management Advisory Committee that brings the two management authorities together.

**III.303** The Bureau noted that IUCN recognises that currently efforts are underway to address the different challenges in managing this serial site. IUCN has been in contact with the State Party and has received detailed information responding to the issues raised. The Bureau also noted that these issues will be addressed by the State Party in the context of the Asia Pacific regional reporting in 2003.

#### **Greater Blue Mountain Area (Australia)**

**III.304** In response to the Bureau's request for further information on the proposed Clarence Colliery mine extension before 15 September 2001, the State Party, by letter dated 14 September 2001, submitted up-to-date information to the Centre. The Australian Government has examined the referral from the company regarding the possible extension of the Clarence Colliery mining lease and determined that additional information is required on water emissions from the mine. Current mine de-watering emissions have been determined by the New South Wales Environment Protection Agency (EPA) to exceed statutory water quality standards and have been causing pollution problems in the Wollangambe River, which flows through the World Heritage Area. The company and the EPA have agreed to a plan for a trial water transfer system that if successful, would result in the cessation of mine de-

watering emissions to the Wollangambe River. A decision by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage on the referral on the proposed extension of the Clarence Colliery mining lease has been deferred until after the establishment of the trial water transfer system. It is anticipated that a decision will be made on the referral by mid-2002.

**III.305** The Bureau noted with satisfaction the actions taken and the information provided by the State Party and noted that a comprehensive review of this property in the context of the Asia Pacific regional reporting due in 2003 would be provided by the State Party.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal)

**III.306** The Bureau noted that the State Party has been requested to submit a detailed state of conservation report before the end of December 2001 and that it will be presented to the twenty-sixth session of the Bureau in April 2002.

## IV. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

**IV.1** In introducing the agenda item, the Director of the World Heritage Centre briefly explained the role of the Centre in the processing of nominations. He noted that in addition to the current requirements - adequate maps, text of protective legislation, management plan, etc. - the Centre was also requesting supplementary information that is being proposed for the revised *Operational Guidelines*, including electronic copies of the nomination dossiers, electronic image and GIS files. The Director announced that at the twenty-sixth sessions of the Bureau and Committee the Centre would present the first results of these new electronic formats.

### Nomination of properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger

**IV.2** During the discussion concerning the state of conservation of properties on the World Heritage List, the Bureau recommended that the World Heritage Committee inscribe four properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger:

- Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)
- Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines)
- Abu Mena (Egypt)
- Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco)

**IV.3** The Bureau requested that in the case of two sites, **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)** and **Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco)**, the State Parties be consulted to verify that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was still appropriate.

### Nominations of cultural and natural properties not examined by the twenty-fifth session of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau

**IV.4** The Secretariat announced that, at the request of the States Parties concerned, one site listed in the working documents would not be examined at this session of the Bureau and Committee: the proposed **Extension to Crespi d'Adda** (Italy). In addition, the authorities of the Russian Federation requested that the cultural values of one mixed site, the **Natural complex "Central Sikhote-Alin"** be withdrawn. Consequently, the site would only be examined for its natural values.

## A. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

### A.1 Historic towns

Property	<b>Tbilisi Historic District</b>
Id. N°	<b>1020</b>
State Party	<b>Georgia</b>

The Bureau decided to *defer* the nomination of the Tbilisi Historic District, subject to the establishment of an appropriate legal framework, management structures, and guidelines for rehabilitation.

Property	<b>The Old City of Acre</b>
Id. N°	<b>1042</b>
State Party	<b>Israel</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Old City of Acre be on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), and (v):

**Criterion (ii):** Acre is an exceptional historic town in that it preserves the substantial remains of the its medieval Crusader buildings beneath the existing Moslem fortified town dating from the 18th and 19th centuries.

**Criterion (iii):** The remains of the Crusader town of Acre, both above and below the present-day street level, provide an exceptional picture of the layout and structures of the capital of the medieval Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem.

**Criterion (v):** Present-day Acre is an important example of an Ottoman walled town, with typical urban components such as the citadel, mosques, khans, and baths well preserved, partly built on top of the underlying Crusader structures.

The State Party, at the request of the twenty-fifth session of the Bureau, had provided extensive information on awareness-raising activities in Acre designed to give the residents a "Pride of Place". Several Bureau members asked whether it had been appropriate to request this type of information, not specifically mentioned in the *Operational Guidelines*. In response, the Observer of Israel explained that the information was being incorporated into the overall management of the site, citing paragraph 14 of the *Operational Guidelines*: "Participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site." Several delegates commented on the importance of encouraging a sense of "Pride of Place" and welcomed this initiative.

### A.2 Religious properties

Property	<b>Painted Churches in the Troodos Region</b> [ Extension to include the Church of Ayia Sotira, Palaichori ]
Id. N°	<b>351 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Cyprus</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the extension of the Painted Churches in the Troodos Region be **approved**, maintaining the existing criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

This proposed extension to the serial inscription would henceforth include 10 structures:

DATE INSCRIBED	NAME	LOCATION
1985	Church of Ayios Nikolaos (St. Nicholas) tis Steyis	Kakopetria
1985	Ayios Ionannis (St. John) Lambadhistis Monastery	Kalopanayiotis
1985	Church of Panayia (The Virgin) Phorviotissa (Asinou)	Nikitart
1985	Church of Panayia (The Virgin) tou Arakou	Lagoudhera
1985	Church of Panayia (The Virgin)	Moutoullas
1985	Church of Archangelos Michael (Archangel Michael)	Pedhoulas
1985	Church of Timios Stavros (Holy Cross)	Pelendria
1985	Church of Panayia (The Virgin) Podhithou	Galata
1985	Church of Stavros (Holy Cross) Ayiasmati	Platanistasa
2001	<b>Church of Ayia Sotira (Transfiguration of the Savior)</b>	<b>Palaichori</b>

