

LIST OF ANNEXES

ANNEX I	List of Participants
ANNEX II	Speeches
	ANNEX II.1
	Speech by the Under-Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs
	ANNEX II.2
	Speech by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO
	ANNEX II.3
	Speech by the Vice President of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Cultural Property and Environment
	ANNEX II.4
	Speech by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
	ANNEX II.5
	Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee
ANNEX III	Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the Committee on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee concerning the overall financial and administrative management of the World Heritage Convention
ANNEX IV	Statements concerning the Central Karakorum National Park
	ANNEX IV.1 Observer of India
	ANNEX IV.2 Observer of Pakistan
ANNEX V	Text of the resolution on periodic reporting adopted by the 29th session of the General Conference

ANNEX VI	Statements concerning the inscription of cultural heritage in Poland
	ANNEX VI.1 Observer of Germany
	ANNEX VI.2 Observer of Poland
ANNEX VII	Statement of Italy concerning the co-operation between the Italian Government, ROSTE, the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM
ANNEX VIII	Recommendation on Illicit Traffic affecting World Heritage sites
ANNEX IX	Provisional agenda of the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee
ANNEX X	Decisions of the twenty-first extraordinary session of Bureau concerning international assistance requests

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

I. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE / ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE

AUSTRALIA / AUSTRALIE

Ms. Sharon M. SULLIVAN
First Assistant Secretary
Australian and World Heritage Group
GPO BOX 1567
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dr. Warren NICHOLLS
Director
World Heritage Unit, Environment Australia
GPO BOX 787 CANBERRA ACT 2601

Ms. Roni ELLIS
Deputy Permanent Delegate
Australian Delegation to Unesco
Australian Embassy
PARIS

Prof. Richard VARNE
Department of Geology
University of Tasmania
HOBERT, Tasmania

BENIN

S. Exc. M. Nouréini TIDJANI-SERPOS
Ambassadeur Délégué Permanent
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

M. Isidore MONSI
Conseiller
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

BRAZIL / BRESIL

Mme Roseana SARNEY MURAD
Gouverneur de l'État du Maranhão
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

S. Exc. M. Carlos Alberto LEITA BARBOSA
Ambassadeur

Dr. Glauco DE OLIVEIRA CAMPELLO
Président de l'IPHAN

Dr. Jorge MURAD
Secrétaire d'Etat de la Planification du Maranhão

Dr. Jackson Kleper LAGO
Maire de São Luiz, Maranhão
Prefectura de São Luiz, Maranhão
AV. Pedro II S/N - Centro
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

M. Joao BATISTA CRUZ
Conseiller
Ambassade du Brésil à Rome
14, Piazza Navona
ROME

Mme Andrea CURI ZARATTINI
Assesseur du Directeur d'Ecosistèmes de l'IBAMA
Sain Av. Norte Ibama / direc L4
BRASILIA 70800-200

Mme Gláucia SILVEIRA GAUCH
Conseiller du Ministère des Relations Extérieures du Brésil

Observateurs:

S. Exc. M. Paulo CARDOSO de OLIVEIRA PIRES do RIO
Ambassadeur
Ambassade du Brésil en Italie
14, Piazza Navona
ROME

S. Exc. M. Francisco THOMPSON FLORES
Ambassadeur
Ambassade du Brésil auprès du Saint - Siège
14, Piazza Navona,
ROME

S. Exc. M. Julio César GOMES DOS SANTOS
Ambassadeur
Ambassade du Brésil auprès de la FAO
14, Piazza Navona
ROME

Dr Antonio Carlos GOMES LIMA
Governo do Estado Do Maranhão
Rua Miragem do Sol Ed. Ignacio Regadas Renascenca II
São Luiz, Maranhão

Assesseeurs:

Dr. Fernando José MACIEIRA SARNEY
Assesseeur privé du Gouverneur de l'Etat du Maranhão
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

Prof Jean Pierre HALEVEY

Prof. Rafael MOREIRA
rua Marques de Subserra 11
Government of the State of Maranhão
LISBON

Ing. Luiz Phelipe DE CARVALHO CASTRO ANDRÉS
Coordinateur du Patrimoine Culturel
Segretaria de Estado da Cultura do Maranhão
Rua do Giz N.59
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

Arch. Ronald DE ALMEIDA SILVA
Special Consultant
Government of the State of Maranhão
Rua Sebastião Archer 17
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

Dr. José MURILO DE CARVALHO
Adviser for International Affairs
Prefectura de São Luiz, Maranhão
Palacio de la Ravardièrre
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

Dr. Joao Batista RIBEIRO FILHO
Adviser
Prefectura de São Luiz, Maranhão
Rua Isaac Martins, 141, - Centro
SÃO LUIS, MARANHÃO

CANADA

Dr. Christina CAMERON
Director General
National Historic Sites
Parks Canada
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Str.
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

Mr. Murray McCOMB
Director, Park Establishment Branch
National Parks Directorate
Parks Canada j
Department of Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Str.
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN
Chef
Affaires internationales
Parcs Canada
Ministère du Patrimoine Canadien
25 rue Eddy
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

CUBA

Lic. Maria Josefa VILABOY MORALES
Jefa de Asuntos Multilaterales de la Dirección del Ministerio de la Cultura
Ministerio de la Cultura
LA HABANA

Ms Marta ARJONA
Director of Council for Culture
Ministerio da Cultura
LA HABANA

ECUADOR / EQUATEUR

Ministre Dr. Flor Maria VALVERDE
Ministra de Medio Ambiente del Ecuador

Mr. Hernán GUARDERAS
Director del Instituto Nacional del Patrimonio cultural
Palacio de la Circasiana

M. Mauricio MONTALVO
Délégué Permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente de l'Equateur auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mme Pilar ANDRADE
Assistante du Ministre de Medio Ambiente del Ecuador
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente del Ecuador

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Mr. Henrik LILIUS
Director General of the National Board of Antiquities
BOX 13
HELSINKI 00100

Mr. Jukka-Pekka FLANDER
Senior Adviser
Ministry of the Environment
Land Use Department
Korkearnorenk. 21
00120 HELSINKI

FRANCE

S. Exc. Mr. Jean MUSITELLI
Ambassadeur Délégué permanent
Délégation permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

M. Chérif KHAZNADAR
Président du Comité Culture
Commission Française pour l'UNESCO
36, rue de la Pérouse
75775 PARIS CEDEX 16

M. Michel RICARD
Sous-directeur des Affaires Internationales
Direction du patrimoine et de l'Architecture
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication
8, rue de Vivienne
75002 Paris

Mme. Aimée DUBOS
Adjoint au Sous-Directeur des monuments historiques
Direction du patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication
8, rue Vivienne
75002 PARIS

M. Alain MEGRET
Directeur adjoint de la Nature et des Paysages
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Environnement
20, Avenue de Ségur
75302 PARIS Cedex 07

Mme. Catherine DUMESNIL
Conseiller technique à la Commission française pour l'UNESCO
36, rue de la Pérouse
75775 PARIS CEDEX16

GREECE / GRECE

M. Yannis TZEDAKIS
Directeur des Antiquités auprès du Ministère de la Culture
Ministère de la Culture
20, rue Boubolines
ATHENES

Mme Hélène METHODIOU
Conseiller pour la Culture
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Dr. Zoltan SZILASSY
Deputy Head of Department
National Authority for Nature Conservation
Ministry for Environment and Regional Policy
Committee Member
1121 Kolto u. 21 BUDAPEST

Mr. Béla KOVÁCSI
Chief Counsellor
Regional Development and Buildings Affairs Office
Ministry for Environment and Regional Policy
1011 BUDAPEST I. FÖ u. 44-50

Observer:

Ms. Andrea FARAGÓ
Ministère Hongrois des Biens Culturels
BUDAPEST UAS u.2

ITALY / ITALIE

M. Francesco FRANCONI
Professeur
Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Sienne
Président du Comité du Patrimoine Mondial
Piazza San Francesco
SIENA

Mme Lucia FIORI
Conseiller
Responsable du Bureau de la Coopération Culturelle Internationale
Direction générale des relations culturelles
Ministère des Affaires étrangères
Piazza della Farnesina
ROME

M. Pasquale Bruno MALARA
Surintendant des Biens architecturaux de Turin
Piazza S. Giovanni, 2
10122 TURIN

Mme Alessandra MELUCCO VACCARO
Direction Générale pour l'Environnement et le Paysage culturel
Ministère des Biens Culturels
Piazza del Popolo, 18
00187 ROME

M. Giovanni ARMENTO
Attaché pour les affaires financières et administratives
Délégation permanente d'Italie auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mme Margherita SABATINI
Direction générale des relations culturelles
Ministère italien des Affaires Etrangères
Piazza della Farnesina
ROME

Mme Roberta ALBEROTANZA
Cabinet du Ministre,
Ministère des Biens Culturels
Via del Collegio Romano, 27
00186 ROME

Mme Licia BORELLI VLAD
Membre de la Commission Nationale italienne pour l'UNESCO
Piazza Firenze, 27
00186 ROME

M. Giuseppe CATALDI
Professeur de Droit International
Institut Universitaire Oriental de Naples
Piazza S. Giovanni Maggiore
80134 NAPLES

M. Silvio GIACHINO
Expert
Commission Nationale italienne pour l'UNESCO
Piazza Firenze, 27
ROME

JAPAN / JAPON

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

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

Mr. Hiroshi KARUBE
Director
Second Cultural Affairs Division, Cultural Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

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

Mr. Hiroshi WATANABE
Second Secretary of Japanese Embassy to Italy
Embassy of Japan
Via Quintino Sella 60
ROME

Mr. Tomoyuki ONO
Attaché
Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr. Nobuhiro OISHI
Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division
Cultural Affairs Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

Mr. Naohisha OKUDA
Assistant Director
Planning Division, Nature Conservation Bureau,
Environmental Agency
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

Mr. Sumio WAKAMATSU
Director-General Cultural Properties Protection Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

Mr. Takafumi GODA
Director
Monuments Sites Division
Cultural Properties Protection Department
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku

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

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

Mr. Shingo ROKUKAWA
Unit Chief
Monuments and Sites Division
Cultural Properties Protection Department,
Agency for Cultural Affairs
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

Mr. Kazuya ANDO
Audit Officer
Management Planning Division
Forestry Agency
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
TOKYO, 100

Mr. Taikio HANDA
Manager
Cultural Properties Preservation Section,
The City of Kyoto
KYOTO, 604

Mr. Soichi TAKAMI
Chief in charge of Promotion and Research
Cultural Properties Preservation Section,
The City of Kyoto
KYOTO, 604

Mr. Hiroshi TAKAGI
Assistant Manager
General Affairs Section, Cultural Affairs Division,
The City of Kyoto
KYOTO 604

Ms. Kumiko YONEDA
Research Staff
Japan Wildlife Research Centre
2-29-3 Yushima, Bunkyo-ku
TOKYO, 113

Mr. Kenichi HASEGAWA
Sales Manager
Kyoto Office, Japan Travel Bureau
KYOTO

LEBANON / LIBAN

M. Noël FATTAL
Conseiller
Délégué permanent adjoint du Liban auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

MALTA / MALTE

Mr. Anthony DEMICOLI
Director of Studies
Centre for Restoration Studies
Maltese Ministry of Education and National Culture
FLORIANA

MEXICO / MEXIQUE

Ms. Maria Teresa FRANCO Y GONZALES SALAS
Director- General
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)
Cordoba 45, Col. Roma
04700 MEXICO D.F.

Mr. Salvador DIAZ-BERRIO
Deputy Director for Technical Assistance and Training
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)
Cordoba 45, Col. Roma
04700 MEXICO D.F.

