



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

34 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add

Paris, 22 June 2010

Original: English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee

Thirty-fourth session
Brasilia, Brazil
25 July - 3 August 2010

**Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage
properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

SUMMARY

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. In certain cases, the World Heritage Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion.

Decision required: The World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.

The full reports of reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language:
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>

Table of content

II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST.....	5
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	5
AFRICA.....	5
2. Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257).....	5
7. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302).....	10
ARAB STATES.....	13
8. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186).....	13
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	16
11. Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries - Wolong, Mt Siguniang and Jiayin Mountains (China) (N 1213).....	16
12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083).....	20
16. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120).....	23
17. East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854).....	26
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.....	29
20. Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354rev).....	29
21. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908).....	34
22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	37
23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis).....	40
24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900).....	45
25. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719).....	51
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....	55
30. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303).....	55
31. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N355).....	58
34. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196).....	62
35. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290).....	66
37. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	69
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	74
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....	74
42. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274).....	74
CULTURAL PROPERTIES.....	81
AFRICA.....	81
43. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis).....	81
46. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	83
47. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116rev).....	83

49. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)	87
50. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)	88
52. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)	89
53. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)	92
54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev)	96
ARAB STATES.....	101
56. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)	101
57. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)	103
58. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	105
59. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)	107
61. Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793)	109
63. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)	112
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	115
65. Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)	115
66. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)	117
67. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)	117
68. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255)	120
69. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)	121
71. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 115)	123
72. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	126
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	130
76. World Heritage properties of Vienna.....	130
78. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)	133
79. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)	136
81. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217)	140
82. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)	144
88. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)	149
90. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712bis)	154
92. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)	156
94. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)	160
95. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)	165
96. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)	170
97. Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)	171
98. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis)	175
101. Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348bis)	180

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	182
107. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285) ...	182
110. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180).....	185
111. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414).....	187
112. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)	189
113. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)	193
115. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)	197
116. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis).....	201

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

2. Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2007

Criteria
(ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 8B.9; 33 COM 7B.147

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for preparatory assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: Preparation of the nomination file and development of certain management tools supported through the Madagascar World Heritage programme, with funding from the United Nations Foundation, Conservation International and the Nordic World Heritage Foundation.

Previous monitoring missions
None

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
There have been no previous State of Conservation reports. The IUCN evaluation of 2007 mentions the following threats to the property:

- a) Encroachment;
- b) Fire;
- c) Hunting and poaching;
- d) Artisanal mining;
- e) Illegal logging;

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1257>

Current conservation issues

On 30 November 2009, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the Rainforests of Atsinanana World Heritage property was submitted by the State Party. This urgent report was requested by the World Heritage Committee as a result of reports on an important increase of illegal logging in two components of the property, Masoala and Marojejy National parks. The report provides an overview of ongoing management operations across the serial property and of the implementation of the State Party's Action Plan to halt illegal logging of

precious woods in Masoala and Marojejy National Parks, which was reported to the Committee at its 33rd session.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received a copy of the “Investigation into the illegal exploitation, transport and export of precious timber in the Sava region in Madagascar” of August 2009, by Global Witness and the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA). This report was commissioned by the Ministry of Forest and Madagascar National Parks. A World Heritage Centre mission visited Madagascar in April 2010 in the framework of the Centre’s project activities and was also able to meet various stakeholders.

The State Party report indicates that illegal logging of precious woods in Masoala was still ongoing at the time of the preparation of their report, but states that logging in Marojejy had ceased. Logging activities are primarily targeting the three rosewood species (*Dalbergia*) occurring in the country, as well as to a lesser extent ebony (*Diospyros*). Rosewood or *Dalbergia spp.* are only present in Madagascar, India, Brazil and Central Africa and the species found in Madagascar are endemic to the island.

Most Rosewood is found in the north-east of the country, and in particular in the Masoala and Marojejy National Park, and in Mananara National Park, a biosphere reserve (not included in the property). The other four central/ southern National Parks (Andohahela, Andringitra, Ranomafana, and Zahamena) comprising the serial property seem relatively unaffected by the illegal logging crisis. The State Party specifically reports on the status of illegal logging in Masoala and Marojejy National Parks.

Masoala: The State Party notes that a large portion of the northern, western and southern areas of Masoala National Park was affected by illegal logging. At the time of the report, illegal loggers were present within the park and illegal logging of precious wood was persisting. The State Party further indicates that Masoala National Park obtained some limited funding from the Zurich Zoo and Conservation International to address this issue and secure the park.

Marojejy: The State Party reports that illegal logging in Marojejy occurred over a much smaller area in the north-west of the park. It had ceased in September 2009 and that there was little risk that this threat will resume. The park had re-opened to tourism and park staff were currently undertaking field surveys in the north-west portion of the park to determine the level of damage caused by illegal logging. Overall, the State Party considers that the measures implemented to counter this threat in Marojejy were successful and limited the operations of illegal loggers.

The State Party report further provides an overview of the implementation of the Action Plan developed by the Malagasy National Parks Committee to halt illegal logging of precious woods. Some of the key activities reported include the establishment of a Task Force in October 2009 to halt illegal logging, direct action to limit the collection of illegally logged precious woods, repeated closures of all key Malagasy ports to timber exports, and commissioning the Global Witness and the Environment Investigation Agency (EIA) to investigate and report on illegal logging activities. The State Party further outlines the future actions that it will undertake in order to halt illegal logging of precious woods, including maintaining the anti-logging Task Force and granting it additional powers to effectively control and manage illegal loggers currently within Masoala National Park, and continuing surveillance of both parks and undertaking field surveys to establish the state of both parks (once the situation has returned to normal).

As demonstrated in the Global Witness / EIA report, the logging crisis seems to be driven by a number of loopholes in the legislative framework. In fact, all ebony and rosewood exploitation and export have been forbidden in Madagascar since 2006 by Ministerial Decree. However, in January 2009, an interministerial decree was issued, giving an exceptional authorisation for the export of rosewood and ebony to 13 operators till 30 April 2010, supposedly for timber collected after the 2008 cyclone. Another similar special

authorisation was delivered on 21 September 2009 for the export of 25 containers. In spite of these special authorisations, all logging of rosewood and ebony remained illegal.

However, the Global Witness / EIA report clearly demonstrates that much larger volumes were exported under the cover of these decrees. It further notes that most of the timber did not originate from old stocks, but was freshly extracted from the three National Parks mentioned above. The report estimates the illegal extraction at 200 to 300 m³ per day, equivalent to 100 to 200 trees a day, harvested illegally in Masoala and Mananara National Parks and representing a commercial value of USD 800,000. Following the political crisis in January 2009, nearly 7,000 tonnes of rosewood valued at 16 million euros left the port of Vohémar. The investigation team observed that rosewood was transported openly on the roads controlled by the police and forestry administration. Based on the evidence it was able to collect, the report concludes there is complicity of many government services in the timber trafficking, including the forest administration, regional authorities and even members of the taskforce which was set up to halt the illegal logging activities. It further notes that most export licences provided by the different government services are actually in violation of the legislation and points out that certain illegal stocks were “legalised” against the payment of a fine. The report further clarifies that almost all rosewood transports are destined to China.

On 12 March 2010, the World Heritage Centre wrote a letter to the State Party, expressing its concern over repeated reports on these continuing illegal activities in the two parks. The letter reminded the State Party of the provisions of the List of World Heritage in Danger, as set out in paragraphs 177-189 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and noted the possibility of the property meeting the criteria for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger if illegal logging was not stopped.

On 24 March 2010 a new ministerial decree N° 2010-141 was issued, restoring the ban on the exploitation and exportation of rosewood and ebony. Nevertheless, according to reports received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, illegal logging activities are continuing and permits are still issued to export timber, in violation of the decree, and in complicity with high authorities in Government.

With regard to the impact on the property, the State Party report concludes that the illegal logging of precious woods has led to a reduction in overall rosewood stands in the two components of the property without resulting in an extinction risk within. However, it notes that the high level of disturbance resulting from illegal logging had knock-on effects on wildlife, including diurnal lemurs. The State Party specifically reports on increased poaching of diurnal lemurs by illegal loggers within both parks, and notes the need for a detailed field survey to establish the current population levels of each diurnal lemur species within the parks. Despite this, the State Party considers that most of the Outstanding Universal Value of Masoala and Marojejy National Parks remains intact, while acknowledging that significant negative impacts on Masoala's values are likely.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that following the submission of the State Party report in November 2009, an aerial survey was undertaken in early March 2010 in collaboration with Madagascar National Park's conservation partners, as well as the World Bank and the American and Norwegian embassies. This survey confirmed the presence of several illegal logging camps within both Masoala and Marojejy National Parks. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have also received reports from NGOs indicating that hundreds of loggers are currently operating within Masoala, while Marojejy, though less affected, is still experiencing illegal logging. Information from experts working in the field indicates that the equivalent of 1,500 ship containers of precious woods have been illegally harvested (as of March 2010) and several reports have noted that loggers now need to look sometimes several days to find another rosewood tree to cut, indicating the rapid disappearance of these endemic tree species. Other sources indicate that because of the scarcity of rosewood, there is a gradual shift from illegal logging to other illegal resource extraction, such as the artisanal mining of gemstones. Increased agricultural encroachment has also been reported.

Hundreds of people linked to the illegal precious wood trade have moved into the two parks and their periphery. While the State Party reports that 11,305 people are present within the parks' periphery, NGOs report that the population probably exceeds 50,000 people.

In March 2010, the World Conservation Society (WCS) issued a report based on a lemurs survey realized in Masoala National Park in February and March. The report indicates that populations of lemurs have been disturbed on sites affected by illegal logging: for some species, such as *Varecia rubra* (on the IUCN red list as in danger) and *Eulemur albifrons* (on the IUCN red list as vulnerable), the population density was reduced by 30% to 75% and a major reduction in female fertility was observed, causing a low rate of population's renewal and impacting the distribution of species on a long term basis.

In its state of conservation report, the State Party noted the need for international assistance to support field surveys in Masoala and Marojejy National Parks during the course of 2010 in order to determine the extent of the damage caused by illegal logging. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that following the political crisis in January 2009, key international donors, including the World Bank and USAID, suspended most of their aid to Madagascar. Many of these frozen programmes included capacity building for forestry and park officials, implementing chain-of-custody and tracking systems for timber, and provision of funding to the Ministry of Environment and Forests; this aid suspension resulted in the Ministry operating with only 10% of its previous budget. As a result, operations of mixed patrols composed of police, gendarme and park agents were halted due to funding shortages, leaving the parks exposed to illegal logging. The State Party on 15 March 2010 submitted an emergency request to the World Heritage Fund for funding for mapping the impacts of deforestation and organising patrolling missions. The World Heritage Centre requested some additional details on the budget and the implementation of the proposal and the request will be reviewed by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were also informed of a proposal to inscribe rosewood from Madagascar on CITES Annex III. They note that inscription on Annex III still allows the country to determine export quota. Options to list the relevant species in Annex II or I of CITES may therefore be more appropriate. The World Heritage Centre was also informed that a study has been commissioned by the ITTO (International Tropical Timber Organization) to determine the exact status of the species and provide advice on Listing.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are extremely concerned by ongoing illegal logging within Masoala and Marojejy National Parks, which is directly threatening the property's Outstanding Universal Value. They note that the secondary effects of illegal logging are documented to be far more serious than the direct effects of stand reduction and habitat disturbance. Cumulatively, these effects are likely to amplify the direct impacts of illegal logging and cause serious long-term, and in some cases irreversible, ecological damage. Therefore the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the current situation is directly threatening the values for which the site is inscribed under criteria (x), as a result of the direct and indirect impacts on threatened endemic species, but also under criteria (ix), as a result of the impact on the ecosystem processes. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note from reports that already a commercial lemur bushmeat trade based in Masoala and Marojejy National Parks is developing. These reports are particularly worrying as previously there was virtually no commercial bushmeat trade in Madagascar.