A general debate on the role of comparative studies followed the presentation of this site. Several Bureau members questioned the need for a further comparative study, as had been requested by ICOMOS, suggesting that this was not the responsibility of the State Party once a site had been inscribed. The Chairperson recalled that according to paragraph 12 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it was the responsibility of each State Party to carry out a comparative analysis of similar properties prior to nominating a site to the World Heritage List. The

Observer of Italy indicated that the study should have been conducted by the State Party prior to inscription of the original site; any subsequent comparative analysis should be the responsibility of the relevant Advisory Body.

Property	<b>Mudejar Architecture of Aragon</b> [Extension of the Mudejar architecture of Teruel]
Id. N°	<b>378 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Extension of the Mudejar Architecture of Teruel be **approved**, maintaining the existing criterion (iv). The State Party was urged to complete and implement the required management plan as soon as possible, and to take the necessary measures to guarantee that the relationship of the monuments with their historic setting be maintained. It was further recommended that the name of the nomination be revised as "*Mudejar Architecture of Aragon*."

This serial inscription would henceforth include 10 structures:

DATE INSCRIBED	TOWN	NAME	DATE OF STRUCTURE
1986	Teruel	Torre, techumbre y cimborrio de la catedral de Santa María de Mediavilla	13th cent.
1986	Teruel	Torre e iglesia de San Pedro	13th cent.
1986	Teruel	Torre de la iglesia de San Martín	14th cent.
1986	Teruel	Torre de la iglesia del Salvador	13th cent.
2001	Calatayud	Abside, claustro y torre de colegiata de Santa María	14th-16th cent.
2001	Cervera de la Cañada	Iglesia parroquial de Santa Tecla	14th cent.
2001	Tobed	Iglesia de Santa María	14th cent.
2001	Zaragoza	Restos mudéjares de palacio de la Aljafería	14th-15th cent.
2001	Zaragoza	Torre e iglesia parroquial de San Pablo	13th-14th cent.
2001	Zaragoza	Abside, parroquieta y cimborrio de La Seo	14th-16th cent.

### A.3 Architectural monuments and ensembles

Property	<b>The Bolgar Historical and Architectural Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>981</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Bolgar Historical and Architectural Complex be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii):

**Criterion (iii):** Bolgar represents unique testimony to the history and culture of the Volga Bulgars, and to the lost medieval states of eastern Europe – Volga Bulgaria and the empire of the Golden Horde (Ulus Djuchi).

The Bureau discussed the authenticity of the proposed "reconstruction" of the Great Minaret. ICOMOS indicated that the State Party had submitted measured drawings and extensive archive material of the original structure, before it collapsed in 1841. Of particular importance was an architectural record carried out in 1827. The materials used in the reconstruction were the same as those used in the original structure.

#### A.4 Technological ensembles

Property	<b>The Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen</b>
Id. N°	<b>975</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iii)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that The Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii):

**Criterion (ii):** The Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Essen is an exceptional industrial monument by virtue of the fact that its buildings are outstanding examples of the application of the design concepts of the Modern Movement in architecture in a wholly industrial context.

**Criterion (iii):** The technological and other structures of Zollverein XII is representative of a crucial period in the development of traditional heavy industries in Europe, when sympathetic and positive use was made of architectural designs of outstanding quality.

Property	<b>The Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun</b>
Id. N°	<b>1027</b>
State Party	<b>Sweden</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iii)(v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), and (v):

**Criterion (ii):** Copper mining at Falun was influenced by German technology, but this was to become the major producer of copper in the 17th century and exercised a profound influence on mining technology in all parts of the world for two centuries.

**Criterion (iii):** The entire Falun landscape is dominated by the remains of copper mining and

production, which began as early as the 9th century and came to an end in the closing years of the 20th century.

**Criterion (v):** The successive stages in the economic and social evolution of the copper industry in the Falun region, from a form of "cottage industry" to full industrial production, can be seen in the abundant industrial, urban, and domestic remains characteristic of this industry that still survive.

Following the presentation by ICOMOS, there was substantial discussion on "industrial landscapes," the term originally proposed by the State Party for this site: "The Historical Industrial Landscape of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun". In response to several delegates who asked for clarification on the relationship of "industrial landscapes" to cultural landscapes as defined in paragraph 39 of the *Operational Guidelines*, ICOMOS explained that industrial landscapes could be considered as examples of "organically evolved landscapes," the interaction of man and nature expressed in terms of economic and social history. He explained that they should be classified as "relict landscapes" under the *Operational Guidelines* definition.

The Bureau accepted the proposal made to change the name of the site to "*The Mining Area of the Great Copper Mountain in Falun*" subject to the agreement of the State Party.

Furthermore, the Secretariat informed the Bureau that a total of 13 thematic and regional meetings on cultural landscapes were carried out 1992 - 2001 in all parts of the world and that the results were provided to Bureau and Committee meetings. As, no meeting on "industrial landscapes" had yet been convened, the Committee could request the organisation of such a meeting, if the need arises, which might also cover information on TICCIH studies on industrial heritage.

