

Limited Distribution

SC/84/CONF.004/9
Buenos Aires, 2 November 1984
Original: English and FrenchUNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONCONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee

Eighth Ordinary Session
Buenos Aires, Argentina, 29 October-2 November 1984

REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The eighth session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the Centro Cultural General San Martín, Buenos Aires, Argentina, from 29 October - 2 November at the invitation of the Argentine authorities. It was attended by the following States Members of the World Heritage Committee: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cyprus, France, Germany (Fed. Rep. of), Guinea, Italy, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Switzerland and Turkey.

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

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

CLT-85/WS/11

*[2]

II. OPENING OF THE SESSION

4. A formal inauguration of the session took place in the main hall of the Centro Cultural General San Martín. The Lord Mayor of the city of Buenos Aires, Mr. S.C. Saguier, welcomed all participants and indicated how important the work of the Convention was in protecting cultural and natural properties, and stressed Argentina's full commitment to support its objectives.

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

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

*[8]

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

24. Mr. Batisse recalled that the spirit of the World Heritage Convention was to place both the cultural and natural heritage on an equal footing. Accordingly, there should not be a polarisation towards either "culture" or "nature" although there had perhaps been such a tendency in the past as States Parties had initially nominated the properties which clearly met either the cultural or natural criteria. In this respect, the representative of ICOMOS emphasised the influence of the natural environment on the cultures which have built the monuments of World Heritage quality. In his opinion, however, the role of the Convention was not to "fix" such landscapes but rather to conserve their harmony and stability within a dynamic, evolutive framework. IUCN recalled that one of the eight types of "protected area" recognised by their organisation was the "protected landscape" which included, for example, the national parks of the United Kingdom which consist essentially of man-modified and man-maintained landscapes. He warned, however, that care should be taken in the identification of such landscapes to ensure the nomination of only those properties of outstanding universal value. IUCN was to discuss the topic of "mixed" World Heritage properties at the IUCN General Assembly to be held in Madrid on 2-14 November 1984. Accordingly, the Committee requested IUCN to consult with ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) to elaborate guidelines for the identification and nomination of mixed cultural/natural rural properties or landscapes to be presented to the Bureau and the Committee at their forthcoming sessions.

IX. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

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

*[9]

A. Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

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

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

Lebanon 294 Baalbek C (i) (iv)

The Committee, when inscribing this property, expressed the wish that the protected area include the entire town within the Arab walls as well as the south-western quarter extra- muros between Bastan-al-Khan, the Roman works and the Mameluk mosque of Ras-al-Ain. During the discussion, the representative of Lebanon assured the Committee that the authorities of this country would follow these recommendations.

Lebanon 295 Byblos C (iii) (iv) (vi)

The Committee wished that this site be included in a wide area of protection, encompassing besides the ancient habitat, the medieval city within the walls and the area of the necropoles.

*[12]

Lebanon 299 Tyre C (iii) (vi)

The Committee decided to inscribe this site such as it was defined in the plan submitted by the Lebanese authorities. The Committee furthermore requested the Lebanese authorities to give details on the type of protection given within and around the zones of protection indicated on the plan as uncontrolled urban development should not destroy the old city.

Malawi 289 Lake Malawi National Park N (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee was informed that the Malawi authorities had agreed to the Bureau's recommendation to consider extending the area of the National Park. The Committee, however, recommended that the Malawi authorities officially adopt and implement the management plan that had been prepared for the Park and to continue research on the Park's natural resources.

Nepal 284 Royal Chitwan National Park N (ii) (iii) (iv)

The Committee noted that there was only a remote possibility that the proposed pulp mills be constructed on the Narayani River but requested that the Nepalese authorities keep it informed of any developments in this respect which could affect the Park.

Spain 313 The Mosque of Cordoba C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

*[13]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*[14]

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

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

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

The Committee requested to be kept informed by the Zimbabwean authorities of the possible construction of a new dam on the Zambezi at Mapata Gorge. The Committee also requested the Zambian authorities to consider nominating the adjacent Lower Zambezi National Park in order to eventually constitute a joint inscription on the World Heritage List.

B. Deferred nominations

Bangladesh 321 The Historic Mosque City of Bagerhat

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

*[15]

Bangladesh 322 Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur

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