Mr. Jorge Carlos DIAZ CUERVO
Secretario Administrativo
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)

Mr. Salvador ACEVES GARCIA
National Coordinator for National Monuments (INAH)
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)
Correo Mayor 100
04700 MEXICO D.F.

Mr. Francisco J. LOPEZ MORALES
Director de Catalogo y Zonas de Monumentos
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)

Ms. Amelia LARA TAMBURRINO
Cultural Counsellor to the Embassy
Via Lazzaro Spallanzani 16
ROME

MOROCCO / MAROC

M. Abdelaziz TOURI
Directeur du Patrimoine Culturel
Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de la Culture
Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur de la Recherche Scientifique et de la Culture
17, rue Michlifen,
ADAL, RABAT

Ms Naima SEDRATI
Délégué permanent adjoint
Délégation permanente du Maroc auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15

NIGER

Mr. SEYDOU SEYNI
Directeur National de La Faune-Pêche et Pisciculture
Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement
B.P. 721
NIAMEY

REPUBLIC OF KOREA / REPUBLIQUE DE COREE

H. E. Mr. Dong-Chil YANG
Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Korea to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS CEDEX 15

Mr. Dae-Hyyn KIAN
Deputy Director
Office of Cultural Properties
Ministry of Culture and Sports
SEOUL

Ms Jr-Eun PARK
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
77 Sejongo, Chongo Gu
SEOUL

THAILAND / THAILANDE

Prof. Dr. Adul WICHIENTHAROEN
Chairman
Thai National Committee for the protection of the World Cultural and
Natural Heritage
1056/3 Nakonichiari Rd.,
BANGKOK

Ms. Siripon NANTA
Secretary
The National Committee for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning
60/1 Rama 6 Road,
BANGKOK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Mr. Donald J. BARRY
Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Parks
Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20249

Mr. John J. REYNOLDS
Regional Director, Pacific West Region
National Parks Service
Department of Interior
600 Harrison St., suite 600
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94107

Advisor:

Ms. Sharon J. CLEARY
Chief
Office of International Affairs
National Parks Service
Department of Interior
1849 C Street, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20249

Mr. William W. McILHENNY
United States Observer to UNESCO
American Embassy in France
PARIS

Mr. James H. CHARLETON
International Cooperation Specialist
Office of International Affairs
National Parks Service
Department of the Interior
1849 C. ST., NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

Mr. David HOLLEMBERG
Associate Regional Director
National Heritage Partnership
Northeast Region
National Parks Service
Department of the Interior
200 Chestnut St.
PHILADELPHIA PA 19106

ZIMBABWE

Mr Dawson MUNJERI
Executive Director
The National Museums and Monuments
Penrose Hill
107 Rotten Row
P.O.Box CY 1485, Causeway
HARARE

Dr. Fenton COTTERIL
Natural History Museum of Zimbabwe
P.O. Box 240
BULAWAYO

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

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

Mr. Marc LAENEN
Director-General
via di San Michele, 13
00153 Rome
Italy

Mr. Jukka JOKILETHO
Assistant to the Director-General
via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME, Italy

Mr. Alejandro ALVA
Programme Officer, GAIA
via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME, Italy

Mr. Joseph KING
Acting Coordinator, ITUC
via di San Michele, 13
00153 ROME, Italy

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

Jean-Louis LUXEN
Secrétaire général
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Mme Carmen ANON
Membre du Comité Exécutif de l'ICOMOS
Puerto Santa Maria 49
MADRID 28043

M. Henry CLEERE
Coordinateur du Patrimoine Mondial
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

Mme Regina DURIGHELLO
Assistante du Coordinateur
49-51, rue de la Fédération
75015 PARIS

M. Roberto DI STEFANO
Président d'honneur de l' ICOMOS

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

Dr. Jim THORSELL
Head of the Natural Heritage Programme
rue Mauverney, 28
CH- 1196 GLAND, Switzerland

Mr. P.H.C. (Bing) LUCAS
Vice-chair of the World Commission on Protected Areas
1/268 Main Road, Tawa
WELLINGTON 6006, New Zealand

III. OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

ALBANIA / ALBANIE

M. Sefedin XHEMALÇE
Secrétaire Général de la Commission Nationale de l'UNESCO
Ministère des Affaires étrangères
Bld. Zhan d' Ark
TIRANA

ARGENTINA / ARGENTINE

Ms. Magdalena FAILLACE
Presidenta de la Comisión Nacional de Museos,
Monumentos y Lugares Historicós
Av. de Mayo 556
BUENOS AIRES

Lic. Inés GOMEZ
Secretaria de recursos Naturales y Desarrollo Sustentable
San Martin 459
1430 BUENOS AIRES

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

M. Hans HORCICKA
Ministère Fédéral de l'Enseignement et des Affaires Culturelles
Minoritenplatz 5
1014 WIEN

BELARUS

Mr. Sergei ZVONKO
Chargé d'Affaires
Embassy of Belarus in Italy
Via della Giuliana 113
ROME, Italy

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

M. Edgard GOEDELEVEN
Chef de la Division des Monuments et des Sites
Communauté Flamande
Bâtiment Graaf de Ferraris,
Emile Jacqmainlaan, bte 7
1000 BRUXELLES

Mme. Bénédicte SELFSLAGH
Relations avec les Organisations Internationales
Division du Patrimoine
Ministère de la Région Wallone
12-14 rue d'Aumale, 75009 PARIS

CAMERON / CAMEROUN

M. Charles ASSAMBA-ONGODO
Deuxième Secrétaire
Délégation permanente du Cameroun auprès de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 Paris Cedex 15

Mme Ambroise MBIA
Directeur Adjoint du Patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture
B P. 8163 YAOUNDE

CHINA / CHINE

Mr. Jinghui WANG
Deputy Director-General
Department of Urban Planning
Ministry of Construction
BEIJING

Mr. Yansheng MA
Director
Division of Culture and Communication
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO
BEIJING

Mr. Zhan GUO
Director
Division for Management and Protection
State Bureau of Cultural Relics
General Secretary of the National Committee of ICOMOS
BEIJING

Mr. Wentao XU
Director
Suzhou Municipal Bureau of Gardens & Parks
SUZHOU

Mr. Changzhi CAO
Deputy Director
Shangxi Provincial Construction Committee

Mrne Jiang CHEN
Vice-Director of Lijiang County, Yunnan Province
YUNNAN

CROATIA / CROATIE

Mr. Miljenko DOMIJAN
Service for the Protection of the Cultural and Natural Heritage
Ministry of Culture
S. Brusine 11
23000 ZADAR

Mr. Dino MILINOVIC
Secretary-General of the Croatian National Commission for UNESCO
Kneza Milava 18
1000 ZAGREB

**DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO / REPUBLIQUE
DEMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO**

Mr. Ma Oyisenzoo MANKOTO
Conservateur du Parc National Kahuzi-Biega
ICCN
852 BUKAYU

ESTONIA

Mr. Jaan TAMM
General Director
Central Board of Antiquities
Uus 18
E0001 TALLIN

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

H. E. Mr Beglar TAJARTKILADZE
Ambassador
Embassy of Georgia in Italy
Piazza di Spagna, 20
ROME, Italy

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

H. Exc. Mr. Horst WINKELMANN
Ambassador
Foreign Office
53001 BONN

Dr. Hans CASPARY
Conservateur du Service des Monuments Historiques
Göttelmannstr. 17
55130 MAINZ

Mr. Hendrik WASSERMANN
Legationsrat I. Klasse
Auswartiges Amt - Referat 611
Postfach 1186
53001 BONN

LATVIA / LETTONIE

H.E. Ms. Aina NAGOBADS-ABOLS
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Latvia to the UNESCO
Permanent Delegation of Latvia to UNESCO
6, Villa Saïd
75016 PARIS, France

Ms. Karina PĒTERSONE
Chairperson
Committee of Culture, Arts and Religious Matters
The City of Riga
3 Valdemara Str.,
RIGA, LV-1539

HOLY SEE / SAINT-SIEGE

S.Exc. Monseigneur Ernesto GALLINA
Délégué pour les Organisations Internationales Gouvernementales
CITE DU VATICAN

INDIA / INDE

H. Exc. Mr. Chiranjiv SINGH
Ambassador
Permanent Delegation of India to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis,
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

INDONESIA / INDONESIE

Mr. I.G.N. ANOM
Director-General of Culture
Department of Culture and Education
Genayan JAKARTA

Mr. Giuseppe TESTA
Consul of Indonesia in Naples
Consolato di Indonesia
Via Cervantes
NAPLES, Italy

Mr. Rea BENSON
Embassy of Indonesia in Italy
ROME, Italy

MALAWI

Ms Jane TSEKA
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of National Heritage
P / Bag 384
LILONGWE 3

Mr. Willard MICHALA
Director of the Department of Antiquities
P.O. Box 264
LILONGWE

NEPAL

Hon'ble Sharat SINGH BANDARI
Minister for Youth, Sports and Culture
His Majesty's Government of Nepal
KATHMANDU

Mr. Khadga MAN SHRESTA
Joint Secretary
Ministry for Youth, Sports and Culture
KALIMATI KATH

Mr. Shyamanand SUMAN
Minister Counsellor
Permanent Delegation of Nepal to UNESCO
45 bis, rue des Acacies
75017 PARIS

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Dr. Robert DE JONG
Dutch State Department for Conservation
President International ICOMOS - IFLA Committee
Broederplein 41
ZEIST

Mr. Stanley BERTRIAN
Governor
Curaçao Government
Sokuako 28
CURAÇAO

René Antonio RÖMER
Chairman Council for the Preservation of Monuments, Curaçao
Governments of Netherlands
Newport 101
CURAÇAO

PAKISTAN

Mr. A. S. BABAR HASHMI
First Secretary
Pakistan Embassy in Italy
Via della Camilluccia 682
00135 ROME, Italy

PERU / PEROU

Mr. Carlos VELASCO MENDIOLA
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Peru to UNESCO
Delegation of Peru to UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr. Carlo IACCARINO
Consul of Peru

Mme Ana Rosa VALDIVIESO
Première Secrétaire
Ambassade du Pérou en Italie
Via Po, 22
00198 ROME, Italy

PHILIPPINES

Mme Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO
Premier Secrétaire
Délégation permanente des Philippines
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

POLAND / POLOGNE

Prof. Andrzej TOMASZEWSKI
Directeur général du patrimoine
Ministère de la Culture
Ksamerov 13
00656 WARSZAWA

Mme Aleksandra WACLAWCZYK
Secrétaire général adjoint
Commission nationale polonaise pour l'UNESCO
Palac Kultury: Nauki 7p
00901 WARSZAWA

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Mr. Ioane ONISEI
State Secretary
Ministry of Culture
Piata Cirsei Tibere
BUCAREST

M. Andrei PIPIDI
Président
Commission Nationale pour les Monuments Historiques
Ministrère de la Culture
15A Bd. Catargiu
BUCAREST

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Ms Natalia POTAPOVA
Deputy Chief
Department for Preservation of Heritage
19, Pyatnitskaja str.
113035 MOSCOW

SAUDI ARABIA / ARABIE SAOUDI1TE

M. Khalid M. ESKOUBI
Assistant Deputy Minister for Antiquities and Museums
P.O. Box 3734
11481 RIYAD

SAINT MARIN / SAN MARINO

Mme Edith TAMAGNINI
Ambassadeur de San Marino auprès de l'UNESCO
Segreteria di Stato per gli Affari Esteri
Palazzo Pegni
SAN MARINO

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Benigno PENDAS GARCIA
Director General de Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales
Ministerio de Educación y Cultura

Mr. Luis LAFUENTE BATANERO
Subdirecteur General de Protección del Patrimonio Histórico
Ministerio de Educación y Cultura