#### A.5 Cultural landscapes

Property	<b>Alto Douro Wine Region</b>
Id. N°	<b>1046</b>
State Party	<b>Portugal</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii) (iv) (v)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Alto Douro Wine Region be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv), and (v):

**Criterion (iii):** The Alto Douro Region has been producing wine for nearly two thousand years and its landscape has been moulded by human activities.

**Criterion (iv):** The components of the Alto Douro landscape are representative of the full range of activities association with winemaking – terraces, quintas (wine-producing farm complexes), villages, chapels, and roads.

**Criterion (v):** The cultural landscape of the Alto Douro is an outstanding example of a traditional European wine-producing region, reflecting the evolution of this human activity over time.

In response to the questions of several Bureau members about the significance of vineyard landscapes, a representative of the Secretariat informed the Bureau about the Thematic Meeting on Vineyard Cultural Landscapes which had taken place in Hungary in July 2001 (see working document WHC-01/CONF.208/INF.7). All States Parties who had included vineyard landscapes on their Tentative Lists had been invited. The meeting not only reviewed specific case studies and made recommendations concerning management, integrity, but concluded that a global study of vineyards was needed. Details for this study could be discussed during the Global Strategy agenda item at the Committee session.

While concurring with the conclusion of the thematic meeting, the ICOMOS representative noted that its own comparative analysis had concluded that the Alto Douro region was one of the oldest of all the historic winemaking regions in the world and the very first institutional model for organizing and controlling a winemaking region.

Following an extensive debate, the Chairperson called for a vote as to whether or not to recommend inscription to the Committee. The result of this vote was: four members of the Bureau voted in favour of inscription, whereas three members of the Bureau voted for deferral.

Property	<b>Aranjuez Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1044</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Aranjuez Cultural Landscape be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** Aranjuez represents the coming together of diverse cultural influences to create a cultural landscape that had a formative influence on further developments in this field.

**Criterion (iv):** The complex designed cultural landscape of Aranjuez, derived from a variety of sources, marks a seminal stage in the development of landscape design.

## B. MIXED PROPERTIES

Property	<b>Cultural Landscape of Fertő/Neusiedlersee</b>
Id. N°	<b>772 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Austria / Hungary</b>
Criteria	<b>C (v)</b>

The Bureau recalled that it did not recommend the inscription of Fertő/Neusiedlersee on the World Heritage List under natural criteria.

Concerning cultural criteria, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that this property be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion (v):

**Criterion (v):** The Fertő/Neusiedlersee has been the meeting place of different cultures for eight millennia, and this is graphically demonstrated by its varied landscape, the result of an evolutionary and symbiotic process of human interaction with the physical environment.

The Bureau noted that the States Parties should provide within two years of inscription a revised management plan for the enlarged area resulting from the revised boundaries of the cultural landscape. The Delegate of Hungary and the Observer of Austria confirmed that the transboundary co-operation had commenced.

Property	<b>Natural Complex "Central Sikhote-Alin"</b>
Id. N°	<b>766 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	<b>N (iv)</b>

The Bureau noted that the cultural criteria had been withdrawn that this serial nomination consists of four protected areas in the Sikhote-Alin mountain range in the extreme southeast of the Russian Federation:

Name	Location	Area
Sikhote-Alin Nature Preserve	Terney District	401,428 ha
Goralij Zoological Preserve	Coastal zone on the Sea of Japan, N of Terney	4,749 ha
Bikin Territory of Traditional Nature Use	Middle Birkin River Valley	407,764 ha
Verkhnebikinski zakaznik	Upper Birkin River catchment area	746,482 ha

Concerning natural criteria, the Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Sikhote-Alin Nature Preserve and Goralij Zoological Preserve be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iv):

**Criterion (iv):** The nominated area is representative of one of the world's most distinctive natural regions. The combination of glacial history, climate and relief has allowed the development of the richest and most

unusual temperate forests in the world. Compared to other temperate ecosystems, the level of endemic plants and invertebrates present in the region is extraordinarily high which has resulted in unusual assemblages of plants and animals. For example, subtropical species such as tiger and Himalayan bear share the same habitat with species typical of northern taiga such as brown bear and reindeer. The site is also important for the survival of endangered species such as the scaly-sided (Chinese) merganser, Blakiston's fish-owl and the Amur tiger.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party to improve management of the Bikin River protected areas (Bikin Territory of Traditional Nature Use and Verkhnebikinski zakaznik) before nominating it as an extension.

### C. NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### Afrotropical Realm

Property	<b>Rift Valley Lakes Reserve</b>
Id. N°	<b>1060 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Kenya</b>

The Bureau noted that no confirmation from the State Party has been received on the timing and effectiveness of the Wildlife Sanctuary status of Lake Elmenteita. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that on 12 November 2001 a letter had been received from the Kenya Wildlife Service informing the Centre that "Kenya Wildlife Service is in the process of mapping out the boundaries for Lake Elmenteita Wildlife Sanctuary to be followed by the processing of legal documents on the status."

The Bureau decided to **defer** a decision on the site until this confirmation became available.

#### Neotropical Realm

Property	<b>Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park and Emas National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1035</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recommend to the Committee that the Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park and Emas National Park be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** The site has played a key role for millenia in maintaining the biodiversity of the Cerrado Ecoregion. Due it its central location and altitudinal variation, it has acted as a relatively stable species refuge when climate change has caused the Cerrado to move north-south or east-west. This role as a species

refuge is ongoing as Earth enters another period of climate change.