It is further noted that in spite of the recent decree banning all export and exploitation of rosewood and ebony, it has not slowed down illegal logging. In addition reports indicate export permits continue to be granted, contrary to the decree. Therefore, the World Heritage Centre consider that this is a clear case of ascertained threat to the Outstanding Universal value of the property and consider the property meet the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommend an urgent monitoring mission to the property to develop the corrective measures and a timeframe for their implementation

and to raise awareness with the authorities on their obligations in the framework of the Convention. They stress the urgent need for the Government to enforce the logging ban and put in place a credible enforcement policy. They further recommend donors to restore conservation support funding and note that attention also needs to be given to developing alternative livelihoods for the park's periphery communities.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.147**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about the increasing illegal logging and hunting of endangered lemurs in Masoala and Marojejy National Parks, which is endangering the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
4. *Notes that in spite of the approval of ministerial decree N° 2010-141 of 24 March 2010 banning the exploitation and export of rosewood and ebony, reports indicate that the State Party of Madagascar is continuing to provide export permits for illegally logged timber, that no credible measures are in place to enforce the ban on logging or the export of illegally logged timber, and that States Parties to the World Heritage Convention are also known destination countries for illegally logged timber;*
5. *Urges the State party to immediately take the necessary measures to enforce the above mentioned decree and halt all illegal logging in the property, halt all export of rosewood and ebony and ensure that all people participating in illegal resource extraction activities are removed from the property;*
6. *Calls upon all States Parties to the Convention to act urgently to assist protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by restoring conservation funding and support, and by ensuring that illegal timber originating from Madagascar is both banned and prevented from entering their national markets, especially those countries that are known destinations for illegally logged timber;*
7. *Requests the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to draw the relevant issues to the attention of the Secretariat of the Convention on the Illegal Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), with a view to considering action in relation to threats through this international mechanism;*
8. *Considers that the property is faced by an imminent danger to its Outstanding Universal Value;*
9. ***Decides to inscribe the Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
10. *Also requests the State Party to invite, as soon as possible, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation of Masoala and Marojejy National Parks and develop in cooperation with the State Party the corrective measures to address the threats to the Outstanding*

Universal Value as well as a timeframe for their implementation, and a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;

11. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, describing the implementation of the action plan and other measures taken to address illegal logging, as well as any data on the direct and indirect impacts of illegal logging on Masoala and Marojej National Parks, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

7. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1984

Criteria
(vii) (ix)(x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
8 COM

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

Illustration material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/302>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports of mining threats and threats from Hotel Development to the Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas World Heritage property before and following the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Sevilla, 2009) and have investigated these issues with the State Parties of Zimbabwe, where the property is located, and Zambia, where the threats are said to originate. They have also reviewed the situation through their networks and published sources of information. At the time of inscription of the property, the World Heritage Committee 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.

a) Mining threats

IUCN has received reports of significant prospecting for Copper, Gold and Uranium on the Zambian side of the Zambezi, including Uranium mining planned on the Kafue River. These activities are not within the property but are in areas that are adjacent to it. A letter signed by many international conservation organizations and local community leaders to the Zambian government in early 2009 outlining a range of the concerns, which include direct impacts on protected areas in Zambia, as well as indirect impacts on the Mana Pools World Heritage property. Although the mining efforts are currently understood to be at the “exploratory” stage, stakeholder reports from the invested mining companies and the rapid development of infrastructure in the exploratory sites suggest that full mining operations are imminent, and that some may be developed prior to issuing of production licences. It is reported that community leaders have publicly expressed concerns about the effects of possible contamination by uranium waste by-products which may already be occurring during the exploration stage.

It is also suggested that full Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) are not required until after completion of exploration stage activities. Published information indicates positive results from exploration activities. A range of national and international companies with recorded interests in the area include Zambezi Resources Ltd., Omega Corporation, Albion Mining, and African Energy Resources, Glencore International AG of Switzerland, Lithic Metals and Energy, Denison Mining and Rio Tinto Zinc. Prospects under consideration are noted to include mining activities that could be directly adjacent to tributaries to the Zambezi, which forms the properties boundary.

Additional information is required to make a full assessment of the possible impacts and concerns in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. IUCN notes that the property is listed for aesthetic and biodiversity values. The mid-Zambezi Valley containing the property was considered one of the last areas that is not grossly modified by man. It thus provides a benchmark site for study of the riverine “sand-bank” environment and associated succession and adaptive change, whilst the annual congregation of animals in the riparian parkland along the broad Zambezi is one of Africa’s outstanding wildlife spectacles. The area also is one of the most important refuges for black rhino in Africa as well as a number of other threatened species (elephant, leopard, wild dog, and Nile crocodile) and therefore meets criteria (x). IUCN further notes that one of the prospects is reported to be located inside the Lower Zambezi National Park and is reported to be a “world class open pit copper deposit”. Thus this prospect could directly impact on the area that was recommended by the Committee to be considered by Zambia as a potential transboundary extension of the existing property.

b) Threats from hotel development

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information on a possible substantial hotel development by Protea Hotels, which would have been located on the opposite bank of the Zambezi to the property. Significant concerns were expressed regarding the impacts of the development and the precedent it might also set for increased development pressures. In April 2010 it was reported that Protea Hotels has taken the decision to withdraw its application for development of a proposed hotel in the Lower Zambezi region. Having engaged in a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and taken cognizance of the concerns raised, they decided not to progress, taking the view that further clarity on the matter is needed. Whilst this threat may have receded, it indicates the additional importance of considering tourism plans within the property and the region that adjoins it.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the level of knowledge on the integrity, protection and management of the property is particularly low, with no report having been considered by the World Heritage Committee regarding the property since 1984. It would be beneficial to the property to have the opportunity to provide information to the World Heritage Committee on these matters, considering the scale of challenge that has been experienced by protected area services in the sub-region during recent years. The World Heritage Centre

and IUCN consider that further information and dialogue are required to consider the current conservation status of the property, and also obtain and review further information from the adjoining State Party of Zambia regarding the consideration being given to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and the World Heritage Committee's recommendation regarding the Lower Zambezi National Park, in relation to its planning and assessment of possible mining developments and tourism plans. Since this process should also include dialogue with community representatives, mining, tourism and other economic interests, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider a reactive monitoring mission to the property and its surrounding area, to meet both the relevant States Parties, should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Article 6 of the Convention which states that each State Party undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention;*
3. *Notes with concern the reported threats from mining to the property and adjoining related protected areas in Zambia;*
4. *Requests the State Party of Zambia to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas World Heritage property of Zimbabwe, is considered fully in relation to possible mining exploration and production plans that could affect the Zambezi River and its catchments, or the property and protected areas adjacent to it;*
5. *Also requests the State Party of Zambia to provide to the World Heritage Centre copies of any baseline or feasibility studies already completed by the mining companies, and to ensure that any mining or other developments that could impact the property are notified to the World Heritage Centre, in line with the Operational Guidelines, prior to granting any permission for mining exploration or production or other development;*
6. *Encourages the States Parties of Zambia and Zimbabwe to increase their cooperation in the protection of the property, including in relation to mining threats and of planning for tourism and visitation in the area, in the context of the conservation of the Lower Zimbabwe area and the protected areas in this region;*
7. *Further requests the States Parties of Zimbabwe and Zambia to jointly invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the state of conservation of the property, and to examine mining activities in the Lower Zambezi in relation to the possible impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Requests furthermore the States Parties of Zimbabwe and Zambia to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property, including the potential impacts on the property from mining activities in Zambia, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

ARAB STATES

8. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(viii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 8B.5; 32 COM 7B.5

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property
N/A

Illustration material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1186>

Current conservation issues

On 7 April 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre, in response to the request of the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.5**. This decision noted the significant progress by the State Party in managing this property since its inscription, and a number of outstanding issues including in relation to the possible extension of the property, vehicle use, provision of funding and the revision of the management plan.

The State Party report is set out as a five-year progress report, and has been prepared by the management unit for the property, covering the period since the date of inscription on the World Heritage List.

a) *Boundary changes*

The State Party report mentions that an extension of the property is a long-term goal but provides no further information on this issue. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the World Heritage Committee has already provided clear guidance on the potential for extension of the property to include Gebel Qatrani, which does not need to be restated further.

b) *Management of tourism, including vehicle use*

The State Party report provides commendable evidence of the implementation of effective monitoring of the property, although it only presents data up to 2008. Monitoring schemes have been established in relation to the condition of the fossil resources, and the patterns of visitation to the property. The report notes a significant increase in the number of visitors to the property to a current level of 12,000 visitors per year. This appears to represent at least a threefold increase in the level of visitation since the time of inscription. The State Party report notes that 25% of visitors are from France and 7% from Japan. The report appears to indicate that the only permitted entrance to Wadi Al-Hitan is through the main gate. It notes that off-road driving within the property has almost stopped but does not provide information on the uncontrolled access to the property from the north.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the progress with managing tourism use is commendable, and notes that the increase in visitor numbers has been facilitated by a significant investment in well designed tourism facilities outside the main fossil bearing layers. Vehicular traffic has also been regulated in the open air museum.

c) *Provision of adequate funding*

The State Party report provides information on the budgets of several completed projects. It records Italy's significant investment in the Wadi Al-Rayan protected area, which includes the property, through a project implemented in cooperation with IUCN. A twinning with the Grand Sasso National Park in Italy is also mentioned, together with support from Shell Egypt for on-site signage. The report notes that financial sustainability concerns are a long-term issue, and that, despite the increase in visitation, self-financing arrangements remain unresolved. The report notes a number of management needs in its conclusions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the apparent uncertainty regarding the sustainability of funding for the property is a key concern. The property has clearly defined management needs that require ongoing and adequate financing if the success achieved since inscription is to be sustained. The issues noted in the report as challenges include some basic requirements, such as lack of adequate vehicles, lack of electricity supply and lack of an adequate water supply system. The State Party is therefore strongly encouraged to establish a secure long-term funding regime for the management of the property. Continued international support may also be appropriate to ensure that a significant investment of project funding is converted into a successful ongoing conservation project.

d) *Finalisation of management plan*

The State Party report does not provide specific information on this request of the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, whilst the State Party should clarify this issue, there is ample evidence of the effectiveness of management to date, and the establishment of monitoring programmes is a measure of the maturity of management systems. The property is also part of a wider protected area, which is considered to have an effective management system in place. However, some concerns are raised by the lack of up-to-date survey information, and the continued reporting of concerns regarding sustainable finance and basic management requirements.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34 COM/7B.Add,

2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.5**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the sustained progress in the management of the property, including in relation to monitoring and the development of sustainable tourism;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop a proposal for changing the boundary of the property, taking into account recommendations at the time of inscription as well as recent additional fossil discoveries to the north of the property, and the possibility to link the property with the Gebel Qatrani area;*
5. *Takes note that the property has unmet management needs, including some basic requirements for ongoing success, and therefore urges the State Party to address these needs, and to ensure adequate long-term finance for the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011** more information on the issue of uncontrolled access to the property from the north as well as a copy of the finalized management plan.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

11. Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries - Wolong, Mt Siguniang and Jiajin Mountains (China) (N 1213)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2006

Criteria

(x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 8B.22

International Assistance

June 2008, US\$40,000, Emergency Assistance to reinforce management capacity at the earthquake affected areas of the property

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1213>

Current conservation issues

From 12 to 17 April, an IUCN monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the Committee at its 30th session at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. The mission was able to hold discussions with various stakeholders, including representatives of the Sichuan Government, the A'ba Tibetan/ Qiang Autonomous Prefecture, the management authority of Wolong Reserve, as well as NGO representatives.