Mr. Pedro SANZ ALONSO
Presidente
Gabinete Prensa de la Rioja

Ms Flor RAPOSO
Jefe
Gabinete Prensa de la Rioja

Mr Domingo RIVERA CANNOBELLAS
Director
Gabinete Prensa de la Rioja

Mr Luis ALEGRE GALILEA
Consejero de la Rioja

Mme Basilia MARTINEZ SOTO
Jefe
Patrimonio Histórico del Gobierno de la Rioja
Portales n 2
26001 LOGROÑO

Mr. Javier TOQUERO
Consejería Cultura
Aud. Puente Colgame s/4
VALLAPOLLO

Mr. José Antonio NAVARRO COSSIO
Gobierno Autonómico
Portaferrissa n. 1
08001 BARCELONA

Ms Maria Rosa SUAREZ-INCLAN
Presidente
ICOMOS / Spain

SOUTH AFRICA / AFRIQUE DU SUD

Mr. Makgolo Ansley MAKGOLO
Assistant Director
Cultural Resources Management
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
P/B X2 Rogge Bay
8012 CAPE TOWN

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

M. Osvaldo CASONI
Consul de Suisse à Naples
Via Pergolesi, 1
80122 NAPLES

M. Jean-Hubert LEBET
Conseiller Culturel
Ambassade de Suisse,
ROME

M. Beat SCHMID
Consulat de Suisse
NAPLES

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME UNI

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

H.E. Mr. Tom RICHARDSON
British Ambassador to Italy
Via XX Settembre 80a
00187 ROMA

Mr. John CULVER
British Consul-General
Via Francesco Crispi 122
80122 NAPLES

Mr. Gerardo KAISER
British Consulate-General
Via Francesco Crispi 122
80122 NAPLES

URUGUAY

Dr. Jaime Ruben SAPOLINSKI
Dirección General del Ministerio de Educación y
Cultura del Uruguay
Reconquista 535
MONTEVIDEO

VENEZUELA

Mme Vilma NOBILE MONTESANO
Gerente Ejecutiva
Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural
Villa Santa Ines Av. Ppal Catto Amarillo
CARACAS

VIETNAM

Prof. Dr. LUU TRAN TEU
Vice Minister of Culture and Information
Ministry of Culture and Information

Dr. TRUONG QUOC BINH
Vice-Director General
Department of Conservation and Museology
51. Ngo Quejcer,
HANOI

IV. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION / ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNAMENTALES

THE GETTY CONSERVATION INSTITUTE

Ms Margareth G. H. MacLEAN
Program Director
Documentation
The Getty Conservation Institute
1200 Getty Center Drive
Suite 700
LOS ANGELES, 90049-1684
California, USA

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

Mr. Hans DORN
IFLA Vice President
Chairman of IFLA Committee of Historic Gardens and Landscapes
Holbeinstrasse 17
D-60596 FRANKFURT / M
Germany

**WORLD HERITAGE CITIES ORGANIZATION / ORGANISATION DES
VILLES DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

Mr. Marcel JUNIUS
Secrétaire General
Organisation des Villes du Patrimoine Mondial
56, rue St. Pierre
QUEBEC

Mme Céline SAUCIER
Directeur
Organisation des Villes du Patrimoine Mondial
56, rue St. Pierre
QUEBEC

WORLD HERITAGE KIDS CLUBS/ WALKLENS KIDSCAMERA

Mr. Károly GÉMESI
Founder President
1121 KÖLTÖ u. 2
Hungary

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Mr. Alec MARR
National Campaign Officer
68 Stradbroke St
PEAKIN ACT 5T
Australia

**V. INTER-GOVERNAMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS /
ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES**

**ARAB LEAGUE EDUCATIONAL CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC
ORGANIZATION (ALECSO) /
L'ORGANISATION ARABE POUR L'EDUCATION, LA CULTURE ET LA
SCIENCE (ALECSO)**

Dr. Rita AWAD
Deputy-Director
Department of Programmes of Culture and Communications
P.O. BOX 1120
TUNIS, Tunisia

VI. UNESCO SECRETARIAT

Mr. Adnan BADRAN
Deputy Director-General

Mr. Bernd von DROSTE
Director
World Heritage Centre

Mr. Mounir BOUCHENAKI
Director
Cultural Heritage Division

Mr. Georges ZOUAIN
Deputy Director
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Minja YANG
World Heritage Centre

Ms Breda PAVLIC
Director
Women and Gender Equality Unit

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO
World Heritage Centre

Mr. Mark WARREN
Deputy Comptroller
Bureau of the Comptroller

Ms. Lyndel PROTT
Division of Cultural Heritage

Mr. Herman van HOOFF
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Mechtild ROSSLER
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Alexandra zu SAYN-WITTGENSTEIN
World Heritage Centre

Ms Junko TANIGUCHI
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Laurence LISSAC
World Heritage Centre

Ms Sarah TITCHEN
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Johanna SULLIVAN
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Jane DEGEORGES
World Heritage Centre

Ms. Jocelyne POUTEAU
World Heritage Centre

Mr. David MARTEL
World Heritage Centre

Mr. Jesus GETAN BORNN
Interpretation Division

Mr. Alessandro BALSAMO
World Heritage Centre

Ms Rosalba TUSEO
World Heritage Centre

Mr. Yves DAUGE
Special Adviser, WHC

Mr. Pietro LAUREANO
Expert for Lalibela

Ms Elisabeth PANITZ BICCA
UNESCO Office, BRASILIA

EXTERNAL AUDITOR OF UNESCO

Ms Bonnie MILLER
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Str.
OTTAWA Ontario, K1A 0G6
Canada

Mrne Esther STERN
Office of the Auditor General of Canada
240 Sparks Str
OTTAWA Canada

DISCOURS DU SOUS-SECRETAIRE D'ETAT AUX AFFAIRES ETRANGERES

Excellences, Messieurs les Délégués, Mesdames, Messieurs,

C'est avec une grande satisfaction que le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères voit encore une fois réunit en Italie, après 14 ans, cet organisme si important, auquel a été confiée la responsabilité d'assurer l'application de la Convention du 1972 pour la protection du Patrimoine Mondial culturel et naturel.

A une époque marquée encore par des confrontations idéologiques, l'UNESCO a eu le grand mérite d'initier, avec la Convention, la recherche d'un territoire idéal commun dans lequel l'humanité partagée pouvait se reconnaître, dialoguer et coopérer, au delà des barrières politiques. C'était un projet ambitieux et clairvoyant, auquel l'Italie s'est immédiatement associée par vocation naturelle à partager un patrimoine historique et culturel, aussi bien que naturel, dont notre pays offre un si riche témoignage.

En 1983, Florence a accueilli le Comité: Florence, berceau de la Renaissance, témoin d'une expérience culturelle extraordinaire qui a permis d'affirmer le rôle central de l'homme et sa citoyenneté universelle.

Un long chemin a marqué depuis ce moment-là les relations entre les Etats et leur façon de faire face à leurs engagements dans le domaine de la coopération internationale. Aujourd'hui, à l'occasion du vingt-cinquième anniversaire de la Convention du Patrimoine Mondial, l'Italie est fière de marquer, avec l'hospitalité si généreuse de la Ville de Naples, une étape importante du processus qui a permis de passer de la phase de définition juridique d'un accord à des activités concrètes de suivi et de coopération entre les institutions internationales, les Etats parties et la société civile.



Ministero degli Affari Esteri

Je voudrais rappeler les étapes les plus significatives de ce processus: il s'agit de rendez-vous que l'Italie n'a jamais manqué, mais qui, au contraire, ont vu notre Pays à l'avant-garde dans l'action visant à donner aux normes juridiques la force nécessaire pour modifier, de façons cohérente, les mentalités et les comportements des Gouvernements et des citoyens.

En 1983 on ne percevait encore aucun signe spécifique de l'accélération soudaine de l'histoire qui, quelques années après, aurait changé de façon très profonde la scène internationale, en ouvrant vers des horizons insoupçonnés les relations et les échanges inter-culturels. Mais, en même temps, la possibilité s'ouvrait de nouvelles confrontations culturelles, ethniques et religieuses.

Le cadre florentin des travaux du Comité bien soulignait, à l'époque, l'adhésion idéale des Etats parties à la Convention, à ce principe d'appartenance commune des biens et des valeurs affirmé par l'UNESCO et consacré de manière formelle dans la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial. Un principe qui rencontrait, toutefois, encore des difficultés à se concrétiser dans une participation réelle des institutions internationales et des communautés locales aux responsabilités des gouvernements.

C'est seulement avec la récente et rapide expansion au niveau planétaire de la notion de "village globale" que cette sensibilité a pris la forme d'un engagement de solidarité et de coopération plus opérationnelle. L'Italie, en premier lieu, s'est rendue compte de la nécessité de donner une impulsion décisive à l'application de la Convention pour qu'elle devienne un véritable instrument d'intervention mis à la disposition de la communauté internationale, qui était profondément atteinte par les crimes perpétrés contre le patrimoine et néanmoins désarmée en raison d'une longue tradition de non ingérence.

Je me permets de rappeler que, en 1991, face aux bombardements de Dubrovnik, l'Italie avait proposé et obtenu, après une Résolution signée par 48 Etats et votée à l'unanimité, un engagement de la Conférence Générale de l'UNESCO à réexaminer les formes et les moyens d'une intervention internationale plus décisive pour la protection du Patrimoine commun des peuples. A partir de ce moment-là, grâce à l'action de l'UNESCO, on a constaté le démarrage d'une protection renforcée par des initiatives multiples.

Dans ce contexte, l'Italie a joué un rôle de guide dans la recherche de solutions opérationnelles susceptibles d'encourager une collaboration accrue.



Ministero degli Affari Esteri

Nos experts les plus qualifiés ont participé au processus de révision des Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention de 1972, visant à rechercher toutes les possibilités de coexistence entre le respect de la souveraineté nationale et les droits de la communauté internationale.

Il s'agit d'un processus qui a permis d'initier une coopération active entre les Etats et ce Comité dans le cadre d'un engagement commun qui a pour objet une gestion appropriée et efficace des biens qui bénéficient de la protection internationale.

Le parcours a été parfois marqué par des débats animés, mais toujours avec la volonté d'aboutir à des résultats cohérents avec l'esprit de la Convention et dans l'intérêt prioritaire de la sauvegarde des biens qui appartiennent à l'humanité.

Ce parcours a été l'objet d'une étude par la 2^{ème} Université de Roma qui a voulu marquer de cette façon la célébration du vingt-cinquième anniversaire de la Convention. Cette étude a abouti à une publication qui sera présentée à la presse demain.

C'est aussi dans cet esprit que l'Italie a déployé un effort décisif pour favoriser l'adoption de normes internationales plus efficaces contre le trafic illicite des biens.

Dans le même esprit, tandis que en 1992 l'Union Européenne travaillait à la mise au point d'instruments juridiques pour réglementer la circulation interne des biens culturels sur la base d'un partage des responsabilités, l'Italie essayait d'affirmer le même principe de solidarité dans un contexte géographique plus vaste. Cette action a été couronnée de succès avec l'adoption à Rome, en juin 1995, de la Convention UNIDROIT sur les biens volés ou illicitement exportés. L'Italie est bien consciente que la prévention des actes illicites et les actions juridiques pour la restitution des biens ont des implications financières qui dépassent souvent les capacités des particuliers aussi bien que des Gouvernements.

La communauté internationale est donc appelée à donner un signal de solidarité envers les victimes de pillages auxquels la fragilité de leurs systèmes de protection les ont exposés. Cette manifestation de solidarité serait cohérente avec les affirmations de principe et de droit exprimées dans les Conventions en vigueur dans ce domaine.