**Criterion (iv):** The site contains samples of all key habitats that characterise the Cerrado ecoregion – one of Earth's oldest tropical ecosystems. It contains over 60% of all floral species and almost 80% of all vertebrate species described for the Cerrado. With the exception of the Giant Otter, all of the Cerrado's endangered large mammals occur in the site. In addition, the site supports many rare small mammals and bird species that do not occur elsewhere in the Cerrado and a number of species new to science have been discovered in the Cerrado Protected Areas.

The Bureau noted that the State Party agreed to the change of name from Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park to **Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park and Emas National Park** and that the site comprises two parts:

Park	Location	Size
Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park	Central Brazil Plateau, NE State of Goiás	235,970 ha
Emas National Park	Central Brazil Plateau, SW State of Goiás	131,386 ha

The Observer of Brazil noted the importance of the Cerrado ecoregion for the conservation of biological diversity and that the site forms part of the Brazilian Amazon region.

Property	<b>Brazilian Atlantic Islands: Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas Reserves</b>
Id. N°	<b>1000 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Brazil</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iii)(iv)</b>

The Bureau recommended to the Committee that the Brazilian Atlantic Islands: Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas Reserves be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** Fernando de Noronha / Rocas Atoll represents over half the insular coastal waters of the Southern Atlantic Ocean. These highly productive waters provide feeding ground for species such as tuna, billfish, cetaceans, sharks, and marine turtles as they migrate to the Eastern Atlantic coast of Africa. An oasis of marine life in relatively barren, open ocean, the islands play a key role in the process of reproduction, dispersal and colonisation by marine organisms in the entire Tropical South Atlantic.

**Criterion (iii):** Baía dos Golfinhos is the only known place in the world with such a high population of resident dolphins and Rocas Atoll demonstrates a spectacular seascape at low tide when the exposed reef surrounding shallow lagoons and tidal pools forms a natural aquarium. Both sites also have exceptional



submarine landscapes that have been recognised worldwide by a number of specialised diving literatures.

**Criterion (iv):** Fernando de Noronha / Rocas Atoll is a key site for the protection of biodiversity and endangered species in the Southern Atlantic. Providing a large proportion of the insular habitat of the South Atlantic, the site is a repository for the maintenance of marine biodiversity at the ocean basin level. It is important for the conservation of endangered and threatened species of marine turtles, particularly the hawksbill turtle. The site accommodates the largest concentration of tropical seabirds to be found in the Western Atlantic Ocean, and is a Global Centre of Bird Endemism. The site also contains the only remaining sample of the Insular Atlantic Forest and the only oceanic mangrove in the South Atlantic region.

The Bureau noted that the State Party agreed to the change of name from Fernando de Noronha / Rocas Atoll to **Brazilian Atlantic Islands: Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocas Reserves** and that the site comprises two parts:

Area	Location	Size
National Marine Park of Fernando de Noronha	State of Pernambuco	11,270 ha
Biological Marine Reserve of Rocas Atoll	State of Rio Grande do Norte	32, 000ha

The Delegate of Thailand raised the question whether the area between the two sites lies within the territorial waters of the State Party and whether steps are taken to control any adverse affects on the values. IUCN assured the Bureau that the sub-Atlantic ridge connects the islands and the Observer of Brazil confirmed that the corridor is under full jurisdiction of the State Party.

Property	<b>Alejandro de Humboldt National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>839 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Cuba</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii) (iv)</b>

The Bureau recalled that at its twenty-third session it had noted that Alejandro de Humboldt National Park is considered to meet natural criteria (ii) and (iv), but decided to defer the nomination to allow approval of the law expanding the Park and approval of an expanded boundary which links the currently isolated core zones. Until this law and this boundary are in place, the integrity of the site cannot be guaranteed.

Following the receipt of this information the Bureau recommend to the Committee that Alejandro de Humboldt National Park be **inscribed** on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (ii) and (iv):

**Criterion (ii):** The size, altitudinal diversity, complex lithologies, and landform diversity of Alejandro de Humboldt National Park have resulted in a range of

ecosystems and species unmatched in the Insular Caribbean. It was a Miocene-Pleistocene refuge site, particularly in the glacial eras, for the Caribbean biota. The fresh water rivers that flow off the peaks of the Park are some of the largest in the insular Caribbean and because of this have high freshwater biological diversity. Because of the serpentine, peridotite, karst and pseudokarst geology of the region, the Park is an excellent example of ongoing processes in the evolution of species and communities on underlying rocks that pose special challenges to plant survival.

**Criterion (iv):** Alejandro de Humboldt National Park contains the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of terrestrial biological diversity in the entire insular Caribbean. It contains 16 of 28 plant formations defined for Cuba, the largest island in the Caribbean, which is a unique biogeographic province. It is one of the most important sites for conservation of endemic flora in the entire Western Hemisphere – nearly 70% of the 1,302 spermatophytes already described, of an estimated total of 1,800-2,000, are endemic to the Park. The Park is one of the most biologically diverse terrestrial tropical ecosystems in an island setting anywhere on earth. Endemism rates for vertebrates and invertebrates found in the Park are also very high. Many of these are threatened because of their small range. Because of their uniqueness and the fact that they represent unique evolutionary processes, they are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science and conservation.

The Bureau requested that the management plan be finalized within a timeframe of 12 months and be sent to the World Heritage Centre in three copies.