The mission assessed the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the time of inscription as outlined below:

- a) *Ensure the "Sichuan World Heritage Management Committee" has sufficient powers, resources and authority to ensure it can effectively carry out its role in relation to management of the property, including in relation to the review and approval of any major development proposals which may impact on the natural values of the nominated property;*

The Sichuan World Heritage Management Committee (SWHMC) meets twice annually to discuss problems or issues identified by the management units and includes representatives from all 18 management units within the property as well as representatives from the Provincial Tourism Bureau, Provincial Cultural Heritage Bureau, and the Provincial Religious Affairs Bureau. The primary functions of the committee are to review management and

formulate relevant policy measures for the property and, specifically, to review and approve or deny any project proposal which may affect the conservation value of the property.

However, the mission noted that the SWHMC does not request nor does it receive regular reports from the biodiversity monitoring programmes already in place, and its agenda appears at this time to be limited to reactively managing issues, as opposed to proactive oversight of the property. In addition, the SWHMC does not have any direct management responsibilities for the property, for example budget oversight. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the management authority should establish regular reporting on the property's state of conservation to the SWHMC, including information on habitat, wildlife populations and the conditions of local people, in order to allow the Committee to proactively manage the property and identify issues of concern early on.

b) Review existing infrastructure within the property with a view to better controlling impacts and, where possible, removing infrastructure and allowing habitat restoration with native species;

The mission noted that any infrastructure planned prior to inscription has been stopped, with the exception of the Yaoji dam (discussed under point (e) below), that the relief phase of the disaster recovery following the earthquake has just concluded and that ecological restoration has not yet started. However, the SWHMC has recently approved the development of a tunnel at Balangshan with the commitment to build, as part of the tunnel construction, animal corridors above the tunnel to facilitate wildlife movements. The SWHMC has identified two tiers of management including 'strict core' areas, in which the only use options are related to research and education activities, and 'World Heritage protected area', which permit some human habitation by local communities that were already established at the time of inscription. The SWHMC has rejected applications for 16 hydropower plants in the property and has established management principles prohibiting medium-large infrastructure and limiting road construction in the core zone. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN strongly urge the State Party and the SWHMC to apply the same management principles prohibiting large scale infrastructure and limiting road construction in the 'World Heritage protected area' zone, which has the same World Heritage status as the so-called "core zone".

As part of post-earthquake construction, previously existing hydropower sites will be evaluated on an individual basis prior to approval for re-construction and, in all cases, the SWHMC will require that any hydropower facility maintain a minimum of 30% original flow. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that while this minimum flow is an important starting point, it may also be necessary to ensure seasonal fluctuation in flow levels in order to support biodiversity downstream of any dams, some of which may need variation to support life cycles. In order to determine the levels required, biodiversity surveys and identification of species that may require such variation will be needed for all dam sites as well as ongoing monitoring.

c) Review the possibilities for future addition of areas of high nature conservation value to the property; with priority on those areas which are particularly important for panda habitat and which are close to but outside the property. Options for developing conservation corridors linking the property with other suitable areas of panda habitat should also be reviewed;

As the earthquake and its aftermath have taken up significant time and resources from the Management Committee and management units, the options for addition of high nature conservation values to the property have been delayed somewhat. However, the mission noted that the SWHMC has identified the Caopo provincial nature reserve (in the North East of the property), the Tianquan and Yingjing counties to the south of the property, both having giant panda populations, as potential areas for expansion.

The mission recommends that once recovery from the earthquake is complete, strong consideration should be given to including the Rongjin Nature Reserve within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the mission's recommendations as Rongjin would provide an important link between the Qionglai and Liang mountain ranges, thereby connecting the panda populations from these two sites and supporting the longer term conservation strategy for the species. Rongjin Nature Reserve already has a management plan and structure in place and could be easily integrated.

- d) *Progressively increase the level of staffing and resources within all reserves within the property, with the aim of ensuring that the level of staffing and management in all areas of the property is equivalent to that within the Wolong Nature Reserve within a ten year period;*

There is highly variable ability to support and undertake biodiversity monitoring programmes in the various management units of the property. Capacity in national forest reserves is higher than in scenic area properties within the site. The National reserves under the auspices of the State Forestry Administration (SFA) are benefiting from the national level efforts on standardizing and regularizing giant panda monitoring and capacity training and ongoing support in these reserves is demonstrated by the more complete monitoring and records available here. Invitations for training for staff within forest reserves are not extended to staff under the auspices of SFA. Therefore, in the scenic area sites within the property, capacity is not strong and the mission recommended that it be raised to the level of the SFA reserves to ensure effective and integrated management of the property.

- e) *In relation to the existing and proposed dams, ensure that: (i) the impact of the dam at Yaoji, and the associated relocation of people, on the values of the property be closely monitored; (ii) effective mitigation measures are applied at Yaoji to minimize the impacts associated with dam construction, the impoundment and the relocation of the village; with priority to implementing measures to encourage the establishment of panda habitat; and (iii) no additional dams are built within the property.*

The Yaoji dam site was built within the buffer zone located in the middle of the property and with resulting significant ecological impacts immediately around the dam site. However, the mission did not observe any obvious changes to habitat within the property boundaries. The Yaoji dam site has altered the flows of the river and the company running the dam, Huaneng, has guaranteed a minimum flow of 30% to ensure adequate flow for downstream ecosystems. However, it may also be necessary to ensure seasonal fluctuation in flow levels in order to support biodiversity downstream of any dams, some of which may need variation to support life cycles.

While Huaneng has stated its intention to undertake adequate biodiversity monitoring, the mission noted that limited work has been done to date on this. Both the dam site and the property include habitat for some of China's endemic species. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that SWHMC should urgently ensure that Huaneng, working with suitable partners, undertake biodiversity monitoring with follow up actions to ensure that local species, especially endemic species, and the integrity of the ecosystem that supports them, are not threatened by the dam. In particular, Huaneng, should work with local organizations having experience in biodiversity monitoring in this area to identify indicator species and develop and implement an appropriate monitoring programme.

The mission also noted that household incomes have increased as a result of the dam, which has led to increased holdings of yak on high alpine grasslands. The mission recommends that the yak management committee should set clear targets with respect to yak on the alpine grasslands. In addition, an impact monitoring programme is needed for the high alpine grasslands to ensure that increasing numbers of yak are not adversely affecting native biodiversity.

The mission team was informed that there are no plans for any additional dams to be built within the property, beyond the reconstruction of pre-existing dams damaged by the earthquake.

- f) *In relation to the Wolong Tourism Development Plan, undertake an independent expert review of the existing plan, under the direction of the World Heritage Management Office, to assess the impacts of the proposals on values within the nominated property and to recommend modifications that may be required. The World Heritage Office should also play a role in establishing tourism development guidelines, review of proposals and development of recommendations for mitigation of impacts for any major tourism development which may affect the values of the property;*

As a result of the earthquake, some parts of the property were closed to tourism. Wolong remains closed to tourists almost two years after the event. Tourism numbers since the earthquake have fallen precipitously in the rest of the property, but not as much as in Wolong. The mission team noted that tourism guidelines have been drafted but have not yet undergone review. These include general guidance on international and national, local laws and regulations, zonal management rules; impact assessment for infrastructure; management principles for community development; and monitoring and impact assessment with suggested indicators. These guidelines do not yet include specific guidance for particular audiences in the tourism industry such as hotel owners nor do they include suggestions for management of tourism industry staff, for example, the potential option of certification to ensure that tourism-related staff understand the values of the property and actions needed to maintain those values. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to rapidly undertake a review of the tourism guidelines, under the direction of the World Heritage Management Office.

- g) *Address other management issues noted in this evaluation report, including in relation to local populations, scientific research and education;*

Considerable portions of the local community, 1269 people, were directly affected by the earthquake and helping them to cope with this disaster has been a priority activity for the past two years. International cooperation projects, supported by *inter alia* the GEF, UNEP, and the US China Environmental Fund have been working to support livelihoods skills trainings for local people – supporting transition to alternative employment options in tourism, bee-keeping and biogas development. According to reports received, a number of research projects are underway within the property. In addition, discussions regarding collaboration with the Chinese Academy of Sciences Institute of Mountain Hazards and Environment on longer term research and capacity building within the property have begun.

- h) *Consider changing the name of the nominated property to "The Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries" from the currently proposed name of: "The Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries - Wolong, Mt Siguniang and Jiabin Mountains";*

The Sichuan World Heritage Management Committee has agreed with this name change.

- i) *Other conservation issues - the impacts of the Wenchuan earthquake in May 2008*

The Wenchuan earthquake in May 2008 was one of the most devastating in China's history with nearly 70,000 deaths, 375,000 injuries and almost 4.8 million people left homeless. Despite the potentially significant impacts of the quake, subsequent surveys have shown that the damage was limited to the northeast corner of the property and that the loss of habitat for giant pandas, in particular, was relatively minor with less than 3 % of panda habitat being affected. The result is that the integrity and values for which the site was inscribed have not been affected by the quake. The property management plan is being revised to take into account any relevant changes resulting from the earthquake and its recovery. At this time, no changes to boundaries or significant changes to management planning are envisioned. However, some changes to zonation (protected area vs. core area) will be included. The mission recommended that immediate attention should be given to the ecological recovery of earthquake effected sites, with completion, by the end of 2010, of an ecological recovery plan that includes i) identification of key areas for restoration and management strategies for

restoration, and ii) strategies for mitigation of impacts from recovery activities, such as infrastructure construction.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the State Party has made noteworthy advancements in the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the time of inscription despite the Wenchuan earthquake in May 2008. In particular, significant efforts have been made to enhance management and improve the integrity of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the values for which the property was inscribed are intact and note that despite the May 2008 earthquake, panda populations are believed to be stable. However, a number of the recommendations made at the time of inscription have only been partially implemented and should be addressed. The main issues requiring immediate attention include enhancing integrated monitoring and management capacity across all 18 management units of the property, establishing and implementing tourism management plans and monitoring programmes, and implementing the ecosystem restoration aspects of the post-earthquake recovery plan, especially in Wolong Reserve. In addition, to strengthen management of the property, the State Party should consider expanding the property to include the Rongjin nature Reserve as a critical link between the giant panda populations of Quionglashan and Liangshan.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 8B.22**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Commends the State Party for its achievements in implementing the recommendations adopted at the time of inscription, despite the impacts of the Wenchuan earthquake, but notes that a number of these have only been partially implemented;*
4. *Requests the State Party to fully implement the recommendations made at the time of inscription, and in particular to rapidly undertake actions to enhance integrated monitoring and management capacity across all 18 management units of the property, establish and implement tourism management plans and monitoring programmes, and implement the ecosystem restoration aspects of the post-earthquake recovery plan, especially in Wolong Reserve, and encourages the State Party to pay particular attention to the these issues;*
5. *Strongly encourages the State Party to consider expanding the property to include the Rongjin Nature Reserve as a critical link between the giant panda populations of Quionglashan and Liangshan.*

12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

Criteria
(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.11; 31 COM 7B.15; 32COM 7B.11

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
April 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of network of dams;
- b) Large copper mine adjacent to property;
- c) Boundary modifications;
- d) Future tourism development;
- e) Encroachment.