Ministero degli Affari Esteri

Au sein du Comité de l'UNESCO pour la restitution aux Pays d'origine des biens culturels exportés de façon illégale, l'Italie, conformément à la position déjà exprimée au cours des négociations UNIDROIT, a donc sollicité une Recommandation visant la création d'un instrument approprié pour la recherche et la gestion de ressources nécessaires à la protection, sur le territoire national, des biens de chaque Pays.

Nous souhaitons également que le Comité du Patrimoine, saisi pendant cette Session du problème des actions illégales dans les sites protégés par la Convention de Paris de 1972, puisse, pour sa part, partager cette exigence.

Je voudrais rappeler que le processus de renforcement de la Convention de La Haye pour la protection contre les dommages provoqués par les guerres, promu à l'initiative des Pays-Bas et qui est maintenant sur le point d'aboutir, a été mis en route grâce à la contribution apporté par l'Italie à une nouvelle conscience de la nécessité de renforcer aussi dans ce domaine la protection en vigueur.

En raison de sa situation historique et géographique, l'Italie à été, pendant les siècles, au centre d'importants trafics maritimes touchant aussi des productions artistiques. C'est la raison de notre engagement pour la sauvegarde des trésors qui ont été ensevelis au fond des mers, témoins silencieux de guerres, de pirateries, ainsi que de commerces florissants anciens.

Il s'agit d'un patrimoine immense de témoignages, pour la sauvegarde duquel nous souhaitons une définition rapide du texte de la nouvelle Convention pour la protection des biens subaquatiques en préparation par l'UNESCO.

Enfin l'Italie considère la protection et la valorisation du patrimoine culturel et naturel des peuples comme un instrument extraordinaire de communication inter-culturelle et, donc, comme un instrument de paix.

La pleine adhésion de l'Italie aux Conventions internationales, son engagement pour le renforcement des normes en vigueur et pour l'inscription sur la Liste de l'UNESCO des biens les plus significatifs de nôtre patrimoine, ne sont motivés ni par la recherche d'une attribution de valeur formelle, ni par celle de moyens supplémentaires pour leur protection. En revanche, nous sommes



Ministero degli Affari Esteri

animés d'un sentiment sincère d'appartenance à la communauté internationale, avec laquelle nous souhaitons partager la responsabilité d'un patrimoine à transmettre aux générations futures: un patrimoine qui permette à nos fils d'enraciner le sentiment de leur histoire et les valeurs auxquelles se référer pour contribuer au progrès de la civilisation humaine.

L'Italie est de plus en plus concernée par une évolution pluri-ethnique de sa situation démographique. La politique de protection et de valorisation des biens culturels et naturels apparaît dès lors comme un instrument qui contribue à améliorer les relations sociales à l'intérieur du Pays aussi bien que les relations internationales.

Mais pour l'Italie une telle politique constitue aussi un devoir moral vis à vis des nombreux savants, artistes, créateurs, voyageurs qui, pendant les siècles, ont honoré la valeur de nos trésors artistiques. Ils ont partagé leur amour de ces gites avec les millions de visiteurs qui chaque année affluent vers nos villes d'art, admirent nos paysages et nos monuments, entraînant par conséquent les Italiens à découvrir les pays les plus éloignés et leur différentes civilisations.

Dans l'esprit de ces échanges fructueuses de cultures et de civilisations dont l'Italie est le témoin, je voudrais exprimer la plus vive gratitude du Gouvernement au Maire de Naples qui a bien voulu assurer, avec la collaboration efficace de son Administration, l'hospitalité de cette Session du Comité du Patrimoine Mondiale.

Je souhaite adresser un remerciement particulier à M. Adnan Badran, Directeur Général Adjoint de l'UNESCO. Sa présence à cette cérémonie confirme l'engagement avec lequel l'Organisation s'efforce de favoriser la mise en oeuvre la plus efficace possible de la Convention pour la protection du Patrimoine mondiale.

Aux Délégués, aux Observateurs, aux Représentants des Organismes Consultatifs du Comité et de l'UNESCO, au Président en charge, Professeur Francesco Francioni, mes meilleurs souhaits d'un travail productif, qui puisse imprimer un nouveau élan à la protection internationale du Patrimoine de l'Humanité.

Speech of the Representative of the Director General, Mr. A. Badran, Deputy Director General of UNESCO, at the Opening of the Twenty First Ordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee, 1-6 December 1997, Naples, Italy

Mr President of the Committee

Mr Mayor of the City of Naples

Madame Under-Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs

Mr Vice-President of the Council of Ministers

Dear Colleagues

Let me begin by expressing my thanks and gratitude to Italy, for its continuing important contribution to UNESCO and the Italy for having organised this Committee session in such a rich cultural environment. I am pleased to have the opportunity to address all of you, on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO, at the inauguration of this twenty-first ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee.

Most of you may be aware of the fact that on 16 November 1997, the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage completed 25 years since its adoption by UNESCO (in 1972). This silver jubilee year has also witnessed the conduct of a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention, both carried out by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

The Director General and I have read with great interest the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention", including the 35 recommendations made by the Reviewers. We are pleased to note that the Reviewers found that the "Centre has a motivated group of professional and support staff" who "perform a multiplicity of tasks and a broad range of activities that are largely output oriented", and that the "diversity and number of initiatives undertaken is impressive relative to the size of the staff and budget". However, there are some aspects of the Centre's work, for example, information management, where there could be improvements.

The Director General has commented on each one of the 35 recommendations

contained in the Report, in the most constructive and positive manner as possible. However, the Director General found most of the recommendations to be of a general nature and sometimes it will be difficult to apply them. The establishment of mechanisms for a closer and decentralised monitoring of the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites, has not received the attention he wishes to see. Nevertheless, the Director General has asked me to convey to you his commitment to apply those recommendations which you consider as priorities, and whose implementation is feasible. I hope that you will have time to study them carefully this week.

Earlier this year, in June 1997, the External Auditors gave their view on the management of the World Heritage Fund:

"in my opinion, the transactions of the [World Heritage] Fund that have come to my notice during my audit of the financial statements have, in all significant respects, been in accordance with the Fund's and UNESCO's Financial Regulations and legislative authorities"

As a follow up measure, the Director General has requested the Director of the Centre to take steps to implement all the recommendations made by the External Auditor for improving the presentation of information, to the Bureau and the Committee, on the management of the Fund, and appointed a professional Administrator to the Centre. The Director and the Administrator will ensure the implementation of all measures suggested by the Auditors for streamlining budgetary and contractual procedures critical for the efficient disbursement of the Fund's resources.

The Silver Jubilee of the World Heritage Convention in 1997 also coincided with anniversaries being celebrated by some individual World Heritage sites themselves; for example, the 125th year anniversary of Yellowstone National Park of the USA, the world's first national park established in 1872. Yellowstone of USA, together with 21 other World Heritage sites, such as Virunga National Park of the Democratic Republic of Congo and cultural heritage sites like Angkor in Cambodia and the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in Peru, have been designated by the Committee as "World Heritage in Danger". Mitigation of threats to Yellowstone

needed the intervention of the US President himself who offered a US\$ 65 million trade-of-land offer to withdraw mining rights in an area of about 22,000 acres immediately outside of Yellowstone's borders. As you will realise during your discussions on the state of conservation of the other 21 World Heritage sites in Danger, conflicts between World Heritage conservation and economic development are intensifying; resolution of these conflicts more often than in the past demand interventions from the highest levels of the executive and legislative authorities in States Parties.

The Life Magazine, in an article celebrating Yellowstone's 125th year anniversary in its July, 1997, issue, noted that

"In 1,000 years national parks will be regarded as we now regard the Pyramids: as the most original and impressive works of those who made them"

This observation is testimony to UNESCO's foresight and vision in creating, 25 years before, a unique international Convention that simultaneously provided a legal framework for the preservation of both cultural as well as natural heritage of outstanding universal significance. However, as you enter the 26th year of the Convention, let me draw your attention to some questions frequently posed by those who genuinely care for the work of the Convention and wish to sustain its reputation as the most credible international legal instrument for the conservation of humankind's outstanding cultural and natural heritage:

- How can we improve the universality of the World Heritage List so that the List reflects a balanced representation of all regions and cultures in the world? As you know the List has been criticised within and outside of UNESCO for being heavily skewed in favour of the monumental heritage of European cultures and for not adequately reflecting the heritage of living cultures from other parts of the world. The Committee's introduction, in 1992, of the category of cultural landscape has begun to redress this imbalance to a certain extent but we need to allocate much more human and financial resources, for implementing the Global Strategy and enabling States Parties to identify and nominate new and innovative

categories of cultural heritage sites to the World Heritage List;

- How can we improve the balance in the representation of sites included in the List, and at the same time prevent a rapid rise in the total number of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List? The credibility of the Listing process is in part linked to the fact that only the most outstanding of the nominated sites are inscribed on the List and that the rate of growth in the total number of Listed sites is kept at modest levels;
- How can we ensure that monitoring the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and reporting to the Committee by the States Parties, and mobilising financial and human resources for the long-term conservation of World Heritage sites become as important as identification, nomination and inscription of new sites in the World Heritage List; and
- How can we best meet the rapidly growing demand for information, public education, documentation, promotion and fund-raising and other services which must be met adequately if the States Parties and UNESCO are to be effective in presenting and popularising World Heritage among the present generation and ensure its safe transmission to future generations?

I am pleased to inform the Committee that the 29th Session of UNESCO's General Conference adopted, for the biennium 1998-99, a Programme of Action for the Cultural Sector Sub-Programme III.1.2, entitled "Promotion of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage", that has been designed to address the four concerns mentioned above; i.e. to improve the universality of the World Heritage List; to reinforce national capacities for the protection of sites; to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage sites and to facilitate periodic reporting by the States Parties; and to inform and increase awareness of the work of the Convention among the public and specialised target groups such as youth. A special project on the "Participation of Youth in the preservation and the promotion of World Heritage" has also been approved and will be jointly executed by the Centre and the Education Sector.

Since I am aware of the complex, and often diplomatically sensitive nature of the work awaiting you for the next six days I do not intend to take any more of your

valuable time. Before I conclude, let me reiterate the fact that the Director General sees the World Heritage Convention as UNESCO's premier international legal instrument to promote co-operation between its Member States and for pursuing an on-going, inter-cultural dialogue that encourages a climate of tolerance and lays the foundations for a culture of peace.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, let me conclude by wishing you all the very best and a successful twenty-first session of the Committee.

Thank you.

SPEECH BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND
MINISTER OF CULTURAL PROPERTY AND ENVIRONMENT

It is with particular pleasure that I extend to the XXI Session of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO the greetings of the Italian Government.

Italy, indeed, takes a keen interest in the Committee's lofty mission to which the globalisation of communications, the expansion of tourism and the increasing internationalisation of information give fresh significance. In fact, in accomplishing its functions of protection and exploitation of Italy's cultural heritage, the Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Heritage, which I have the satisfaction to direct, just as the individual men and women who make up its administration, is fully aware of the fact that the task it is performing is to some extent of universal interest.

Even recently the press and media have dwelt on a series of events and initiatives which have been promoted in Italy for the improved functionality of art collections, museums and archaeological complexes of prime historical and cultural importance.

To cite only some examples in Rome, may I refer to the reopening of the Borghese Gallery, the new itinerary that crosses the *Roman Forum*, enriched by the new exhibition in the *Antiquarium* on the Palatine, the reorganisation of the National Gallery of Modern Art.

Nevertheless, no matter how rich individual collections and how important individual monuments and archaeological sites are, what is truly unique in Italy, what even the most endowed imaginary museum could neither contain or represent is our territory itself which features a continuity of points of such supreme artistic, historical, architectural, archaeological and environmental interest as to make it a single cultural park.

Coherently, the Italian Constitution sets out the obligation, in the interests of all citizens, to safeguard the noble values of the protection of the national cultural heritage.