## V. OTHER BUSINESS

**V.1** The Observer of Nigeria took the floor, noting that out of the fifteen properties examined by the Bureau for nomination on the World Heritage List, not one was from Africa or the Arab States. He then went on to express the hope that the Committee, in the future, would pay more attention, and invest adequate human and financial resources, to ensure a more balanced World Heritage List.

**V.2** The Chairperson clarified that the sites examined were only those which had been referred back to the States Parties, but nonetheless reassured the Observer of Nigeria that the Committee was fully aware of this problem, as well as of its firm engagement to improve the representivity of the List.

**V.3** The Delegate of South Africa informed the Bureau that her Government had in principle agreed to host the 2004 session of the World Heritage Committee, but that a more official communication will be provided by

the end of January 2002, upon the completion of internal administrative formalities.

**V.4** The Observer of Italy thanked the Finnish authorities, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for the excellent organization of this session of the Bureau as well as for the quality of the documentation.

## **VI. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**VI.1** The Chairperson thanked all persons involved in the organization of the session, including the Finnish staff from the various concerned institutions and the Secretariat.

**VI.2** Emphasizing the special “historical” significance of the meeting, considering that with the introduction of the new calendar, from 2002, no more extraordinary sessions of the Bureau will be held, the Chairperson declared the twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau closed.

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

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

**BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE/  
BUREAU DU COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL  
Twenty-fifth extraordinary session/ Vingt-cinquième session extraordinaire  
Helsinki, Finland/ Helsinki , Finlande  
7 – 8 December 2001/7 –8 décembre 2001**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

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

**EGYPT/EGYPTE**

Dr. Gaballa Ali Gaballa  
Secretary General  
Supreme Council of Antiquities  
Ministry of Culture

Ms Maire Mattinen  
Chief Intendant  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O.Box 169  
HELSINKI 00511

Mr Ari Mäki  
Deputy Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015

**FINLAND/FINLANDE**

Mr. Henrik Lilius  
Director General  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O. Box 913  
HELSINKI 00100

Ms Irma-Liisa Perttunen  
Counsellor  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
P.O.Box 127  
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Raija Mattila  
Counsellor of Cultural Affairs  
Ministry of Education  
P.O.Box 29  
HELSINKI 00023

Ms Paula Purhonen  
Director of Department  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O.Box 169  
HELSINKI 00511

Mr Jukka-Pekka Flander  
Senior Adviser  
Ministry of the Environment  
P.O.Box 380  
HELSINKI 00131

Ms Riitta Resch  
Director  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
P.O.Box 176  
HELSINKI 00131

Mr Pekka Kärki  
Director of Department  
National Board of Antiquities  
P.O.Box 169  
HELSINKI 00511

**Official Finnish State Party Observers:**

Ms Leena Rinkineva  
Project Leader  
The Kvarken Council  
Kauppapuistikko 23 A  
VAASA 65100

Mr Stig Östdahl  
Managing Director  
City of Nykarleby  
Topeliusesplanaden 7  
NYKARLEBY 66900

**GREECE/GRECE**

Ms Helene Methodiou  
Conseiller pour la Culture  
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, Rue Miollis  
Maison De L'UNESCO  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Dr Tamás Fejérdy  
President of Hungarian Comm. ICOMOS  
National Office of Cultural Heritage  
Tancsics Mihály n.1  
BUDAPEST 1014

Dr János Tardy  
Deputy Secretary of State  
Ministry for Environment  
Kóltő u. 21  
BUDAPEST 1121

Dr Janos Jelen  
Ambassador  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary  
Nagy Imre ter 4  
BUDAPEST 1027

Dr Zoltán Szilassy  
Deputy Head of Department  
Ministry for Environment  
Kóltő u. 21  
BUDAPEST 1121

Ms Edit Herboly  
Staff  
Hungarian WHC  
Szinház n.5-9  
BUDAPEST 1014

Ms Julia Buda  
Staff Member  
Hungarian WHC  
BUDAPEST

**MEXICO/MEXIQUE**

Dr Francisco Javier Lopez Morales  
Director Patrimonio Mundial  
INAH  
Puebla 95  
MEXICO D.F 06700

Ms Viviana Kuri Haddad  
Subdirectora Patrimonio Mundial  
INAH  
Puebla 95  
MEXICO D.F 06700

Prof Salvador Diaz-Berrio  
Profesor Posgrado  
Univers.Autón.Metrop.  
Callejon Ojito n.9  
Coyoacán  
MÉXICO D.F. 04320

**SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD**

Ms Thuthukile Skweyiya  
Ambassador to France  
South African Embassy  
59, Quai d'Orsay  
PARIS 75007  
FRANCE

Mr Makgolo Makgolo  
Deputy Director  
Dept. of Environmental Affairs&Tourism  
Pretomus Street  
PRETORIA P/B 4 447

Ms Maria Mbengashe  
Chief Director  
Dept. of Environmental Affairs &Tourism  
Pretomus Street  
PRETORIA P/B X 447

Ms Louise Graham  
Counsellor  
South African Embassy  
59, Quai d'Orsay  
PARIS 75007  
FRANCE

## **THAILAND/THAÏLANDE**

Prof. Adul Wichiancharoen  
National Committee for WHC of Thailand  
OEPP Piboon Wattana 7  
Rama 6 Road  
Phrayathai  
BANGKOK 10400

Mr Arak Sunghitakul  
Deputy Director General  
Fine Arts Department  
Naprathat Rd.  
BANGKOK 10200