Illustration material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1083>

Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. This responds to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.11** in relation to planned dam building, plans for mining and plans and justifications for modification of boundaries. The State Party report also includes information about progress on management measures, and contains a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

a) Issues related to planned dam building

The State Party reports that there has been no further progress on hydro-electric dam planning since the last report to the World Heritage Committee, and that all projects are at a standstill. The report notes that the different dam projects mentioned in the previous Committee decision are still under investigation by the proposing companies, that none is inside the property, and that none has a Government approval. Thus none of the requested studies is available to be sent to the World Heritage Committee. The State Party notes that plans will promptly be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review and evaluation should approval be granted.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the report of the State Party, and remain concerned that any plans for dam building in the areas within and around the property, including the specific areas previously noted, should be carefully considered in relation to possible impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. To ensure this takes place, the State Party should submit any further Environmental Impact Assessments and any other new planning documents to the World Heritage Centre for review, before any approval is granted to proceed, and ensure the findings of any review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is considered fully.

b) Mining issues

The State Party reports that large-medium scale mineral deposits have been found within and adjacent to the property. The report notes that the State Party has not approved any mineral development since inscription of the property, and further notes that there are “some small-scale mineral exploration and illegal mining left in the heritage site”. The report states that national and local departments have closed all illegal mining sites.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that additional information is provided by the State Party in relation to a proposed boundary modification (see below). This notes that there are a number of legally operating mines, as well as licensed exploration areas for mining within the boundaries of the Hongshan sub-unit, a cluster of component parts in the north-east of the property. These areas appear to predate the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List but were not detected by the State Party in its nomination process, nor during the evaluation. IUCN was able to visit some of these mines during a visit to Yunnan in October 2009, and could verify that they are locally extensive, established, and have a significant environmental impact within the property and adjacent to it. Mining issues will be considered in relation to the proposed minor boundary modification that is currently under evaluation, and are highly challenging. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the clearly stated policy that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, as recognised by the International Council on Mining and Metals and other industry lead bodies, and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee. Thus the State Party should ensure that no mining takes place in the property.

c) Modification of boundaries

The State Party has submitted a proposed minor boundary modification, separately to its State of Conservation report. This includes a range of different proposals including both extension to and reductions to some components of the property, creation of additional buffer zones, and establishment of wildlife corridors. IUCN is currently evaluating this proposal which will be considered by the World Heritage Committee under a separate item during its 34th session. However, it is important to consider the conservation issues noted in Document *WHC-10/34.COM/8D* on the evaluation of the proposed minor boundary modification in the context of this state of conservation report.

d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The State Party includes a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SoOUV) for the property. This will be reviewed by IUCN, with a view to submitting an agreed revised SoOUV for consideration at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.11**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee fully informed on any developments in plans for dams, as noted in Decision **32 COM 7B.11**, and to ensure that any completed Environmental Impact Assessment for any dam on the Nujiang,

Lancang and Jinsha Rivers, and on any water course within or adjacent to the property, be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for assessment, prior to the consideration of any approval for such developments;

4. *Also requests the State Party to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property be considered as an explicit factor in the Environmental Impact Assessments for any dam or other developments that could affect the property;*
5. *Notes with great concern that legal mining that predates the inscription of the property is taking place within the Hongshan sub-unit of the property, and that additional areas are subject to mining licences, and further requests the State Party to take all necessary steps to ensure that mining does not take place within the boundaries of the property, and to not permit any further expansion of mining production in the property;*
6. *Notes the State Party's submission of a proposed boundary modification for the property, and a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;*
7. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the status of any dam related projects and the removal of mining threats from the property, and to take into account in the same report of any revisions to the property agreed through the minor boundary modification proposal.*

16. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(vii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.a; 30 COM 7B.15; 31 COM 7B.19; 33COM 7B.17

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 71,995 Technical Cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2002: IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Pressure and degradation from increasing tourism and mountaineering;
- b) Climate change;
- c) Development of tourism resort in core area.

Current conservation issues

On 23 March 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation report of the property. The report briefly outlines the status of the Kongde view resort and of the illegal footpath between Kongde and Thame, as well as the implementation of the 2007-2012 Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) Management and Tourism Plan's priority activities.

a) *Development of tourism resort in core area*

The State Party reports that the final verdict of the Supreme Court of Nepal regarding the Kongde View Resort, located in the core area of the property, has not yet been issued and notes that this verdict will be provided to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it is available. The illegal construction of a foot trail from Kongde to Thame was stopped by the Park Authority in line with the Nepalese Wildlife Conservation Act 2029 (1972), and the report indicates that all the stakeholders in the area are against its construction. Moreover, the State Party notes that Himalayan Park Regulations (1979) prohibit the construction of new routes and trails without prior planning permission, except those that are traditionally used by local communities.

b) *Strengthening the management and tourism plan*

The State Party reports on the implementation of priority aspects of the management and tourism plan, as requested by Decision **33 COM 7B.17**:

- *Protecting endangered species and habitats*: A wildlife field survey was undertaken in 2008, which found a number of snow leopards within the property, as well as increasing populations of the snow leopard's prey species, such as Jharal (*Hermitragus jemlahicus*).
- *Clarifying the extent and location of mining of rock, sand and turf*: The State Party recalls that these activities are regulated by the Himalayan Park Regulations (1979), which sets times and dates during which natural resource exploitation and collection is permitted within the property. Building material extraction is permitted once a year for a month, and sand and turf exploitation is permitted all year round.
- *Reducing pressure on forest and rangelands from wood gathering*: The report indicates that the Himalayan Park Regulations (1979) allow firewood collection twice a year and timber collection for domestic purposes once a year. These activities are closely monitored by the Park and Buffer Zone Committees. The provision of micro-hydropower schemes has also significantly reduced fire wood demand, and the State Party consider that the growing ecotourism market minimises grazing pressure on rangelands.
- *Controlling environmental pollution*: Park management collaborates with various stakeholders and conservation partners to minimise pollution within the property and its buffer zone. One prominent partner is the Sagarmatha Pollution Control Committee, a local NGO involved in solid waste management. Actions that have helped tackle pollution include the establishment of micro-hydropower (which has reduced air pollution) and awareness raising among local communities through several Eco-clubs.
- *Monitoring the state of conservation of the property*: The report notes that monitoring activities are carried out as prescribed in the SNP Management and Tourism Plan.

The State Party reports that new SNP Regulations are currently being drafted and, will soon be submitted to the Nepalese Government for approval. The State Party considers that these regulations should assist in regulating, controlling and monitoring illegal developments within the park.

c) Other conservation issues of concern

The State Party reports that other current conservation issues within the property include poaching of endangered species, forest fires, pollution and growing energy needs due to tourism. However, no details are provided on the importance of these conservation issues.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome that construction of the illegal trail between Kongde and Thame has ceased, and note that this trail would have adversely affected key wildlife habitat within the property. However, the absence of a verdict regarding the Kongde View Resort case is of continuing concern, particularly as this resort has been operational for some time and the legal case ongoing since 2007.

The State Party's efforts to implement the Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) Management and Tourism Plan are noted. However, as little data is provided on the effectiveness of conservation efforts in protecting endangered species, promoting sustainable use of natural resources within the park, and minimising environmental pollution, it is difficult to assess the current state of conservation of the property's values. With respect to building material extraction, IUCN notes that the information provided by the State Party on this activity is insufficient to determine its extent and location, and recalls that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status.

IUCN continues to receive reports from experts working on site and its members that tourism and mountaineering pressures continue to seriously affect the property's physical and aesthetic environment, and that there is potential for additional tourism developments within the property's buffer zone. There has been a substantial increase in the numbers of helicopters and other aircraft flying over the property and ensuing noise pollution, as well as inadequate disposal of the garbage left by mountaineering expeditions at Amadablam and Pumori base camps in particular. With respect to potential tourism developments within the buffer zone of the SNP, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that these may affect the property's aesthetic values and degrade its physical environment. They request the State Party to clarify whether any tourism developments are planned within this zone, and also encourage the Government of Nepal to consider officially designating a World Heritage buffer zone for the property by including the existing buffer zone of the National Park within the property's listing and submitting a request to this effect to the World Heritage Committee.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that additional effort is needed to address the tourism management issues impacting on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The revision of the SNP Management and Tourism Plan, due in 2012, may provide a good opportunity to determine the property's carrying capacity and identify stronger tourism- management measures against this baseline. The State Party should be invited to submit an International Assistance request to assess tourism's impacts on the property, identify its carrying capacity and to seek expert assistance in reviewing the tourism management measures of the SNP Tourism and Management Plan.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.17**, adopted at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009),
3. Commends the State Party for halting construction of the illegal trail between Kongde and Thame, which would have damaged a key wildlife area within the property, remains concerned that a verdict regarding the Kongde View Resort, which is within the property's core area, has not yet been issued by Nepal's Supreme Court and requests the State Party to submit the verdict to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it is issued by the court;
4. Notes the State Party's efforts to implement the 2007-2012 Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) Management and Tourism Plan, but considers that additional effort is needed to address the tourism management issues impacting on the property's Outstanding Universal Value;
5. Also notes the information provided by the State Party concerning measures to protect endangered species within the Park's area, but also considers that additional effort is needed to promote sustainable use of natural resources within the park, and minimise environmental pollution;
6. Invites the State Party to submit an International Assistance request to assess the current impacts of tourism on the property, identify the property's carrying capacity and to secure expert assistance in reviewing the SNP Tourism and Management Plan tourism management measures in the context of the upcoming review of this Plan;
7. Encourages the Government of Nepal to consider officially designating a buffer zone to the World Heritage property by including the existing buffer zone of the National Park within the property's listing and submitting a request to this effect to the World Heritage Committee;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012** a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in addressing tourism management issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012. .

17. East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)

Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(ix)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.12; 29 COM.7B.10; 31COM 7B.21; 33 COM 7B.19

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 26,350 for the preparation of management plan in 2006

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March – April 2005: UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining;
- b) Logging;
- c) Over-exploitation of coconut crab and marine resources;
- d) Invasive species.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854>

Current conservation issues

While a management plan was approved for East Rennell in 2007, administered by a community organisation, the property is still not protected under national law as there is no national legislation for protected areas in the Solomon Islands. However, East Rennell is protected under customary law. A draft World Heritage Protection Bill, which was outlined at the time of inscription in 1998, is still at a standstill due to the lack of financial and technical resources necessary for its finalisation and implementation. The World Heritage Committee has previously called upon the International Community to provide further financial and technical support for the conservation of the property, and recommended that the State Party consider requesting International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund for actions necessary to secure its protection (Decision **33 COM 7B.19**).

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report, which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). Therefore, the state of conservation of the property is difficult to assess.