It should, perhaps, be recalled that Italian legislation, among the oldest on the subject of the protection of the cultural heritage, has, since 1939, backed up a law on the protection of individual monuments and the movable heritage, with specific rules governing the safeguarding of the landscape and the environmental heritage.

The latter, initially conceived in relation to the sole aesthetic criteria of natural beauty, has evolved over time to comprise the protection of the context, that is, of the only apparently minor environment surrounding the large monumental sites, thereby ensuring the latter greater dignity, recognizability and accessibility.

Given these premises, the Ministry for Cultural Heritage has been made also

responsible for the protection of the historical and cultural values embodied in the Italian territory itself.

This institutional arrangement intends to stress how the Italian landscape and the discovery and enjoyment of it are a distinct cultural phenomenon: this concept lies at the very basis of the perception of landscape and of the extraordinary favour landscape painting has enjoyed in Italy, as well as the fashion of cultural tourism dating back to the epoch of the Grand Tour.

In short, the Italian territory is composed only in minimal part of areas of uncontaminated nature while the factor dominating it is the role and quality of the human actions which, by transforming the landscape, have made up its present configuration.

Faced with the actual situation of that widespread museum which our national territory in fact is, the Italian Government is today profoundly committed to enriching the panoply of instruments for its protection: an approach which is being taken in the context of a concept of the cultural heritage which aims also to ensure that it is intelligently enjoyed and actively protected.

These are two important components of the civil and social growth above all of the young generations.

Three years ago the Central Office for Environmental Heritage and Landscape was established within the Ministry for Cultural Heritage to ensure new levels of efficiency and transparency in environmental protection, in the first place by accelerating the time required for administrative actions in more direct conjunction with the competent local authorities. In that context, since 1996, a systematic activity of monitoring, collecting, and processing objective information data has been undertaken: this makes it possible to provide an adequate informative support to the Public Administration's strategic choices which also in this sector want to be as systematic and far-sighted as possible. One example may serve to illustrate the sense of the new direction and capacity to intervene thus acquired. The *Reggia* of Caserta which you will have a chance to visit shortly, a complex of prime importance which not by chance we hope will be inscribed in the World Heritage List, has for a long time been protected within its own perimeter.

Nevertheless, in the light of the new procedures of analysis and evaluation it has recently been decided to integrate the protected monumental area by applying an extensive environmental constraint on the adjacent area in order to limit more effectively the impact of the surrounding urban development.

We are, however, aware that a merely defensive approach on the part of the public administration is insufficient to satisfy the imperatives and needs of the function of protection which must effectively also take into account technological progress, the country's prospects for development, the challenges of professional qualification and of the access by the young generations to culture.

Therefore, taking a broad view of the objectives of the protection and enhancement of the heritage, the Italian Government is making a special effort to provide the sector with more substantial financial resources by introducing important legislative and administrative innovations.

Thus, for example, since last March a new midweek drawing of the National Lottery is being made, the proceeds of which will be dedicated to the cultural heritage: once running, it will almost double the ordinary budgetary allocations for restoration. These

additional resources will be used to finance specific projects which have already been singled out such as the recovery of the *Reggia Sabauda di Venaria Reale* in Turin, the restoration of the large complex *Albergo dei Poveri* in Naples, the enlargement of the *Galleria degli Uffizi* in Florence and of the *Pinacoteca di Brera* in Milan, to mention only a few.

It is however evident that public resources will never be completely commensurate with the immensity of the tasks of the protection of Italy's cultural heritage, particularly when faced with an increased demand by the public for knowledge and access.

Therefore, a policy of incentives for local authorities as well as for the private sector has been implemented.

To begin with, a new law concerning historical cities has provided more effective and simplified rules, as well as new tax incentives, for interventions for the improvement, recovery and utilisation of both public and privately owned monuments.

At the same time, the attention of business and financial circles has been drawn to the exigencies of a sustainable development of the important national resource represented by the cultural heritage.

The promising dialogue which has thus begun came to an important organisational moment with the recent constitution, on the initiative of the Ministry for Cultural and Environmental Heritage, of a joint-stock company called SIBEC, whose task is to raise funds for interventions on a suitable scale to support the *national* cultural heritage.

The new law on cultural property which, together with other measures, has confirmed the establishment of SIBEC has become better known at international level as the Law on Pompeii on account of the novelty of its provisions in favour of that well known archaeological site chosen, because of its emblematic value, as the object of a pilot project.

Since the Pompeii experience, after timely experimentation and verification, may well be extended in the future to apply to other archaeological sites and monumental complexes, it seems to me worth briefly dwelling on the new rules which have profoundly modified the centralised traditional approach in the relations between the central administration and the *Soprintendenze*: in particular the *Soprintendenza* of Pompeii has been attributed new, wider discretionary powers: it has been directly allocated the financial resources deriving from the sale of tickets and services provided to the public, it has been authorised to take a broader range of initiatives both as concerns the use of these resources as well as to the raising of others by means of private sponsorship of the restoration of portions (a single *domus* or entire *insulae*) of the entire complex and it has been accorded increased independence in defining the scientific and administrative orientation as concerns the management of the site.

Of course, even in the context of a broader and more flexible relationship with the private sector, it remains the indispensable task of the public authorities to define the programmatic framework for the individual interventions of restoration as well as to analyse the operative requirements and priorities, which cannot be satisfied by a simple campaign of sponsored adoptions of the individual *domus*.

Pompeii is the largest and most important city of antiquity which has survived over the centuries and it is possible to safeguard it only by tackling the problems on an integral urban scale.

For that purpose a Master Plan is being prepared and in this connection two

important initiatives have been taken in recent months for its completion.

First of all, in the framework of the AGESA project (*Ateliers de Gestion des Sites Archeologiques*) financed by the European Union, an international seminar was held in Naples and in Pompeii which focused on management problems and served in the preparation of the Master Plan for the ancient Vesuvian site.

Secondly, a research project has just been concluded with the objective of analysing itineraries as well as the composition and expectations of the large body of visitors (numbering about 2,000,000 each year) to the Pompeii area in order to gauge its impact and improve management of the influx.

The data and information gathered and processed by the *Centro Internazionale di Studi sull'Economia turistica di Venezia* (CISSET) will make it possible to minimise the risks of straining the heritage while at the same time to improve what can be offered to cultural tourism, relying on targeted and differentiated tariff policies capable of adjusting itineraries and proposals to the expectations of different types of users. I can affirm that even a serious emergency such as the earthquake which struck the regions of the Marches and Umbria in recent months has brought to light the profound sensitivity and the great commitment of the Italians, and of the public institutions of this country, vis-a-vis the cultural heritage.

Without detracting from the priority concern for safeguarding human lives and for the suffering of the people affected, the competent authorities immediately gave maximum attention to the problem of the damaged monuments, both in terms of immediate intervention as well as of the allocation of the considerable technical and financial resources necessary in the medium-term.

I would like to take this occasion to express once again Italy's heartfelt gratitude to all those - governments, associations, citizens - beginning with UNESCO who have, in this situation expressed their solidarity and made offers of help.

I also wish to assure you that the Italian Government is committed to complete the recovery of the damaged religious buildings and civic monuments by the Jubilee Year 2000.

In the context of the increased engagement in favour of the cultural heritage of which I have given some examples, Italy's action has been transferred to the International level with the intention of promoting, also in the context of relations between States and within multilateral organisations, a growing awareness of the value of culture and, in that sphere, of a correct management of monuments and the environment.

During the Italian Presidency of the European Union it was possible to begin consultations between the European Ministers competent in matters of the organisation of the territory to reach the elaboration of a *Schema di Sviluppo dello Spazio Europeo (SSSE)* in which the exploitation of the cultural heritage is considered to be a factor of development: thereby the premises were put to promote joint projects in this field soon.

Still in the sphere of the European Union we have considered it our duty since last year to make a special effort to re-launch the cultural sector as a whole, with particular reference to the prospect - which will be considered in Brussels next year - of obtaining the establishment of a Unitarian and better financed programme in favour of cultural actions which in large part concern the cultural heritage.

Furthermore, it is significant that the Council of Europe has chosen the city of Florence to host next spring the Ministerial Conference for the adoption of the European Convention on the Landcape. This will be an important venue in which not only public

institutions but also the most significant exponents of the civil society will be involved in order to provide a European response to a typical challenge of our times: to find a new, more appropriate equilibrium between the identity of a territory and modernisation, between permanence and transformation, between past and future.

In carrying out its policy of safeguarding the cultural heritage at the national level as well as of promoting its meaning and relevance in the competent international fora, the Italian Government has always been inspired by the lofty objectives identified by UNESCO and which make UNESCO the central point of reference for the development of culture in the world.

I feel allowed to state that the sincere commitment of Italy is deeply written in the history of this Organization.

Thus, it is not a mere coincidence that the 21st session of the World Heritage Committee is being held in Naples.

The choice of Naples represents for Italy substantial proof of its deep commitment to that system of cultural values of which the heritage is probably the most visible expression and of which UNESCO is the most authoritative depositary: UNESCO, which yesterday, as well as today, has always enjoyed the wholehearted support of Italy, a support which the pending challenges of the third millennium can only render still more qualified in the future.

SPEECH BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Distinguished delegates to the World Heritage Committee,
Observers,
Members of the UNESCO Secretariat,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Congratulations to the new 7 members elected at the 11th General Assembly: Finland, Greece, Hungary, Mexico, Korea, Thailand and Zimbabwe.

Before we begin the proceedings of this twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee, let me express my sincere thanks and my sense of appreciation for the opportunity I have been given to chair the work of the Committee.

This is a very special meeting for several reasons. First, because it marks a sort of "silver anniversary", the 25th of the World Heritage Convention. This is an age that in biological terms coincides with the peak of fresh youth; but in the life of institutions and international treaties seems more to indicate the time of maturity.

With maturity the time comes for wiser choices; and here comes another reason why this meeting is a special one. In the more than four years during which I have been associated with the work done under the World Heritage Convention, I have witnessed manifold forms of success and strength of the Convention. I need only to mention its capacity of raising consciousness for the importance of cultural and natural heritage as an element for reinforcing identity and civic pride; its effectiveness as a forum for developing fiducial spirit and cooperation among countries with different history; its function as a catalyst for sharing expertise and professional resources in order to bridge the gap between the developed and less developed world.

Besides these unquestionable merits, the work of the World Heritage Convention shows also that there are sources of strain and weakness that can be corrected. I will mention only a few:

- 1) The dual character of the Convention as an instrument aimed at protecting both natural and cultural heritage: the two souls of culture and nature should mutually reinforce each other. Yet a theme recurring with nagging frequency in our debates is how to balance natural and cultural patrimony. This debate, of course, is legitimate. But it should not become, permit me to say so, a sort of contest between naturalists and culturalists for who can score the higher number of sites. A balance in this field can be best understood, not in numerical terms but rather in terms of world-wide representation of sites

satisfying the absolute requirement of universal value and the relative criteria of integrity and authenticity.

At a legal level, a source of strain I have witnessed with a certain frequency is the relationship between State sovereignty and the general interest of humankind in the conservation and management of World Heritage sites. This relationship which should be one of mutual support, has sometimes turned into one of conflict. This issue of monitoring and reporting was one of such cases, until a compromise was reached in Berlin 1995 based on the respect of State consent and of the use of Article 29 of the Convention.

The single most important source of tension in the Convention resides, in my view, in the unsettled definition of the respective spheres of competence, on the one hand, of the World Heritage Convention, and of the World Heritage Centre, the Director-General and UNESCO Secretariat, on the other.

The problematic character of this relationship has become apparent in the repeated request by the World Heritage Committee of more effective information, transparency and harmonization between the activities of the Centre and World Heritage Committee's objectives and programmes. The discussions that have taken place on this subject since my first participation in the Committee in Cartagena, in 1993, show that the time has come for stemming the tide of distrust and for beginning a new era of institutional confidence building.