Mr. Borvornvate Rungrujee  
Director of General Management Div.  
Fine Art Department  
81/1 Sri Ayuttaya Road  
BANGKOK 10300

Ms Siriporn Nanta  
Assistant Secretary  
National Committee for WHC of Thailand  
OEPP Piboon Wattana  
Rama 6 Road  
BANGKOK 10400

## **II. ORGANISATIONS ATTENDING IN ADVISORY CAPACITY/ ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF**

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

Mr Joseph King  
Programme Manager  
ICCRUM  
Via di San Michele, 13  
ROME 00153  
ITALY

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

Dr Henry Cleere  
Coordinator  
ICOMOS  
49-51 Rue De La Fédération  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

Ms Regina Durighello  
Assistant Coordinator  
ICOMOS  
49-51 Rue De La Fédération  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

Dr Jukka Jokilehto  
ICOMOS  
Via Anicia 6  
ROME 00153  
ITALY

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

Mr David Sheppard  
Head, PPA  
The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney 28  
GLAND 1196  
SWITZERLAND

Mr Rolf Hogan  
Programme Officer  
The World Conservation Union  
Rue Mauverney 28  
GLAND 1196  
SWITZERLAND

Dr Jim Thorsell  
Senior Adviser  
IUCN  
Rue Mauverney 28  
GLAND 1196  
SWITZERLAND

### **III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS**

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

##### **ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE**

Ms Maria Susana Pataro  
Direction Organisations Internationales  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Esmeralda 1212  
BUENOS AIRES C1007 ABP

##### **AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE**

Mr Matthew Peek  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO  
4, Rue Jean Rey  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

Mr David Walker  
Director  
International Section, World Heritage Branch  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
GPO Box 787  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

##### **AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE**

Dr Hans Horcicka  
Director  
Ministry of Culture  
Schreyvogelg. 2  
VIENNA 1014

##### **BELGIUM/BELGIQUE**

Mme Bénédicte Selfslagh  
Relations Internationales  
Division du Patrimoine du Ministère de la Région  
Vallonne  
p/a 30 Avenue Junot  
PARIS 75018  
FRANCE

M. Philippe Thiéry  
Directeur Service Monuments  
Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale  
CCN 7, Rue Du Progrès 80bte 1  
BRUXELLES 1030

##### **BRAZIL/BRESIL**

H.E. Mr Luiz Henrique Pereira Da Fonseca  
Ambassador  
Embassy of Brazil  
Itäinen Puistotie 4 B 1  
HELSINKI 00140  
FINLAND

Mr José Pedro De Oliveira Costa  
Secrétaire à la Biodiversité et Forêts  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
Esplanada Dos Ministerios-Bloco B  
BRASILIA-DF

Dr Sergio Abi-Sad Caldas  
Minister-Counsellor  
Brazilian Embassy  
Itäinen Puistotie 4 B 1  
HELSINKI 00140  
FINLAND

##### **CHILE**

Mr Alejandro Rogers  
Chargé d'Affaires  
Delegation of Chile To UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

##### **CHINA/CHINE**

Mrs Shi Shu Yun  
Deputy Secretary General  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
35, Damucang Hutong, Xidan  
BEIJING 100816

Mr Zhi Jung Yang  
Director  
Dept. of Protection of Cultural Property  
State Administration of Cultural Heritage  
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street  
BEIJING 100020

Mr Zhan Guo  
Inspector  
State Administration of Cultural Heritage  
Secretary General ICOMOS/China  
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street  
BEIJING 100020

Mr Zhe Li  
Ministry of Construction  
9, Sanlihe Road  
BEIJING 100835

Ms Zuo Xiaoping  
Ministry of Construction  
Office of National Park  
9, Sanlihe Road  
BEIJING 100835

Mr Chen Xicheng  
Deputy Director  
Construction Department of Yunan Province  
KUNMING 650032

Mr Chamba Kelsang  
Director  
Administration of Potala Palace  
LHASA, TIBET

Mr Zhi-Guo Li  
Professor  
State Administration of Cultural Heritage  
N.10 Chaoyangmen Street  
BEIJING 100020

Prof Liang Yongning  
Professor  
Kunming University of Science  
Faculty of Land resources  
KUNMING 660093

## **FRANCE**

Mme Catherine Caro  
Sous-Directeur  
Ministère Environnement  
20 Avenue De Segur  
PARIS 75007

Mme Eva Caillart  
Chargée de Mission  
Ministère Culture  
8 Rue Vivienne -DAPA  
PARIS 75002

## **GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE**

Dr. Hans Caspary  
Conservateur  
State Conserv. Office  
Schillerstrasse 44  
MAINZ 55116

## **ISRAEL**

Mr Michael Turner  
Chair  
Israel World Heritage Committee  
25, Caspi Street  
JERUSALEM 93554

Ms Hemda Golan  
Deputy Legal Adviser  
Ministry Of Foreign Affairs  
6 Sharoni St Jerusalem

## **ITALY/ITALIE**

Dr Roberta Alberotanza  
Chef de la Section n.1  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères-DGPC  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1  
ROME 00194

Prof Luciano Marchetti  
Soprintendente Regionale dell'Umbria  
Ministero Beni e Attività Culturali  
Piazza Della Repubblica 78  
PERUGIA 06100

## **JAPAN/JAPON**

Dr Makoto Motonaka  
Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan  
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome  
Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Yousuke Hashimoto  
Senior Specialist  
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan  
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome  
Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Tsuyoshi Hirasawa  
Associate Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan  
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome  
Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Kazuhiko Nishi  
Associate Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan  
2-2 Kasumigaseki 3-Chome  
Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO 100-8959