Recent media reports suggest that commercial logging may threaten the property, as well as adjacent areas in West Rennell (the property comprises only the eastern part of Rennell Island). IUCN notes that the forest located within the property's boundaries is intrinsically linked to the forests in West Rennell. On its own, the East Rennell forest is insufficiently large to ensure the long-term survival of endemic birds. At the time of inscription IUCN noted proposals for mining and forest clearance on West Rennell, which would have serious conservation consequences on the property's Outstanding Universal Value if they had proceeded. IUCN recommends that the State Party, in collaboration with the East Rennell Chiefs Council, should explore the possibility of aligning the conservation of East and West Rennell's forests with the REDD-plus program (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) as this could potentially lead to sustained and predictable finance to support alternative local development strategies, and reward local institutions and communities for safeguarding this exceptional site.

The World Heritage Centre note additional media reports suggesting that the East Rennell Chiefs Council considers that the local population is not receiving benefits from the island's World Heritage status, for example in terms of income generating activities. IUCN recalls that

at the time of inscription, it was hoped that World Heritage status would encourage the development of eco-tourism in East Rennell.

IUCN has also received reports that the Australian Government, through the Australian Aid Agency (AusAid), is supporting a heritage and governance capacity-building project in the Solomon Islands. This is a positive step forward and may contribute to improving the property's management.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that without detailed information from the State Party, it is not possible to objectively assess the state of conservation of the property. They also note that East Rennell does not have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and consider that the forthcoming Periodic Reporting process for Asia and the Pacific will provide a good opportunity to assist the State Party in developing one.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.19**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session;*
4. *Welcomes reports that the Australian Government, through the Australian Aid Agency (AusAid), is supporting a heritage and governance capacity-building project in the Solomon Islands, which may contribute to improving the property's management;*
5. *Notes with concern reports that commercial logging may be threatening the property and adjacent areas in West Rennell;*
6. *Reiterates its recommendation that the State Party seeks International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the establishment of a more effective protection and management system for the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property together with information on the status of the World Heritage Protection Bill, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

20. Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(vii) (ix)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

19 COM VIII.1 A.1; 33 COM 7B.22

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) mining and energy developments;
- b) fragmentation of natural areas due to human constructions and activities;
- c) invasion of non-native species;
- d) climatic changes.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/354>

Current conservation issues

From 20 to 27 September 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>, and the final report incorporated some factual corrections proposed by both States Parties.

On 9 April 2010 Canada submitted by email a joint report on the state of conservation of the property. A hardcopy reached the World Heritage Centre from the United States of America on 12 April together with the Memorandum of Understanding between the Province of British Columbia (Canada) and the State of Montana (United States of America) concerning Environmental Protection, Climate Action and Energy. The report of the States Parties addresses the issues raised in Decision **33 COM 7B.22**, and also reports, inter alia, on developments that have taken place since the reactive monitoring mission. The key issues considered in the Committee decision relate to transboundary cooperation, mining threats, wildlife connectivity, climate change impacts, and a number of other issues. The report below presents the relevant mission conclusions, the subsequent report from the State Party, and the observations of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

a) *Transboundary cooperation*

The mission noted the importance of managing the property holistically and recommended a review and strengthening of institutional arrangements related to management of the property, and initiatives for co-operative planning, management and research between Waterton Lakes and Glacier National Parks, possibly supported by a shared project funding resource, to make more effective use of resources. The mission also recommended further co-operation be fostered between the Parks and land and resource managers and key stakeholders in the Crown of the Continent ecosystem, and be supervised by the Crown Managers' Partnership. In particular this should encourage greater synergies with the Biosphere Reserves, First Nations and indigenous tribal groups, and environmental NGOs on issues of mutual interest. It noted that the entire Flathead basin, in Canada and the United States of America is important for protecting, maintaining and buffering the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, and recommended a single conservation and wildlife management plan be developed for the transboundary Flathead.

The States Parties report notes that on 9 February 2010 the Government of British Columbia (Canada) announced a new partnership with the State of Montana (United States of America) to “*sustain the environmental values of the Flathead River Basin in a manner consistent with current forestry, recreation, guide outfitting and trapping uses*”, which will “*establish new collaborative approaches to transboundary issues*”. The area covered by this agreement includes the World Heritage property. On 18 February 2010 the Premier of British Columbia and the Governor of Montana signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Cooperation on Environmental Protection, Climate Action and Energy. Representatives of the Ktunaxa Nation Council and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes spoke in support and signed the MOU as witnesses. A range of areas of work are identified for joint action. The States Parties report that the MOU resolves three decades of discussion and puts in place a new framework for cooperation and partnership, and a process of implementation is proceeding. The State Party of the United States of America notes additionally the importance of specific mechanisms for implementation such as transboundary assessments of forestry operations and cooperation on wildlife connectivity issues. The States Parties also report on transboundary assessments of ecological health and landscape change by the Crown Managers Partnership, including development of a landscape indicator for key species.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the historic signing of the MOU which is an extremely positive response to the needs for transboundary cooperation on the management, endorsed at the highest political level. The key need is now the follow up of the MOU with an effective programme of implementation and leadership, involving all parties to the MOU.

b) Mining threats in the Flathead watershed

The mission to the property reviewed mining threats to the property and considered that mining in the transboundary Flathead watershed would not be compatible with the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park. Accordingly, the Southern Rocky Mountains Management Plan (SRMMP) should be revised to provide for permanent prohibition of mining and energy development in the Canadian Flathead. The mission made additional recommendations on specific mining threats in areas around the property.

The States Parties report that the MOU noted above includes specific provisions to remove mining, oil and gas development and coal development as permissible land uses in the Flathead River Basin. Three immediate actions have been taken by the Province of British Columbia (BC). These include a no disposition notation that identifies that petroleum and natural gas rights will not be posted for tenure in the Flathead, a mineral and coal reserve to prevent acquisition of new mineral titles and coal tenures, and a Cabinet Order to prohibit the issuing of Mines Act permits in the BC portion of the Flathead River Basin. The Province is also amending the SRMMP to bring this into alignment with the commitment above. There

are 103 leases for oil and gas in the US portion of the Flathead which are non active due to a court ordered moratorium on all oil and gas production. Two Montana Senators have introduced legislation to the United States Congress to prohibit future oil and gas leases and mineral development within the United States portion of the basin, and announced their intention to seek withdrawal of existing leases. The States Parties note that the MOU is a significant response to the main concerns raised in the mission report, and the Committee's decision, in relation to the Flathead River Basin.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the signing of the MOU and the positive move by the Province of BC in rapidly taking actions, and the initiation of legislation in the United States of America to be highly commendable. This represents an immediate and effective response that fully addresses the most pressing issues of concern regarding mining threats to the property.

c) Connectivity in the wider ecosystem

The mission recommended that steps should also be taken to minimise the barrier to wildlife connectivity due to mining, transportation and communication lines and associated developments in the Crowsnest Pass of British Columbia and to plan and implement relevant mitigation measures. The mission recommended a long-term moratorium be placed on any further mining developments in south eastern British Columbia in a corridor providing vital habitat connectivity and to the Rocky Mountains World Heritage property in Alberta. Other measures should include minimising future infrastructure development and removal of unnecessary structures, maintenance of core natural areas and rehabilitation of degraded areas, and development of a pro-active plan for enhancing connectivity in the area.

The States Parties report recognizes the need to preserve wildlife connectivity in the Crown of the Continent ecosystem. The concerns noted in the report include those reviewed by the mission as well as other issues such as United States Route 2 and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad to the south of the property in the United States of America. Residential development is reported to be increasing in focal areas within the Crown of the Continent ecosystem, and United States communities in the main Flathead Valley are experiencing growth. Loss of habitat, loss of connectivity and wildlife conflict from property development and construction are stated to be of major concern to site managers, particularly to the south and southwest of the property. The Mist Mountain Coalbed Gas Project is at the appraisal and design phase, and whilst noted to be outside the Flathead watershed is considered to have the potential to disrupt continuity. Oil and gas leases have also been announced in the reservation east of the property but are stated to be not near the property, but there are adjacent and older leases. In January 2010, five oil companies agreed to relinquish 29,000ha along the Rocky Mountain Front, just south of the property adding to previously relinquished areas. 41,000 acres remain under licence whilst a total of 111,000 acres has been retired in this area. A number of assessments of connectivity issues are being undertaken.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that habitat connectivity remains a challenge, both from the potential impacts of mining and other development as noted by the mission, but also a number of other sources of concern that are considered significant by the States Parties. Connectivity issues are of concern in both Canada and in the United States of America, as noted above. It will be essential that both States Parties and the state/provincial and local authorities are increasingly vigilant about the possible impacts of infrastructure, industrial and residential development. Both effective research and monitoring, and continued effective land use planning and environmental impact assessments are long term requirements. All developments that have potential to impact on wildlife connectivity should ensure that they do not have impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. This need will be facilitated by the commitment made in the MOU that the States Parties will collaborate on environmental assessment of any project of cross-border significance that has potential to degrade land or water resources.

d) Climate Change impacts

The mission recommended that specific programmes of management and associated monitoring and research should be developed to combat climate change impacts for the property, and that further promotion of trans-border co-operation in monitoring and research should be undertaken.

The States Parties report notes that cooperation on the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change is a specific commitment of the MOU. The property benefits from the Climate Change in Mountain Ecosystems research programme in Glacier National Park that links to many international initiatives. The report notes specific commitments to a number of partnerships related to climate change issues, and to enhancing regional capacity. Waterton Lakes National Park includes climate change in its monitoring programme on ecological integrity and revised management plan, while Glacier National Park is part of a new United States Federal initiative attempting to address climate change over a large area of the northern Rocky Mountains, and are also involved in research and climate change scenario planning, including a number of initiatives whose results will be made available to international audiences.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the progress being made in addressing climate change issues, and note that the property includes examples of innovative practice that would be of benefit to other States Parties, and therefore encourage the United States of America and Canada to investigate opportunities to more actively develop international partnerships to transfer learning on climate change adaptation to other settings.

e) Other issues

A number of other issues are raised in the States Parties reports, or were considered by the mission. Mountain pine beetle is a native pest that is causing significant mortality of pine forests in Glacier National Park, covering an area approaching 10,000 ha. Although the States Parties and the mission note current forestry practices are considered compatible with the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, there are possible threats to wildlife connectivity and fish habitat from possible measures to counteract this infestation. The States Parties report on the systems to regulate such initiatives and that the MOU also provides for transboundary assessment of any proposals that could affect land and water resources. Visitation has fallen to levels of the early 1990s in Glacier National Park, whilst there are plans to increase visitation to late-1990s levels in Waterton Lakes. The States Parties also note positive projects in relation to dust abatement, ecological restoration, and further enhancing visitor experience of the property.

The mission also recommended that increased efforts should be made to harmonise the management of the Akamina-Kishinena Provincial Park area with the property and to incorporate it into the property, as was recommended at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List. Canada has noted that mining, commercial logging and hydroelectric development are prohibited in Akamina-Kishinena, and that adding it to the World Heritage property would not change the protection it affords to that part of the Flathead watershed in British Columbia. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to consider further the possible inclusion of this protected area as an extension of the property.