A final point I wish to touch upon is the need for further coordination of the World Heritage Convention with other international instruments in the field of protection of cultural property (Hague, Paris, UNIDROIT).

I note that this problem is now, at least indirectly beginning to find some place in our agenda with regard to illicit traffic of cultural objects removed from World Heritage sites.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I apologize if I have spoken more of problems than of achievement and successes. I am an academic not a diplomat; training drives me more to identify problems and strive for a solution. I hope I have not abused of my "academic freedom" in addressing such problems in a direct manner. It is up to us now to face them in earnest and in the spirit of cooperation that has always characterized this Committee.

Thank you.

Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee

**Distinguished delegates to the World Heritage Committee,
Distinguished Observers,
Ladies and Gentlemen.**

I would like to thank you all once again for the honor you conferred on me one year ago by electing me President of this Committee.

The reports of the last session of the Committee and those of the Bureau, along with the proceedings of the General Conference of UNESCO, and the reports of the advisory group constituted at Mérida and of the External Auditor of UNESCO, provide a detailed account of the work carried out during the present year; I would like however, to add a few comments on some of the most relevant aspects that have come to my attention in relation to the work of our Committee in the application of the World Heritage Convention.

It is not out of place to refer to certain problems that must be faced seriously and courageously, if the Convention is to continue to be absolutely valid to our needs.

I believe that the principles of the Convention are not only exceptionally valid at present, but that the role of culture broadens its domains into the political relationships that unavoidably involve those social and economic.

Globalization does not globalize everything, and we are all aware that internationalization phenomena have promoted an activation of national, local, ethnic and religious values.

Without the slightest moral judgment, I cannot avoid recalling some reflections made by the Mexican writer Rosario Castellanos as she was analyzing the so called "new

novel of the 60's". Many times during our work in the Committee her words came to my mind. She said that this literary trend succeeded in taking away from its main characters, their primacy in the World, their rights of the first born, their anthropocentric prerogatives; and that subtraction, she said, was not produced by a fancy, but by historical necessity, though thought had abandoned its fundamental essence.

Sites described as things on their own, is one of the risks we frequently face. Sites seem as "cosa mentale as painting was to Leonardo". The sites, our cultural and natural sites, became the object of the sites.

Nevertheless, a difference from literature or painting distinguishes the cultural and natural sites. These lose their author's signature and contemporary society integrates them into a national territory and transforms them into "habitat". Sites do not obediently accept to be taken into a museum or into a library. Sites live in and from the actual problems of specific societies although they may deserve an universal appreciation.

The concept of universality is enthroned at a time in which communities display an almost desperate need to get hold of their identities and singularities.

Obviously I do not intend to be boring you by making unnecessary philosophical considerations. I have done these references because in our concrete work this situation became apparent in each of the processes we followed: in the integration of the list; in the procedures to nominate the sites; in the theoretical, scientific and ideological approaches that guide the evaluations of national institutions and advisory bodies; in the specific forms acquired by the programs for cooperation and international assistance, and in promotion and commercialization projects.

I believe we all share the conception that inscription on the World Heritage list is a way of ensuring stronger protection for sites of the highest value for all mankind, and

on the basis of this principle our position is certainly understood when, for example, we supported the case of a natural site in Africa that entered the list in December, 1996, at Mérida, against the recommendations of one of the Advisory Bodies and some of the member States of the Committee. In this case, consideration was given not only to the under-representation of sites in that region of the World ---and also that of natural sites among those on the list -- but also, and above all, to our understanding of inscription on the list as a means of ensuring a better protection for a site whose value is widely recognized on account of its natural importance and which, moreover, has significant regional cultural implications.

We must not lose sight of the principle of "exceptional universal value", enshrined in the Convention of 1972. However, I find it difficult to understand how we can maintain the credibility of an international instrument, widely regarded as one of the most successful, when we find, for two years running, only one or two new inscriptions of sites in Africa, two or three in Arab countries, three or four in Latin America, and five or six in Asia, against twenty-five new inscriptions in Europe.

Between 1978 and 1996, European and North American sites on the list accounted for fifty per cent of the total, but for 1996 and 1997, new inscriptions for these regions came to represent 68 and 64% respectively. In these last two years, the percentage of cultural sites inscribed has also risen in comparison to that of mixed and natural sites, reaching 81 (86% of the total inscribed) whereas the average for the period 1978 to 1996 was 74%.

I am also concerned at the observations published in last September's UNESCO Mail by specialists at the World Heritage Center, which revealed the very different levels and percentages of rejections in the case of applications from different regions.

The tendencies, that ---in the words of this publication--- show a "preponderance of the North...that from 1992 onwards not only maintained its position but strengthened

it while the other regions weakened...", seem to reflect the same imbalance that we have noticed in the international socio-economic sphere, that seems to be influencing the approach to the listing and conservation of our natural and cultural heritage in an alarming way.

Immediately, we are faced with at least two questions. On one hand, are we correctly applying the criteria for entry? Or conversely, are the criteria that we are applying adequate? Another question that arises concerns the use that is being made of the World Heritage Fund, as considered under its various budget headings, and particularly that of Preparatory Assistance, which would be the most suitable and immediate way of financing the preparation of the application file for the inscription of a particular site.

The report of the previous President of the Committee provides further grounds for this questioning; we were told last December that fifteen requests for funds had been authorized during 1996. During the current year, the Presidency of the Committee authorized fifty requests for funds, which represents a notable increase. Nevertheless, the funds set aside for a number of different activities, and specially those for preparatory assistance, though available, are not being taken up.

I believe the basic problem ---which manifests itself in the scarcity both of requests for inscription on the list and requests for funds--- is to be found in the shortcomings and lack of consistency in the structure of the organizations concerned with World heritage protection; this seems to be, above all, a consequence of problems regarding education and training of specialized personnel.

For this reason, México, along with other countries, has put the emphasis on education, as a basis for moving towards both better protection of the heritage in general and a more thoroughgoing application of the 1972 Convention.

Now as it happens, the only budget line that was completely taken up (fund were exhausted by September this year) was that for education and training. I regard this as significant and stimulating since it appears to suggest that the participants in the Convention have noticed where the basic priority lies.

Over the past ---not just twenty five--- but thirty years, and with the cooperation of UNESCO throughout that period, México has maintained a constant and evolving effort in the field of education and training. This interest was recently emphasized in a concrete proposal at the last General Assembly of UNESCO to strengthen and extend this work in the field of regional and international cooperation.

With regard to the 1972 Convention, we also presented a proposal to the Committee this year to organize an International Seminar on the application of the Convention, to be held in 1998 with the purpose of underpinning and providing guidance for the Committee's various activities, through fomenting a greater understanding of the principles of the Convention on behalf of our natural and cultural heritage.

Besides the permanent monitoring activity ---not only of the registered sites, but also of the operation of the Convention ---, as we complete our twenty-fifth year of existence, it is logical to proceed to a broader evaluation of its application and results. For this reason, the Committee opted for an examination and evaluation of the means and instruments available to give a new impulse to this valuable Convention over the following years. We are well aware that the protection of our human heritage is a never-ending task and I hope to have contributed, if only in a modest way, to this important effort in which all of us have taken part.

Another matter pending for the near future ---the coming year in fact--- is the subject of global strategy, which must involve the "balanced participation" of the different regions, as requested by the Committee, and the ever more important work of monitoring the state of conservation of inscribed Sites in order not to forget that the

reason for our Convention's existence is "...the protection...of the World heritage...", and that the Lists and the Fund are the means to achieve this aim of protection.

I make these observations precisely with the intention of improving and strengthening these means. It was with the same purpose in mind that the Committee performed one of its principal initiatives this year: the audit of the Fund and the management review of the World Heritage Center, to which I have already referred. This work aims to increase the efficiency of the means established by the Convention for achieving the best possible protection of our common cultural and natural heritage.

Now we have the results of those audits and it will be the Committee the one to assess its contents and also the one to define its pertinence to strengthen the application of the Convention. We recognize the support given by the authorities and staff of UNESCO, the auditors, and all of those who participated.

We consider that the financial audit and the management review, give some light on several of the aspects that worried the Committee for several years: transparency of budgetary and financial statements; information about the projects supported by the World Heritage Center; personnel involved and its relationship with other units of UNESCO; among others.

In spite of the advances obtained, I cannot avoid to inform you that we found unjustified that the review of the management review was presented so late to the chair of the Committee and, as a result, to the Bureau (the first version was received on the 27th of November here in Naples and the last version on the 29th).

The effort must continue so that confidence and transparency are broadened and self-criticism is not left out of our considerations if we wish a Committee eminently efficient in serving the Convention.

I encourage all members of the Committee and participating observers to examine these documents. We think that this is a first, important and fruitful stop in an effort to clarify the role of the Center and its operation, for the benefit of the Convention, in full respect of the sovereignty of the States.

I wish to thank the Director General of UNESCO, Dr. Federico Mayor, for all the support received in the carrying out of this responsibility, and also to the Director of the World Heritage Center; Dr. Bernd von Droste, the Deputy Director; Georges Zouain, and the excellent working team at the Center, the secretarial staff, the translators and interpreters for their important contribution to our work, and to Lourdes Arizpe and Mounir Bouchenaki from the Culture Sector of UNESCO.

It would be unforgivable for me not to mention the invaluable assistance forthcoming at all times from the Consultative Body created during the Mérida meeting in December 1996, and the effort of all the member of the group to fulfill the Committee's mandate, carrying out the follow-up of the process of auditing the World Heritage Fund and reviewing the management of the Center. I express my personal debt to Christina Cameron and Sharon Sullivan, and gratitude to the Mexican Delegation, specially to Salvador Diaz Berrio and to Jorge Carlos Diez Cuervo.

Allow me to say, in this universal and magnificent city of Naples, that I am very grateful to you all for this opportunity to serve the Convention and to renew my own approach to World Heritage.

Finally, I want to wish the President, Professor Francesco Francioni, the best outcome in his new task and I would like to present to him a CD ROM containing all the documents signed by me as former president. I do think it is important to build the memory of the Presidency of this noble Committee and to strengthen its role.

Thank you for your attention.

ANNEX III

Speech by the Chairperson of the twentieth session of the Committee on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee concerning the overall financial and administrative management of the World Heritage Convention

Before presenting the report on the outcome of the mandate given by the Committee to the Consultative Body established in Mérida, I would like to express Mexico's excitement and motivation to further devote time and effort in favor of the World Heritage Committee in view of the solid results and seriousness of the work done.

At its twentieth session in Mérida, Yucatan, México, the World Heritage Committee thought it would be appropriate to review the functioning of the World Heritage Secretariat in light of the 25th anniversary of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, with the specific purpose of contributing to the improvement of the efficiency in its implementation.

The Committee created a Consultative Body in conformity with Article 10.3 of the World Heritage Convention, composed of Committee members from Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta and México ---other State Parties also participated at one or more of the meetings that were held by the Consultative Body during the past year---. Its mandate was to take action on the proposal adopted to undertake a review of the way in which the Secretariat has assisted the Committee in implementing the Convention.

The Committee directed that the work be undertaken in two phases: first, a financial audit of the World Heritage Fund's financial statements for the year ended

December 31st, 1996, and; second, a review of management practices in the World Heritage Secretariat.

In the case of the financial audit, the Committee directed the president of the Consultative Body to seek the support of the Director-General of UNESCO to have UNESCO's External Auditor to conduct the audit. It further requested that the final report be presented by the External Auditor to the Director-General, and to the World Heritage's bureau meeting at its twenty first session (June 1997) together with the comments to the Director General.