Mr Minoru Soeya  
Assistant Director  
Ministry of the Environment  
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki  
Chiyoda-Ku  
TOKYO

Ms Kumiko Yoneda  
Senior Research Scientist  
Japan Wildlife Research Center  
3-10-10 Shitaya  
Taito-Ku  
TOKYO

#### **LUXEMBOURG**

Prof Guy Dockendorf  
Director General  
Ministry of Culture  
20, Montée de la Pétrusse

Mr Jean-Pierre Kraemer  
President of the National Commission for UNESCO  
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Jean Herr  
Architect  
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Robert Krier  
Architect  
LUXEMBOURG

Mr Fernand Otto  
Director Of The Administration Of Public Works  
LUXEMBOURG

#### **MALTA/MALTE**

Prof. Joseph Licari  
Permanent Delegate of Malta to UNESCO  
46, rue de Longchamp  
PARIS 75116  
FRANCE

Mr Mark Anthony Mifsud  
Assistant Curator of Archaeology  
National Museum of Archaeology  
Republic Street  
VALLETTA CMR 02

#### **NEPAL**

Ms Sannani Kansakar  
Director General  
Department of Archaeology  
KATHMANDU

Ms Riddhi Pradhan  
Joint Secretary  
Ministry of Culture  
Singha Durbar  
KATHMANDU

#### **NIGERIA**

Prof Michael Omolewa  
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Nigeria to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

#### **PERU**

Mr Carlos Vasquez  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

#### **PHILIPPINES**

Mr Hector Villarroel  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegation of the Philippines to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

#### **POLAND/POLOGNE**

Dr Tomasz Orłowski  
Secretary General  
Polish National Commission for UNESCO  
Palac Kultury i Nauki  
WARSZAWA 00-901

#### **PORTUGAL**

Mr Filipe Guterres  
Ambassador  
Embassy of Portugal  
Itäinen Puistotie 11 B  
HELSINKI 00140  
FINLAND

Ms Ana Maria Ribeiro Da Silva  
Diplomat  
Embassy of Portugal  
Itäinen Puistotie  
HELSINKI  
FINLAND



## SPAIN/ESPAGNE

Prof Diego Fernandez  
Chief of Service  
Spanish Ministry for Education, Culture and Sport  
Plaza del Rey n°1  
MADRID 28071

Ms Iciar Alcalá  
Cultural Heritage Manager  
Government of Aragón  
Pº Ruiseñores 26, Casa 2 1ºA  
ZARAGOZA 50006

Ms Abigail Pereta  
Cultural Heritage Manager  
Government of Aragón  
C/ Mariano Barbsán 9, 8º Dch.  
ZARAGOZA 50006

Ms Maria José Martínez  
Tecnico Politico  
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez  
c/Stuart  
ARANJUEZ

Ms Magdalena Merlos  
Tecnico Patrimonio  
Ayuntamiento de Aranjuez  
c/Stuart  
ARANJUEZ

## UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Paul McCormack  
DCMS  
2-4 Cockspur Street  
LONDON SW1Y5DH

Dr Christopher Young  
Head of World Heritage and International Policy  
English Heritage  
23 Savile Row  
LONDON W1S 2ET

Ms Christine Atkinson  
Deputy Permanent  
Delegation of the United Kingdom to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
PARIS 75015  
FRANCE

Dr Tony Weighell  
Science Advisor  
UK Delegation  
JNCC Monkstone House  
City Road  
PETERBOROUGH PE11JY

---

## HOST COUNTRY SECRETARIAT (FINLAND)

Ms Anu Ahoniemi  
Ms Anne Brax  
Ms Margaretha Ehrström  
Ms Lea Halttunen  
Ms Satu Heikkinen  
Ms Nina Heiska  
Ms Raija Helpi  
Mr Petja Hovinheimo  
Ms Jonna Lehtinen  
Ms Seija Linnanmäki  
Ms Marjo Merivirta  
Ms Lea Murto-Orava  
Mr Karim Peltonen  
Ms Sirkku Salomaa  
Ms Päivi Salonen  
Mr Eeva-Liisa Siru  
Mr Kristian Slotte  
Mr Hannu Vainonen  
Ms Satu-Kaarina Virtala

## UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE SECRETARIAT

Mr Francesco Bandarin, Director  
Ms Minja Yang, Deputy Director

Mr Natarajan Ishwaran  
Ms Elizabeth Wangari  
Ms Mechtild Rossler  
Ms Carmen Negrin  
Ms Sarah Titchen  
Mr Giovanni Boccardi  
Ms Junko Taniguchi  
Ms Frédérique Robert  
Ms Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy  
Ms Marjaana Kokkonen  
Mr Peter Stott  
Mr David Martel  
Ms Jane Degeorges  
Ms Marianne Raabe  
Ms Nina Dhumal  
Ms Claire Servoz

### *Interpreters:*

Mr Mourad Boulares  
Chief Interpreter  
Ms Antoinette Bourdelet  
Ms Catherine Lattanzio-Hinthaas  
Ms Chantal Bret  
Mr Charles Speed  
Mr David Shearer  
Mme Odile Monpetit

### *Translators:*

Ms Sabine de Valence  
Ms Anne Sauvêtre

**Speech of Mr Henrik Lilius, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee****Twenty-fifth extraordinary session of the Bureau  
of the World Heritage Committee****7-8 December 2001****Helsinki-Finland**

Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Bureau,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all, I would like to welcome you all to Finland. I would like also to begin by congratulating the 7 members of our Bureau which were elected or re-elected during the 5<sup>th</sup> extraordinary session of the Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> of November in UNESCO Headquarters: Egypt, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Mexico, South Africa and Thailand.