In summary, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider there has been a very positive progress by the States Parties in responding to the Decision of the World Heritage Committee, and welcome the new and very significant initiatives on transboundary cooperation, and the strong new commitments to removing mining threats from the Flathead River Basin. These developments also accord well with key recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission to the property. An effective and ongoing programme of implementation of this agreement is required and promises significant benefits to the overall management of the property, the Flathead River Basin, within the wider setting of the Crown of the Continent ecosystem. A range of management challenges remain, as noted above, and the States Parties will need to consider jointly threats to wildlife connectivity in relation to development plans in both Canada and the United States of America, to ensure that the Outstanding

Universal Value of the property is considered in development strategies and plans. The property also offers opportunities for learning about climate change adaptation that are of wider relevance to World Heritage properties in other regions. Further reporting on these matters should be a priority in relation to the consideration of this property in the forthcoming Periodic Reporting exercise for the Europe and North America Region.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.22**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the results and recommendations of the September 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property;*
4. *Congratulates the States Parties, and in particular the Province of British Columbia (Canada) and the State of Montana (United States of America) and first nations representatives, on signing the new Memorandum of Understanding regarding the Flathead River Basin, including the property, which promises significant progress in the transboundary management of the property, in the context of its wider setting, and encourages the States Parties to ensure its effective, ongoing implementation through the development of specific joint programmes and projects;*
5. *Welcomes the commitments made by the Province of British Columbia to remove mining threats from the Flathead River Basin, and the initiatives in the United States of America regarding extinction of mining licenses, which address significant concerns regarding potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Takes note of the ongoing threats to the property from possible impacts on wildlife connectivity arising from issues outside the property, including residential, industrial and infrastructure development, and forestry practices, in both Canada and the United States of America, and requests the States Parties to jointly ensure that connectivity is considered as a key factor in planning and environmental assessment of such developments, in order to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Encourages the States Parties to share their experiences in the development of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies with other World Heritage properties;*
8. *Also requests the States Parties to give particular attention to the above issues, and the responses to the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, in their reports on the property during the second cycle of the Periodic Report for Europe and North America.*

21. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(viii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.23; 31 COM 7B.24; 32 COM 7B.18

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of overall management plan;
- b) Excessive tourism development;
- c) Pumice-pit mining.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/908>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2009, the State Party submitted a report on the World Heritage property and on 1 February 2010, it provided another document to the World Heritage Centre entitled « Management plan of Aeolian Islands UNESCO WHS » and an updated report on the state of conservation of the property. This document contained a chapter regarding “recommendations by UNESCO” which is intended by the State Party to be its submission on the state of conservation of the property. The report comments on the outstanding questions of implementation of points 6(b) to 6(i) of the World Heritage Committee Decision **31 COM 7B.24**, which were reiterated in Decision **32 COM 7B.18**.

The State Party report considers the mining issue as well as the additional points mentioned. The key points in its response are as follows:

- (i) In response to the request to permanently stop mining, the State Party reconfirms that there was a definitive closure of pumice quarries in the property on 31 August 2007, seizure of mining machinery, and impounding of quarried material and that National Law 394/1991 bans any possible resumption of activity.
- (ii) In response to the recommendation to set a deadline for the removal of stockpiles material, the report indicates that the Sicilian regional industry authority is arranging a plan for removal, but first requires completing a preventive ecological assessment. No firm timetable is stated for completion of this action.
- (iii) In response to the request to prepare a management plan for the property, the State Party presents an extensive document of nearly 300 pages in length, in an English translation, of which the report on the conservation of the property is an annex. The

plan preparation process is summarized in the State Party report and details of progress in relation to governance arrangements during 2008.

- (iv) In relation to the designation of a management entity and provision of funding, the information provided in the report of the State Party mainly concerns 2008. The report indicates that the National Park of the Aeolian Islands, established in 2007 is regarded as the management body with primary responsibility for the World Heritage property, which is stated to be included fully within the national park boundaries. The report notes that this also ensures the availability of stable funding (stated to be at the level of 350,000 Euros at normal annual levels, and a higher amount during the establishment of the park). The management plan is also noted as providing a means to channel regional funds to the property, and notes 500,000 Euros was provided to the Sicilian region by the Foundation UNESCO Heritage of the Sicilian Region in December 2009 to increase awareness of Sicilian World Heritage.
- (v) In relation to the request for a comprehensive impact assessment of the impact of proposed port enlargement at Lipari, including impacts on the property, the State Party notes that the project is “currently under evaluation”, although it appears likely that this statement relates to 2008-09. The report further notes that the port is not within either the inscribed property, its buffer zones or the National Park area, and notes the environmental constraints that are considered to exist in relation to such developments.
- (vi) In relation to the proposal for vegetation and mining restoration projects, the State Party reports that a restoration project is being considered in conjunction with the removal of stockpiled pumice stone, under the leadership of the Municipality of Lipari and supported by the National Park and Sicilian Region. The State Party also refers to the establishment of an eco-museum to be supported by structural funds 2009-13, which will include provisions for communication about the values of the property.
- (vii) In relation to the ratification of the redrawn boundaries of the proposed Lipari Reserve, the State Party report indicates this has been completed and that they will apply for a minor boundary modification.
- (viii) In relation to the consideration of a regional park for the Aeolian Islands, the State Party indicates that this matter has been addressed through the establishment of the National Park for the Aeolian Islands.
- (ix) In relation to the proposal to re-nominate the property to consider additional natural criteria and coastal habitats, the State Party indicates that this matter will be considered by the National Park, taking into account relevant expert advice.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the achievements indicated by the State Party, highlighted by progress towards the establishment of a National Park, and also the presentation of the Management Plan for the property. IUCN has clarified with the State Party the process of establishment of the National Park, which is considered to be well advanced through the establishment of the relevant legal instrument, the agreement of the relevant budgets and the necessary consultations that are currently underway. The State Party will provide additional information as the stages towards launching the park on an operational basis are achieved. It is likely that the full process of establishment will take upwards of a further year of work. IUCN has also reviewed the management plan submitted by the State Party, which appears to be a comprehensive basis for management of the World Heritage property. Detailed operational plans based on the management plan will clearly need to be established at a future stage of the project, and in conjunction with the establishment and inauguration of the governance and the operational management of the National Park on site.

The management plan appears to cover in a comprehensive way the range of natural and cultural values of the area, and thus could provide an appropriate basis for integrated

management, should the State Party consider a re-nomination in line with the previous suggestions of the World Heritage Committee. IUCN also notes that there are continued discussions regarding port development in Lipari. Whilst these appear to be located outside the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it will be important that any such developments are considered through a rigorous process of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which should include, inter alia, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also consider that the quarrying issue that was a key source of concern in relation to the state of conservation of the property appears to have been comprehensively addressed, although the follow up actions to fully remediate the past impacts will take some time to complete. In summary, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there is a good basis for assuring the future of this World Heritage property based on the actions undertaken and planned by the State Party. They look forward to the completion of the actions regarding conservation issues, and the finalisation and inauguration of the National Park for the Aeolian Islands as an effective managing agency for the property, in partnership with the other relevant stakeholders.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 32nd session (Québec City, 2008),*
3. *Takes note of the comprehensive information provided on the progress in addressing the previous decision of the World Heritage Committee, and welcomes the achievements towards the establishment of the National Park for the Aeolian Islands, and the preparation of a management plan for the property;*
4. *Notes the reported progress in addressing the actions requested by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **31 COM 7B.24** and requests the State Party to ensure full completion of the restoration projects that have been commenced or are being planned;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to transmit copies of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) for the restoration projects and other projects that could affect the property to the World Heritage Centre, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is considered in EIAs for any proposals for port developments at Lipari;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property including progress with the establishment of the National Park and the completion of restoration projects within the property.*

22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.31; 32 COM 7B.24; 33 COM 7B.28

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 63,528 for Preparatory Assistance and Training

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001: UNESCO / IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of adequate management regime;
- b) Uncertain legal protection;
- c) Pollution;
- d) Illegal timber harvesting;
- e) Gas and oil pipeline project across the World Heritage property (issue solved);
- f) Illegal construction on the Lake shore;
- g) Illegal sale of land;
- h) Tourism development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754>

Current conservation issues

Since the 33rd session, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information about the re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) and its likely impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of Lake Baikal. In a series of letters dated 16 November 2009, 24 December 2009, 19 January 2010, 4 February 2010, 26 April 2010 and 6 May 2010 the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to comment on the re-opening of the BPPM. Only on 2 June 2010 a letter was received from the State Party which provides detailed information on the BPPM, which is currently under review. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received the following information from a number of sources.

a) *Re opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill*

On 13 January 2010 the State Party approved Decree No.1 "On the introduction of amendments to the list of activities prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Natural Area", making amendments to the "List of activities banned in the central ecological zone of the Baikal Natural Territory" adopted in 2001. This decree removes paragraph 12 of the List: "ban on the production of cellulose, paper, carton, or derivatives thereof without using waste-free systems of industrial water usage", therefore making it again possible for BPPM to operate without using a closed water cycle. With a closed water cycle, the plant would operate without discharging wastewater into the Lake. The new decree also permits the storage, processing, disposal and incineration of all waste, including hazardous waste. According to the information received BPPM began re-opening in late December 2009 and

officially reopened in January 2010. IUCN has received reports that wastewater from the mill is currently being discharged into Lake Baikal.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that since the property's inscription in 1996, the Committee has expressed concerns about the mill's discharge of toxic wastewaters into Lake Baikal and highlighted the importance of eliminating this issue by putting in place a closed-loop water treatment system. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that as early as 1997 the State Party began developing a strategy to convert the BPPM to a closed-loop water system and thereby minimise pollution. However, despite several attempts, the full conversion of the mill has proven elusive for a variety of reasons, including lack of funding. In its 2008 report, the State Party had noted that a close-loop water system was to be operational in September 2008. However, the mill reopened in January 2010 without this system in place, and therefore all its wastewaters are discharged directly into the lake. In addition, it is unclear which wastewater treatment systems are actually in place to minimize levels of pollution.

The Russian Academy of Sciences has been undertaking research on Lake Baikal for over 40 years and documented the impacts of the mill. The mill's operations, including bleaching of pulp with chlorine, creates several toxic by-products such as dioxins and chlorinated furans. There are long-standing concerns that these toxic by-products are adversely affecting the ecological balance between the native Baikal plankton and other algae, and therefore disrupting the Lake Baikal ecosystem. The high levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) and dioxins detected in the endemic Baikal seal population (the only freshwater seal in the world) are attributed to the discharge of the mill's toxic waters into the lake and atmospheric pollution due to burning of toxic waste. A mass death of Baikal seals in 1987 was attributed to the BPPM's accidental discharge of a large quantity of untreated water. Moreover, as indicated in the report "*On the state of Lake Baikal and measures for its protection, 2007*", prior to its closure in 2008 the mill caused 51% of all atmospheric emissions, discharged 86% of all wastewaters entering the lake, and created 42% of all solid waste.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the reopening of the mill without a close-water system and the discharge of waste water into Lake Baikal could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and urge the State Party to rescind Decree No. 1 "*On the introduction of amendments to the list of activities prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Natural Area*". Moreover, they strongly recommend that the State Party evaluate various mitigation scenarios for the BPPM, including a cost-effective close-loop water system or total phasing out of the mill if cost-effective mitigation measures are not possible.

Phasing out of the mill would require a long-term strategy associated with the development of alternative livelihoods for the local people as the mill is the main source of employment in the region. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that there is little doubt that Lake Baikal has tremendous potential to develop tourism, ecotourism and other activities based on its natural and cultural values; activities which would contribute to preserving its unique biodiversity.