Regarding the management review, the Committee directed the President of the Consultative to approach the Director General of UNESCO so that an international call for bids could be prepared by UNESCO for an international firm of management consultants to conduct the review of management practices in the Secretariat.

In consideration of the implications of the management review to be undertaken, it was thought appropriate by the president of the Committee, in full agreement with the Consultative Body, to follow the procedure recommended for the financial audit. Therefore, the External Auditor of UNESCO was requested to undertake the management review.

The costs of both reviews were to be borne by the World Heritage Fund.

The Consultative Body met five times during the year: being the first one in Mérida during the twentieth session of the Committee; the second one in Paris (1st and 2nd of April, 1997); the third one on the 20th of June, 1997, during the Bureau meeting in

Paris; the fourth one on the 30th and 31st of October, 1997, also in Paris, and; the fifth one last Saturday evening here in this historically rich Palazzo Reale. In particular, the Committee will be interested to note that a workshop with most of the staff of the Secretariat was most productive in improving communication and highlighting concerns.

Document WHC-97/CONF.208/5 presents the relevant information related to both, the financial and the management reviews.

In relation to the financial audit results presented, it is important to note that, besides the auditor's report and the Director General's comments to it, a series of recommendations were presented by the Consultative Body to the Bureau this past June, and the Bureau decided to present such recommendations to the Committee at its 21st session here, in Naples.

The results concerning the management review consist of the External Auditor's report and the Director General's comments to it. As I stated yesterday, inexplicably these documents were not available for the Consultative Body to carefully analyze it and formulate recommendations to the Bureau.

Nevertheless, at its last Saturday evening meeting, the Consultative Body members expressed praise for the quality of the management report, insofar as they had an opportunity to review it, but concern that the Auditors may have gone beyond the mandate given to look at the Center and not at the Committee. While I understand this concern, it is also clear that the way the Committee works, ---the demands that it puts on the Secretariat---, has a direct impact on the Secretariat itself. The document presented by the External Auditor of UNESCO is a rich and complex review of the

current state of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Interestingly, it causes us to reflect on the Strategic Plan of 1992 and the urgent need to refocus our effort.

(Today, I propose that we benefit from the presence of the External Auditors of UNESCO to ask for points of clarification on both, the financial audit and the management review).

The next logical step seems to me to be a thorough examination of the recommendations contained in the management review. This will take several days ---I believe--- so I do not propose to do this during our meeting. Rather, I believe that the Committee may wish to create a sub-group ---or extend the mandate of the existing Consultative Body--- to discuss this report in detail and bring concrete recommendations to the Bureau in June 1998. If this proposal is accepted, I am sure that the distinguished Italian President of the Committee, Professor Francesco Francconi, will certainly play a key role in leading and encouraging a solid and objective process of analysis, in the same way he has conducted this Committee meeting.

Other issues were also discussed by the Consultative Body during its meetings. One of them was the need for clear and established rules for fund-raising in favor of the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat presented in June, during the Bureau meeting in Paris, the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favor of UNESCO". After reviewing this guidelines, the Consultative Body has deemed appropriate to recommend the Committee to fully adopt this document as the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favor of the World Heritage Fund" and ask the Secretariat of the Committee to fully comply with this operational framework.

Use of the World Heritage logo and quality control issues were also discussed by the Consultative Body. A specific proposal for improving the way in which the Secretariat has been approaching this issues has just been received. Careful analysis is considered appropriate before taking any action. If the Committee wishes to extend the mandate given to the Consultative Body ---or to any other form of working group---, this proposal could be further discussed so that specific recommendations could be presented to the next Bureau meeting in June 1998.

I wish to close my report with an expression of gratitude for the time and effort invested by the Director and Staff at the Secretariat, the Advisory Body members, and by the External Auditor of UNESCO, as well as to all of the member States who shared ideas, concerns and creative proposals.

But in particular, a recognition should be made to the always intelligent and decided support received from the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Federico Mayor, to an unprecedented, original and, above all, sovereign initiative, in full respect and recognition of the Convention and its State Members.

Thank you for your attention.

ANNEX IV.1

Intervention by the Observer Delegation of Pakistan under Agenda Item 8 on Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802)

Mr. Chairman!

I am taking the floor again concerning the Central Karakorum National Park to I reiterate my earlier request that the nomination of this park of Pakistan as a World Heritage site may now be considered by the Committee under this agenda item.

My Delegation would like to stress that this nomination should be decided on the basis of merit and objective criteria, rather than on the basis of political considerations. I would, therefore, request the Committee that an IUCN evaluation mission may be immediately send to Pakistan so that it could report back to the next session of the Bureau. Let me also inform the distinguished members of the Committee that the Central Karakorum National Park and its total area is under the complete controll of Pakistan and not withstanding any so-called legal claim (which are not even tenable in law), the whole area of the park is within the boundaries and administrative jurisdiction of the Government of Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to put on record my Delegations deep concern at the trend that the nomination of a site can be challenged by others on political grounds and then can be put on hold indefinitely by the Bureau and the Committee without even objective evaluation of the site by technical experts. The examination of the nomination of Central Karakorum National Park was deferred by the Bureau at its last meeting and it was expected that the issue would have been taken up automatically by the Bureau at its next meeting that was held in Naples on 28 and 29 November 1997.

However, unfortunately, this was not the case. We only hope that such a trend will be strongly discouraged by members of this Committee, otherwise there is a great danger that any country, by challenging the nominations of others can make the work of this Committee a hostage to its whims, political considerations and wested interests.

Before concluding, let me once again urge members of the Committee to send an IUCN team to Pakistan as soon as possible for an objective evaluation of the site.

Thank you.

ANNEX IV.2

Statement by the Observer of India under Agenda Item 8 on Central Karakorum National Park (No. 802)

India does not object to the preservation of the Karakorums. India, in fact, welcomes the idea of preservation of our common heritage, whether it is Moenjodaro, Harappa, Taxila, the Sikh and Hindu shrines, the mosques, mausoleums, forts and gardens, or the natural sites in Pakistan. India's objection is to the Karakorum site being sponsored as a Pakistani site, when legally it belongs to India; the State of Jammu and Kashmir, of which the Karakorum site is a part, having acceded to the Union of India in 1947.

Given goodwill and understanding, a solution to this problem could be found, as a solution acceptable to Palestine and Israel was found for inscribing Jerusalem on the World Heritage List. But that takes time. Solutions to such complex problems are not found on the spot in open meetings. Therefore, let the matter be dropped at this stage.

**Text of the resolution on periodic reporting adopted by the 29th
General Conference**

The General Conference,

1. Noting that the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage has recognized that the cultural and natural heritage 'are increasingly threatened with destruction, not only by traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction';
2. Considering the twenty-five years of experience in the implementation of the Convention;
3. Reaffirms that 'deterioration or disappearance of any item of the cultural or natural heritage constitutes a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all the nations of the world';
4. While reaffirming the sovereign right of the State Party concerned over the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, considers that a well-reflected and formulated common policy for the protection of cultural and natural heritage is likely to create a continuing interaction between States Parties;
5. Emphasizes the interest of each State Party to be informed of the experience of others with regard to conservation methods and the possibilities so offered, through voluntary international co-operation, for the general improvement of all actions undertaken;
6. Reaffirms the standard setting role of the General Assembly as well as of the World Heritage Committee;
7. Concludes that monitoring is the responsibility of the State Party concerned and that the commitment to provide periodic reports on the state of the site is consistent with the principles set out in the Convention in

- (i) the first, second, sixth, seventh and eighth
preambular clauses,
- (ii) Art. 4
- (iii) Art. 6.1. and 6.2.
- (iv) Art. 7
- (v) Art. 10
- (vi) Art. 11
- (vii) Art. 13
- (viii) Art. 15
- (ix) Art. 21.3
- (x) Art. 29;

8. Emphasizes that monitoring by the State Party is part of the site management which remains the responsibility of the States Parties where the site is located, and that periodic reports may be submitted in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention;
9. Recalls that Article 4 of the Convention provides that 'Each State Party...recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage...situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State';
10. Recalls that Article 6 lays down the concept of world heritage 'for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate', and that Article 7 requires the establishment of a 'system of international co-operation' and assistance 'designed to support States Parties' efforts to identify and conserve that heritage;
11. Emphasizes that periodic reporting should be part of a consultative process and not treated as a sanction or a coercive mechanism;
12. Notes that within the broad responsibility of the World Heritage Committee in standards setting, the form, nature and extent of the periodic reporting must respect the principles of State sovereignty and that the involvement of the Committee, through its Secretariat and/or advisory bodies, in the preparation of the periodic reports would be with the agreement of the State Party concerned;
13. Further notes that the States Parties may request expert advice from the Secretariat and/or the advisory bodies and that the Secretariat may also commission expert advice with the agreement of the States Parties;
14. Invites the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to submit in accordance with Article 29 of

the Convention, through the World Heritage Committee, via its secretariat the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, reports on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories;

15. Requests the World Heritage Committee to define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports while respecting the principle of State sovereignty;
16. Requests the World Heritage Committee to include in its reports to the General Conference, presented in accordance with Article 29.3 of the Convention, its findings as regard to the application of the Convention by the States Parties;
17. Encourages States Parties to take advantage of shared information and experience on World Heritage matters and to contribute to the conservation of World Heritage properties, including through voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund;
18. Invites other States to become States Parties to the Convention.

STATEMENT BY THE OBSERVER OF GERMANY

Germany welcomes the inscription of the Medieval Town of Torun and of the Castle of the Teutonic Order in Malbork (Marienburg) on the World Heritage List and wholeheartedly supports that decision. Both sites represent a special significance in the history of German-Polish relations. The preservation of these medieval sites will enable future generations to understand the past, to learn from it and to bear it in mind. Situated at the cross-roads of both nations and the settlements of Germans and Poles, their well-preserved appearance symbolises the benefits of co-operation in the past, present and future. At the same time, they show how effective a peaceful living together can be. As a medieval trading city, Torun - birthplace of the famous astrologist Nicolaus Kopernicus - could prosper from trade. The Malbork Castle has been both the seat of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order and later of the Polish kings. In the course of its conservation, Poland had involved experts from Germany as well as from other countries in the same region. At the occasion of the inscription of these two Polish World Heritage sites, we commend the Polish authorities for their outstanding conservation efforts. Furthermore, we thank the Polish authorities for their cooperative approach and express our gratitude for their valuable contribution to the benefit of World Heritage.

The inscription of these two sites in the UNESCO World Heritage list may be regarded as concrete evidence of the increasing spirit of cooperation and friendship between our two nations.

STATEMENT BY THE OBSERVER OF POLAND

La Pologne remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial de l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de la Vieille Ville de Torun et du Château des chevaliers teutoniques à Malbork.

Nous adressons tout particulièrement nos remerciements à l'ICOMOS pour le travail efficace de ses experts : M. Jonas Glemza de la Lithuanie, M. Ernst Badstübner de l'Allemagne, et surtout à notre éminent ami, Henry Cleere, pour son excellente présentation.

Merci pour le soutien de la candidature de Malbork apporté par le Délégué de l'Italie.

Nous présentons également nos remerciements à S. Exc. l'Ambassadeur Horst Winkelmann, Chef de la délégation allemande, pour sa déclaration. Le château de Malbork, ce chef-d'oeuvre des maîtres germaniques qui fut au cours de son histoire le siège des grands maîtres de l'Ordre, des rois de Pologne et des empereurs de Prusse, constitue la preuve matérielle de l'histoire commune de nos nations et en même temps, notre bien commun. Il nous montre que l'art n'est pas la propriété exclusive d'un Etat ou d'une nation mais qu'il constitue une valeur universelle; que le même monument historique peut appartenir à l'histoire de la culture de deux ou même plusieurs nations, en les rapprochant et les unissant au lieu d'engendrer des querelles. Nous accordons une valeur symbolique au Château de Malbork en tant que patrimoine culturel dans l'Europe qui s'unifie et dans laquelle une collaboration amicale entre nos nations est la condition sine qua non.