Ladies and Gentlemen, a lot of work is facing us: as you can see from the documents which have been sent to you, and which I hope you will have reviewed thoroughly, this session of the Bureau has a heavy agenda.

Our main task will be to recommend to the Committee decisions regarding notably the State of Conservation of 77 World Heritage Sites out of which 37 are cultural, 36 natural and 4 mixed. Since our last session in June, a lot of information concerning these sites has been transmitted to the Secretariat and is contained in the relevant documents. When appropriate, new information on these properties received in the past weeks will be presented to you orally by the Secretariat or by the Advisory Bodies.

We will also have to concentrate on the examination of a number of nominations referred back to the States Parties by the last session of the Bureau as well as 2 nominations deferred during earlier sessions. We will transmit our recommendation to the forthcoming session of the Committee for decision.

Furthermore, as the examination of international assistance requests can only be carried out after the approval of the Budget for 2002 by the Committee next week, I would like to inform you that we have decided - as it was already done last year - that a special meeting of our Bureau on this subject will be convened on Friday 14 December in the evening.

Enfin, et en raison de l'agenda très chargé de notre session, j'ai demandé au Secrétariat ainsi qu'aux Organes consultatifs, d'être le plus brefs possible durant leurs présentations. Pour cette même raison et afin de disposer d'assez de temps pour tous ceux qui souhaiteraient intervenir, je vous serais reconnaissant de bien vouloir être également très brefs dans les commentaires que vous souhaiteriez faire.

Mesdames, Messieurs, je suis conscient de la lourde charge de travail qui nous attends et de l'importance des décisions et recommandations que nous auront à prendre, mais je suis certain qu'avec l'aide du Secrétariat notamment, la dernière session extraordinaire du Bureau du Comité du patrimoine mondial sera un succès.

Je vous remercie de votre attention et de votre coopération.

**Tribute to the Memory of Mr. Ferenc Németh,  
Director of the Secretariat of the Hungarian World Heritage Committee  
by the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Mr Francesco Bandarin**

Mr Chairman,  
Distinguished Members of the Bureau,  
Representatives of the Advisory Bodies – ICCROM,  
ICOMOS and IUCN,  
Ladies and Gentlemen

On behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, I join with the Chairman in welcoming you all to Finland and to this extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee.

Let me begin by thanking our local hosts and organisers. You have made us all feel very much at home and we are pleased with the facilities and other provisions made for this meeting. I would like to thank you on behalf of all the colleagues of the World Heritage Centre for your support and for the friendly welcome!

Unfortunately, as you have heard from the Chairman, this session of our work starts with the very sad news of the untimely death of our friend Ferenc Németh.

I was really shocked yesterday evening when I heard of the tragic event that took him away from us. Ferenc had become a familiar figure at the Centre. He had come many times to our meetings in Paris and everybody liked him and appreciated his intelligence, his liveliness, his professional competence.

I went to Hungary in September for the inscription ceremony of the World Heritage site of Hortobágy and I spent a few days with Ferenc. That visit gave me the privilege to get to know him much better than during Bureau or Committee meetings, when we are all very busy and there is little time to develop personal contacts. He told me about his studies, his life before and after the big political changes in Hungary, his professional experiences and aspirations, his views of the future of conservation in Hungary and elsewhere. We traveled the country and spent time visiting sites: I remember his pride in showing me the most charming corners of his city.

We discussed at length the preparation of the next Committee meeting in Budapest: this would have been a major responsibility of the office he directed. We visited the Hungarian Parliament together to study the possibility of using it for the meeting, we discussed its logistical aspects and the great opportunity to use the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the *Convention* to organize special sessions to debate the future outlook of our work. He also was part to the Steering Committee we have set up to prepare the International Congress in 2002, and participated in all the recent meetings.

Ferenc was a very gentle and intense person, who performed his role with great discretion and style, always knowing how to anticipate problems and find appropriate solutions. Working with him was a real pleasure. We shared many things, starting with the fact that we had exactly the same age.

I never met his family, but Ferenc always talked about them and their choice of moving from Budapest to a country house in a village outside of Budapest. I feel very sorry for his family, for his colleagues and in particular for his closest collaborator, Lia Bassa. I think we all suffer today the loss of a friend and of an important member of our community.

I am sure that the best service we can do his memory is to pursue his efforts to strengthen the *Convention* and support Hungary in the task of organising a very important Committee session in 2002.

As Mr Lilius has just noted, and following the decision by the Committee in Cairns last year to change the World Heritage Statutory Meeting cycle as of 2002, this is probably going to be the last of our regular so-called extraordinary sessions of the Bureau.

The Bureau will in the future meet in April each year and will be followed by a Committee session in June. I think that we all have high expectations as to how this change will improve our working methods and the decision-making of the Committee.

These improvements are necessary to face the new challenges that are ahead of us in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and the new opportunities that are offered to us. The Committee session that will open on Tuesday will be of great importance in setting the new directions for the future.

As we embark on the final, and absolutely necessary phase of transition to this new and improved system, I wish you all the best in your deliberations. My colleagues and I stand ready to assist you to the best of our abilities.

Thank you.