- b) *Other conservation issues of concern – pollution of the Selenga river, unplanned tourism developments, conservation status of the Baikal seal and the likely impacts of climate change on the Lake Baikal ecosystem*

In Decision **33 COM 7B.28**, the Committee noted with concern that the heavy metals in the Selenga River, which is the main tributary to Lake Baikal and constitutes 50% of its freshwater inputs, exceeded the maximum allowed concentrations. While a joint Buriatia/Mongolia research project to monitor the pollution load of the Selenga River is ongoing, few concrete pollution minimisation measures have been put in place. The Selenga River is reported to be still heavily polluted, despite improved wastewater treatment in Ulan-Ude. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that comprehensive joint programme between the States Parties of the Russian Federation and Mongolia to address this issue is needed.

Concerning developments on the shores of Lake Baikal, IUCN notes that it has received reports that a marina with 5000-7000 beds is planned within the territory of the Republic of Buriatia. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN request the State Party to clarify the extent of this development and submit its Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre when this becomes available and prior to granting permission for the development. They also recall that in Decision **33 COM 7B.28** the Committee had noted with concern that the measures taken by the State Party to halt illegal constructions on the shores appeared ineffective, and had requested the State Party to develop and implement a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property to guide the delivery of sustainable tourism infrastructure.

While the official population of the endemic Baikal seal is between 70,000 and 100,000 individuals (based on visual estimates), there are concerns that these figures do not coincide with the smaller number of individuals observed in the area the Ushkani Islands which is the seal's preferred habitat (the seal is relatively rare in other areas of the lake). There are also concerns about the impacts of hunting licenses on their population, particularly as these licenses are not effectively controlled. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN strongly recommend that the State Party resume funding for long-term monitoring of the seal population, which as indicated below is likely to also be affected by climate change and reduction in ice cover.

A recent peer-reviewed article 'Climate Change and World's "Sacred Sea" – Lake Baikal, Siberia' (BioScience, 2009) demonstrates that Lake Baikal is already being affected by climate change, based on an analysis of water temperature and ice cover. By the end of the century the lake's ice cover, upon which its endemic plankton and Baikal seal depend, is likely to significantly recede, leading to changes in Lake Baikal's ecosystem. Moreover, melting permafrost may exacerbate the effects of current industrial pollution and accelerate the release of stored toxic chemicals, such as polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) and dioxins, into Lake Baikal. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the impacts of climate change should be monitored over the long-term and adequate mitigation measures developed and implemented based on early detection of emerging trends.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN express their concern over the impacts of the re-opened Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and recommend that the Director of the World Heritage Centre in cooperation with IUCN convene a meeting with the Russian authorities, with the participation of relevant stakeholders, to discuss how these impacts can be addressed.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.28**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes with serious concern the recent re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) without a close-loop water system as well as the continued pollution from the Selenga river, and considers that the ongoing discharge of polluted waters from the mill and the Selenga river could impact the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal;

4. Strongly urges the State Party to rescind Decree No. 1 “On the introduction of amendments to the list of activities prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Natural Area”, which permits the disposal of wastewaters from paper mills into Lake Baikal;
5. Urges the State Party to immediately consider various mitigation scenarios for the mill, including rapidly developing and implementing a close-loop water system;
6. Encourages the State Party to develop and implement a long-term alternative livelihoods strategy for the town of Baikalsk, and notes that Lake Baikal has significant potential to develop sustainable tourism and other activities based on its natural and cultural values;
7. Reiterates its request to ensure long-term monitoring of the seal population and to halt illegal constructions on the shores of the Lake;
8. Requests the State Party to clarify the extent of the planned marina within the territory of the Republic of Buriatia and submit its Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre prior to granting permission for the development, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Calls upon the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to convene a meeting with the Russian authorities and relevant stakeholders, in cooperation with IUCN, to identify how the impacts of the recently re-opened Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property can be addressed;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by **1 February 2011**, on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular progress made in stopping the discharge of toxic water into Lake Baikal, addressing continuing high-levels of pollution in the Selenga River, developing a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property, and monitoring the Baikal seal population and the impacts of climate change on the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1996; extension 2001

Criteria
(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.25; 31 COM 7B.26; 32 COM 7B.23

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1997: IUCN fact-finding mission; 2004: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission; 2007: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal salmon fishing;
- b) Gold mining;
- c) Gas pipeline;
- d) Development of a geothermal power station;
- e) Forest fires;
- f) Boundary changes;
- g) Construction of the Esso-Palana road.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property dated 1 March 2010. This report provides an update on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission, particularly those aimed at strengthening the protection and management of the property, as well as clarification on the status of geological prospecting and mining within Bystrinsky National Park, a component of the serial property, as requested by Decision **32 COM 7B.23**.

The serial property is comprised of six protected areas, including two federal Nature Parks (Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve and South-Kamchatka Sanctuary) and four National Parks (Nalychevo, Bystrinsky, Klyuchevskoy and South-Kamchatka).

a) *Legal protection and management*

The State Party reports on the implementation of the 2007 monitoring mission recommendation relating to protection and management of the property as follows:

- i) Establish an effective management structure for the entire property. The report notes that previously four Terrestrial State Institutions (TSIs) managed the four regionally administered Nature Parks. These have been merged into a single 'Volcanoes of Kamchatka' TSI. The report also indicates that new Volcanoes of Kamchatka Regulations are being produced to improve the level of environmental protection of the property. According to the report this centralized management structure for the regionally administered components of the property will enhance their conservation and effective management and allow for the setting up of an improved monitoring structure.

The report also announces the approval of new 'Volcanoes of Kamchatka' Regulations, which fix their specific protection and land use regime and regulates resource use restrictions for the 4 regionally administered nature parks. The report unfortunately provides no further details but IUCN has received information from other sources that the new regulations permit certain development activities which were previously banned, including geological prospecting and mining. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned by this information and recommend to request the State Party to submit copy of these regulations, in one of the working languages, to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible. They note that the 2007 mission concluded that the protection status of the nature parks was not sufficient to protect their integrity and could allow certain activities that are incompatible with World Heritage status. Therefore the 2007 mission recommended

to upgrade them to National Parks, as originally foreseen in the nomination, or to revise their zoning, foreseeing adequate integrally protected zones to ensure conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that this issue needs to be addressed urgently. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the establishment of the centralized management structure for the 4 regional components of the property but reiterate the need to set up an overall coordination structure for the entire property, covering the two federal administered and the four regional administered components.

- ii) Develop an integrated management plan for the entire property. The report notes that an integrated management plan for the property is currently being drafted with the support of the UNDP/GEF project "Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast" but is not yet finalised. However, it is not clear from the report if this plan will consider all 6 components of the property or only the 4 Nature Parks. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate that an overall management plan for the entire property is necessary, with management objectives based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
- iii) Develop or revise the management plans for each of the component parks. The State Party reports that the management plans for all the component parks of the property have been updated. However, it is unclear whether the plans define their management objectives based on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, as recommended by the 2007 mission nor how they will be resourced to ensure their implementation. It is also unclear whether the recently updated management plans for these parks include a revision of their zonation to better conserve their biodiversity values, as recommended by the 2007 mission. No information was provided on the recommendation of the 2007 mission to establish an access policy for the nature parks as part of their management plans.
- iv) Precisely set all boundaries for the property within the management plan through geo-referencing. The boundaries identified at the time of inscription were geo-referenced in 2009, as recommended by the 2007 mission. While no boundaries were changed, geo-referencing revealed that most of the property's components are larger than originally indicated at the time of inscription: The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this work and recommend the State Party to submit updated detailed maps of the entire property as soon as possible.
- v) Staffing and budgets of the property. The report provides information on the staffing of the property and the budgets of the 4 Nature Parks. The report notes that ranger numbers continue to be insufficient in relation to the size of the property. This is in particular the case for the nature parks. The report notes that to address this issue anti-poaching brigades were set up at the regional level, drawing on staff of other control agencies. Budgets of both the Federal and Regional components of the site also remain inadequate to meet management needs.

b) *Mining*

In 2009, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted NGO reports concerning plans to change the regulations of Bystrinsky National Park to allow geological prospecting, as well as plans to alter park boundaries in order to accommodate mining. The State Party confirms that no mining or geothermal projects is taking place in the property and that no geological prospecting has taken place in any of the component sites, nor is it foreseen in the future. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this confirmation but remain concerned about the new 'Volcanoes of Kamchatka' Regulations which according to information received by IUCN would permit geological prospecting within the Nature Parks.

c) *Salmon poaching*

While the State Party has not submitted a scientific report on the state of conservation of the salmon population across the property, information is provided on the current status of these populations and the impact of poaching. While salmon fishing is prohibited in the two federal protected areas, regulated commercial, sport and indigenous fishing are permitted in the Nature Parks in line with set quotas established by the Federal Fishing Agency (and not by the administration of the Nature Parks) at specific fishing sites. The following specific information is provided:

- i) Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve. Kronotsky Reserve has one of the largest salmon spawning populations and populations are stable and not adversely affected by over-fishing or poaching.
- ii) South-Kamchatka Wildlife Sanctuary. The Sanctuary is located on the largest red salmon spawning area in Asia and the report notes that the annual fish spawning run exceeds 2 million salmon but that poaching pressure is high. The Reserve management has tightened control over the southern boundary of the park.
- iii) Nalychevo Nature Park. The park's rivers are easily accessible by road, which facilitates high levels of poaching. 2008 data from the Kamchatka Fisheries Institute for the Nalychevo River indicate that the volume of poached salmon is between 77% and 93% of the total spawning run. The red salmon population, with 93% illegally poached in 2008, is at greatest risk. The State Party reports that actions implemented to address poaching include prohibition of net fisheries, delegation of power to anti-poaching patrols, and creation of a buffer zone to the west of the Nalychevo river estuary.
- iv) Bystrinsky Nature Park & Klyuchevskoy Nature Park. No commercial fishing is undertaken apart from subsistence salmon fishing by indigenous communities to meet their needs. The report indicates that no poaching has been detected in these areas.
- v) South-Kamchatka Nature Park: While in 2009, official salmon catches were relatively low, there are high-levels of red caviar poaching ongoing in the north of the park, and ranger patrols have reported abandoned poaching camps on the eastern coast of the park. Overall, the Kamchatka Fisheries Institute is reported to consider the state of salmon populations in this park relatively satisfactory, despite important poaching levels.

The State Party reports that the number of anti-poaching brigades patrolling the four Nature Parks have increased significantly, and that a range of other measures are being implemented to address poaching, including eliminating the conditions promoting commercial poaching, and deploying additional checkpoints on key roads during the poaching season.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the data provided on the salmon populations but note that the report does not show salmon population trends since the time of inscription. However, the data provided indicate the important pressure from salmon poaching in three components of the property. This is an issue of major concern and efforts are needed to further increase the number and frequency of anti-poaching brigades and road checkpoints in these areas. IUCN notes that the anti-poaching brigades were created in part with the financial support of the UNDP/ GEF project scheduled to end in 2010 and WWF. The State Party should be requested to ensure that adequate financing is provided to anti-poaching brigades, in case external funding is running out.