Je trouve symbolique le fait que Carcassonne et Malbork (qu'on appelle souvent la Carcassonne du Nord) où les conservateurs français et allemands les plus célèbres ont oeuvré au XIXe siècle, aient été inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial le même jour.

Ce fait nous montre qu'en cette fin de siècle, nous abandonnons, heureusement, notre fondamentalisme ouest-européen, basé sur le culte des reliques des saints du Christianisme occidental, qui nous a amenés à la définition de la notion d'"authenticité", limitée exclusivement à la substance matérielle; une idée que nous avons voulu octroyer aux autres régions culturelles du monde.

On peut espérer que nous tirerons la leçon de la discussion internationale et que nous nous rapprocherons d'un consensus intercontinental concernant la nature de

l'authenticité dans l'esprit du document final de la Conférence de Nara.

Je félicite les membres du Comité et les autorités de l'ICOMOS qui ont pris cette direction dans l'évaluation des biens du patrimoine culturel mondial.

ANNEX VII

Statement of Italy concerning the co-operation between the Italian Government, ROSTE, the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM

Italy supports the international action for the conservation of the Cultural Heritage thanks to its important financial commitment constituted by its contribution to the World Heritage Fund, to ICCROM and UNESCO.

Since 1997, the Agreement co-signed by the Italian Government and UNESCO for the strengthening of ROSTE (the Regional Office for Science and Technology for Europe, with its seat in Venice), allows to the ROSTE Office the assignment to actions in favour of the protection of cultural property, which demand a scientific and technological high-level approach, of a portion of Italy's annual contribution of L.2,500,000.000 (two and a half billion Liras, equivalent to approximately 1.3 US million dollars).

Consequently, the seeking of a joint effort in this field between the various institutions seems very appropriate.

The Italian Government, through the ROSTE Office, is supporting the afore-mentioned co-operation and requests the World Heritage Centre to find the most appropriate legal way in order to put into effect this co-operation between the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ROSTE.

The Italian Government is engaged in establishing the necessary contacts with the Parties concerned, in order to define this agreement, requesting the Centre to file a report - during the next session of the Committee - regarding the results of this work.

ANNEX VIII

Recommendation concerning illicit traffic affecting World Heritage sites

Noting the alarming increase in illicit traffic of cultural property throughout the world and its impact on many World Heritage sites;

Conscious of the often increased vulnerability of sites to this type of crime after inscription on the World Heritage List because of increased publicity, access, popularity and marketability of objects associated with the culture concerned,

Urges States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to

- (i) protect movable and removable material at World Heritage sites by:
 - (a) strengthening the existing legislation if necessary or adopting specific legislation;
 - (b) strengthening supervision of the sites concerned;
 - (c) adopting an active policy for the sensitization of nationals using all available means including media publicity and activities directed at dealers;
- (ii) avail themselves of the assistance of UNESCO for the reinforcement of their legislation, networking with appropriate organizations and publicity for losses;

Invites ICOMOS and IUCN, where appropriate in consultation with other specialized bodies, to include in its evaluation of a site nominated for the World Heritage List an indication of the vulnerability of the site to illicit traffic and the measures for its protection;

Invites all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention

- (i) where they are not yet party, to become party to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague Convention) 1954 and its Protocol as well as to the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970;
- (ii) to consider becoming party to the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects 1995;

Calls attention of States Parties to the need for constant vigilance of the market in cultural property and encourages them to use existing means to prevent illegally trafficked goods from World Heritage sites from being traded on their territory contrary to the duty of mutual assistance according to Article 6 of the World Heritage Convention.
and

Decides to include in the Operational Guidelines at the next revision, a paragraph calling attention to the need to protect sites against illicit traffic by administrative and security measures as well as available legal means, national and international.

Distribution limited

**ANNEX IX
WHC-97/CONF.208/16
Naples, 6 December 1997
Original: English/French**

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Twenty-first session
Naples, Italy**

1-6 December 1997

Item 14 of the Provisional Agenda: Provisional Agenda of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO Headquarters, June 1998)

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Report on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twentieth session of the Committee
4. Methodology and procedures for periodic reporting
5. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:
 - 5.1. Reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 5.2. Reports on state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List
6. Report on the work of the Consultative Body of the Committee

- 6.1. Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention, November 1997
- 6.2. Analysis of the application of cultural criteria i and vi, the test of authenticity and the imbalance of the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy
- 6.3. Communication and Promotion, including an examination of the potential of a cost-recovery policy for World Heritage information products
- 6.4. Use of the World Heritage emblem, content validation and quality guidelines and the UNESCO Fund-raising Guidelines
7. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger
8. Requests for international assistance
9. Date, place and provisional agenda of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau (November/December 1998)
10. Date, place and provisional agenda of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee (December 1998)
11. Other business
12. Closure of the session

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
1. TRAINING						
Cameroon	A.1.1.1	Sub-regional workshop on strengthening biodiversity conservation at the at the Dja Faunal Reserve	29 900	29 900		The Bureau requested the State Party to co-operate with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to: (i) revise the workshop programme to include themes and issues identified in the state of conservation report on Dja; (ii) indicate the amount of national contribution provided by the State Party; (iii) schedule the workshop at a time to allow for better planning; and (iv) invite the participation of bi-lateral donors who are financing commercial and sustainable forestry projects in the forests surrounding the site.
Philippines	A.1.1.2	Training of a Core-group of personnel on Human and Scientific Dimensions of Managing Tubataha Reef as a natural World Heritage site	30 000	30 000		

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
Russian Federation	A.1.1.3	Training workshop for natural heritage site managers from Central & Eastern Europe and Russian Central Asia	30 000	Decision deferred		The Bureau decided to defer consideration of this request as the workshop had been delayed until the summer of 1999. The Bureau requested the State Party to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre to submit a revised proposal for consideration at the Bureau's 22nd ordinary session.
Tanzania	A.1.1.4	Support for 3 fellowships for African Specialists in Protected Area/Wildlife Management to the Mweka College of African Wildlife Management for the Academic Year of 1998-99.	30 000	30 000		The Bureau urged IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to co-operate with Mweka and other regional training centres to review their curricula and propose measures for enhancing use of information for World Heritage site management.
India	A.2.1.1	Meeting of Regional Training Centres and Selected Academic/ Training Institutions for Curricula and Training Materials Development, Wildlife Institute of India	41 000		30 000	The Bureau requested the State Party to consider bearing the costs of the participation of Indian natural World Heritage site managers and specialists.
SUB-TOTAL: TRAINING			160 900	89 900	30 000	

NATURAL HERITAGE

Decisions of the 21st Extra-ordinary session of the Bureau

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
2. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION						
Commonwealth of Dominica	A.2.2.1	Revision of the Management Plan for Morne Trois Pitons National Park	13 900			For approval by the Chairperson, subject to the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List by the Committee at its twenty-first session, and payment of dues by the State Party to the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau encouraged the State Party to use national expertise for revising the management plan.
Niger	A.2.2.2	Purchase of equipment for W National Park	75 000		50 000	The Bureau recommended that the Committee approve a sum of US\$ 50,000 and request the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO's equipment unit and the State Party to purchase the needed equipment through competitive bidding and in the most cost effective manner. The Bureau suggested that the Committee decide that the funds should not be used for maintenance of vehicles and request the State Party to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre for submitting a progress report on project implementation, to enable the Bureau, at its 22nd ordinary session, to determine whether additional funds are needed.
India	A.2.2.3	Strengthening Protection of the Kaziranga National Park	50 000		50 000	The Bureau took note of its recommendation made at its 21st ordinary session, to the Committee that the Committee approve this request.
SUB-TOTAL: TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION			138 900	0	100 000	

NATURAL HERITAGE

Decisions of the 21st Extra-ordinary session of the Bureau

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
3. EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE						
India	A.2.3.1	Contribution towards the Implementation of an Emergency Rehabilitation Plan for Manas Wildlife Sanctuary	160 000		90 000	The Bureau recommended that the Committee approves a supplementary allocation of US\$ 90,000 for emergency assistance to cover: purchase of an additional 2 wooden fiber boats (US\$ 50,000) and 400 patrolling gear (US\$ 15,000) , and contribution towards construction of buildings within the site (US\$ 70,000).
Democratic Republic of Congo	A.2.3.2	Purchase of Vehicles for 4 World Heritage Sites	88 400		45 000	The Bureau, while fully recognising the need for vehicles for each of the four sites, expressed concerns over the current security situation in the eastern parts of the country and its impact on safe delivery, proper use and maintenance of the vehicles. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee, as a first step, approves a sum of US\$ 45,000 for 2 vehicles (of the US\$ 90,000 requested for 4 vehicles) for any two of the four sites under consideration and request the State Party to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre to submit a progress report on project implementation to the Bureau's 22nd session. In addition, the Bureau suggested that the Committee request the World Heritage Centre to co-operate with conservation NGOs to ensure the safe delivery and proper use and maintenance of the vehicles.
SUB-TOTAL: EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE			248 400	0	135 000	

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
1. TRAINING						
Laos	B.1.1.1	Training programme for the Historic Town of Luang Prabang	25000	25000		
Philippines	B.1.1.2	Training to enhance the management of the Baroque Churches	22000	22000		
Russian Federation	B.1.1.3	Training workshop for staff and specialists in the fields of inventory, protection; management and rehabilitation of cultural WH sites in Central, Eastern Europe & Central Asia	29800	Not approved		Detailed information on the use of funds had not been provided by the State Party. The Bureau decided that it will not consider any International Assistance requests submitted by States Parties without a detailed budget breakdown in the future.
Austria	B.2.1.1	Training course for the Examination and Conservation of Architectural Surfaces	35000			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
Brazil	B.2.1.2	Inter-regional Postgraduate Course in the Conservation of Monuments and the rehabilitation of Historic Cities	50000			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
Ghana	B.2.1.3	Ashanti Traditional Buildings	47000			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
ICCROM	B.2.1.4	Development of a training strategy and elaboration of procedural framework	50000			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
SUB-TOTAL: TRAINING			258800	47000	0	

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Decisions of the 21st Extra-ordinary session of the Bureau

Requesting State Party or Advisory Body	Paragraph No. as presented in 21st Extra-ordinary Bureau Documents	Description	Amount (US\$) requested	Amount (US\$) approved by Bureau	Amount (US\$) recommended by Bureau for approval by Committee	Conditions / Comments
2. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION						
China	B.1.2.1	Research project for the protection of the Terracotta Warriors and Horse Pits of the Mausoleum of the First Qin Emperor	30000	Decision deferred.		Chinese Authorities will provide further information concerning this request. Therefore, the Bureau decided to consider this request at its twenty-second session.
Nepal	B.1.2.2	Studies on traditional architecture, construction and conservation techniques, documenting Bhaktapur Monument Zone buildings	28000	28000 Conditional		The Bureau approved this request on the condition that the State Party pays its contributions to the World Heritage Fund for 1997. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the State Party to submit the results of this activity to the Bureau and stressed the importance of documentation for protecting World Heritage sites.
ICCROM	B.1.2.3	Technical Assistance Programme - TAP	25000	25000		
Vietnam	B.2.2.1	Revision of urban planning regulations of the Complex of Hué	35000			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
Zimbabwe	B.2.2.2	Preparation of a conservation plan for Khami Ruins National Monuments	76900			Transmitted directly to the Committee.
Mexico	B.2.2.3	Special course on the World Heritage Convention for Latin America and the Caribbean	30000		30000	The Bureau took note of its recommendation made at its 21st ordinary session to the Committee.
SUB-TOTAL: TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION			224900	53000	30000	