IUCN also received information about the approval of a 2010 driftnet fishing season, with quotas set at approximately 48.5 million pounds of salmon for Russian and Japanese vessels in the Russian Exclusive Economic Zone (including the Kamchatka peninsula and the Bering Sea). This is of concern as it may affect the viability of the salmon populations which return to the property's watercourses to spawn. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN

request the State Party to provide information on the likely impacts of driftnet fishing on the salmon populations of the property.

d) *Poaching of wildlife*

The State Party report provides figures on the current populations of selected species within Kronotsky State Biosphere Reserve, but no data on population trends of key wildlife species across the entire property. IUCN has received information from experts working on site that there have been significant declines in the population of certain species. Apart from salmon, species that show worrying declines include wild reindeer and bighorn sheep. IUCN has received reports that the wild reindeer population within the property, which had remained stable over the last 10 years fell significantly in 2009 and that big horn sheep populations has fallen by up to a factor of three over the last seven years. A current hunting ban for bighorn is due to end in 2010, and IUCN considers that a more integrated approach, backed by adequate financing, is necessary to address the decline of the bighorn population within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the need to undertake regular monitoring of key wildlife species through aerial and terrestrial surveying and to provide information on results from these.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress made in the implementation of some of the recommendations of the 2007 mission. However, they express concern about the marked decline of several key wildlife species within the property and the increased salmon poaching. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the urgency of strengthening the management and protection of the property, in particular by developing an overall management plan and coordination structure for the property and measures to upgrade the protection status of the nature parks. They are concerned about reports that the new Volcanoes of Kamchatka Regulations would allow development activities that are incompatible with World Heritage status including mining and geological prospecting.

Draft Decision: **34 COM 7B.23**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.23** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Welcomes the State Party's efforts to improve the management and protection of the property, including the ongoing work on the development of a draft integrated management plan and the clarification of the boundaries of the property;
4. Requests the State Party to submit as soon as possible a detailed updated map of the property, as well as a copy of the integrated management plan;
5. Expresses its concern about the reported continued decline of several key wildlife species within the property, including pacific salmon populations, which demonstrates the urgency of further strengthening the management and protection of the property, as recommended by the 2007 World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission;
6. Further expresses concern about the reported weakening of the legal protection of the property through the enactment of the Volcanoes of Kamchatka Regulations and also

requests the State Party to submit a copy of these Regulations to the World Heritage Centre in one of the working languages of the Convention before **1 November 2010**;

7. Reiterates its request to the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission, particularly the need to strengthen the protection of the four regional Nature Parks and the development of an overall management plan and coordination structure;
8. Recalls its invitation to the State Party to consider enacting a national law for the management of all natural World Heritage properties in order to address the issue of joint management plans, frameworks, standards and funding allocation for all natural properties composed of both federal and regional protected areas;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including data on trends of the populations of the major wildlife species within the property since its inscription and on progress in the implementation of all the recommendations of the 2007 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1999

Criteria
(ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.32; 32 COM 7B.25; 33 COM 7B.29

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

- a) April 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission; May 2009: High-level visit by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan ;
- b) Weakening of conservation controls and laws;
- c) Impacts of proposed tourism infrastructure development for Olympic Games;
- d) Road construction;
- e) Deforestation.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/900>

Current conservation issues

On 27 January 2010, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party, together with a map indicating the location of the Olympic facilities. The report provides information on the Olympic facilities, efforts to establish clear boundaries and buffer zones for the property, information of the management of the property, as well as a summary of monitoring data for the last 10 years. The same version of the report was again submitted on 10 March 2010.

From 17 to 21 May 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring visited the property, as requested by the Committee at its 33rd session. The mission was able to hold discussions with different stakeholders, including representatives of the Ministry for Natural Resources and the Russian National Commission for UNESCO, the management authority of the Kavkazkiy Strict Nature Reserve (KSNR), representatives of the administration of the Adygea Republic (which is in charge of the administration of the 3 Nature Monuments and Nature Park included in the property), the Sochi 2014 organising committee, Olympstroy and Gazprom (companies involved in the construction of the Olympic facilities) as well as NGO representatives. The mission report is under preparation at the time of writing of this report and will be available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>.

The mission reviewed progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre /IUCN monitoring mission. The following issues were reviewed:

a) Construction of facilities and infrastructure for the 2014 Olympic Games

The mission was pleased to note that the Olympic Mountain Village and the Biathlon Complex were relocated to the Psekhako Ridge and the sliding centre to the Rosa Khuta area, away from the ecologically sensitive Grushevy ridge and upper Mzimta valley where they were originally planned, as recommended by the 2008 mission. The mission team visited the new locations in the Gazprom concession on Psekhako ridge and concluded that the new location, situated several kilometres away from the boundary of the property is minimizing the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. Other facilities in the concession, such as ski slopes and the VIP facility appear to be at least one kilometre from the boundary.

The mission also reviewed the issue of the access road to the facilities on Psekhako ridge. This road follows the right bank of the Achipse river, which according to the map in the nomination file is the boundary of the property, for approximately 100 meter, before crossing the river, following its left bank in the envisaged buffer zone before moving away from the boundary, to the ridge. It was agreed with all stakeholders that the access road should be designated as the boundary of the property until the river crossing, from where the boundary would follow the river bed, upstream, as determined in the official map for nomination of the property. No constructions should be allowed near the road. The mission was informed that no other access roads to the Olympic facilities and crossing the property are planned.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for having implemented the recommendations of the 2008 mission to minimize the impacts of the Olympic facilities on the property. They note that some indirect impact may remain, in particular on wildlife hibernation areas or migration routes and therefore support the recommendation of the mission to establish a comprehensive monitoring programme which would monitor impacts of all new facilities on wildlife trends and movements around the property and in Sochi National Park and to ensure continued cooperation and consultation between the Sochi 2014 organising committee and the Reserve authorities, as also recently suggested by the recent UNEP mission of 28 – 30 January 2010.

b) Buffer zones and delimitation of the property

The State Party announced that recent changes in federal legislation ensure that the buffer zones of federal protected areas such as the KSNR are now under the authority of the Federal Government and have the same protection status as the Reserve. As a result, the legal protection status of the northern buffer zone of the Reserve, which is actually part of the property, has been restored, as recommended by the 2008 mission.

Efforts are also on-going to establish a buffer zone to the south of the property, as recommended by the 2008 mission. The mission was informed that a proposal for a buffer zone with a minimum width of 1 km was submitted to the Ministry of Natural Resources, which is currently consulting with the different ministries and regional authorities as foreseen by law. It is expected that the proposed buffer zone will be approved in the coming weeks.

Work is also on going on to complete the exact definition of the geographic coordinates and legal documentation of the boundary the boundaries of the KSNR, and the registration of its territory in the National Land Registry. While the process is completed for most of the Reserve, several court cases are currently on-going over the boundary in the Adygea Republic, opposing the Federal Government to the Government of the Republic. However, the State Party expects that the process can be completed by September 2010. The same process also needs to be followed for the 3 regional Nature Monuments and Nature Park. The registration of the boundary of the property, especially on the northwestern limit, is of particular importance due to the presence of highly sensitive areas like Lagonaki plateau and other areas of ecological importance. The mission considers that clarification of the boundaries should be finalised in the nearest future, in order to remove all ambiguities regarding the exact location of this border and note the importance of ensuring that the agreed boundaries of the inscribed property are fully recognised in national and regional laws.

c) Issues affecting the integrity of the Nature Monuments and northern buffer zone included in the northern part of the property situated in the Adygea Republic

The 2008 mission noted a number of developments in the Nature Monuments which are part of the property and situated in the Adygea Republic, which were considered incompatible with the World Heritage status. These included illegal logging, construction of a roads and recreational facilities.

Illegal logging

The State Party reported to the mission that all illegal logging was stopped since November 2008 and that only sanitary cutting was taking place in the Nature Monuments in accordance with the forest legislation. The mission team overflew the area and, while it is difficult to sometimes distinguish between recent and old logging from the air, it was of the opinion that some logging is still on-going, although to a smaller extent than in 2008. While the ongoing logging might be considered as sanitary cutting in relation to forest legislation, the mission team clearly considered it incompatible with the World Heritage designation.

Recreational facilities

The mission noted that new cabins had been constructed at Lunnaya Polyana and that also construction is continuing on the Biosphere Centre. The mission received reports that this facility continues to be used for recreational use, contrary to the recommendation of the 2008 mission. The mission notes that while these developments might not be contrary to the national protection status of the Nature Monuments, the unplanned development of recreational facilities is not in accordance with the World Heritage Status.

Road construction and power line construction

According to the State Party, works on the access road to Lunnaya Polyana were stopped after the 2008 mission and the road was used by the forestry department only. However the mission noted that the road is used to access the recreational facilities at Lunnaya Polyana

and observed that moreover some recent improvement works were conducted, inside the Nature Monuments and close to the border of the KSNR.

The mission was also informed by NGO representatives of other road constructions which are on-going around the Lagonaki plateau with funding from the Federal Government and which according to the NGOs, are entering the World Heritage property, more precisely the northern buffer zone, which is part of the property. This concerns the tarmac roads Dakhovskaya village – Lagonaki plateau and Guzeripl settlement – Lagonaki plateau. According to the State Party, road works were stopped at the point where the road enters the property. A power line is reportedly also under construction along the road. The mission overflow part of the Guzeriple road but was unable to evaluate if the road entered the property. In any case, the construction of a tarmac road is a significant investment, and does not seem justified to improve access to the small settlements close to the Reserve.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain very concerned about the uncontrolled developments in the Nature Monuments and buffer zone situated in the Adygea Republic and stress the need to address these issues urgently, as recommended by the 2008 mission. A key issue seems to be the low protection status of the Nature Monuments, which allows certain developments which are not in line with their World Heritage status. In addition, as these Monuments are managed by the Government of the Adygea Republic, the Federal authorities have difficulties in enforcing stricter conservation measures. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party considers upgrading the protected status of these areas, for example by including them in KSNR. However, as other World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation, which are also including regionally administered protected areas, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a solution could be the elaboration of a special legislation for World Heritage sites, ensuring that all components of the properties, whether administered by the federal or regional levels, are under direct supervision of the Ministry for Natural Resources. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that this recommendation was also made following the mission to Volcanoes of Kamchatka World Heritage property in 2007.

d) *Tourism development on Lagonaki plateau, Mt Fisht and Mt Oshten*

The State Party confirmed to the mission team that tourism activities in Lagonaki are limited to backpacking along established routes, but that the Adygea Republic continues to develop plans for ski facilities in this area. However, so far these plans have not been approved, as they are situated on the KSNR and its buffer zone. The on-going court cases on the delimitation of the boundary of KSNR seem related to the same issue, and the heavy investment in tarmac access roads to the area could also be explained by these plans for developing ski facilities.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate that the development of ski and other mass tourism facilities is not consistent with the World Heritage status of this area and therefore plans for these facilities should be abandoned, in line with the recommendations of the 2008 mission. They also note that many projects are currently ongoing to develop different kinds of tourism and recreational facilities in and around the property and that these developments do not seem coordinated and are lacking a strategic vision. They consider that certain low impact tourism activities could be developed, without affecting significantly the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, provided an overall sustainable tourism strategy and comprehensive plan for the property and adjacent protected areas is developed. A similar recommendation was made by the recent UNEP mission, in view of the on-going development of tourism activities across the entire Mzimba valley.

e) *Preparation of an overall management plan*

An overall management plan was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre as requested by the Committee at its 28th session and reviewed by the mission team. While the plan addresses the most important issues related to the property, and sets some clear objectives and expected results, the mission team recommends that in order to facilitate its

implementation more detailed operational plans now be developed, specifying the operational activities that will be undertaken to achieve the set objectives as well as timeframes, budgets and responsibilities. Moreover, the mission considers that the key element still needed to successfully implement the plan is the creation of an overall coordination body, which would represent all services at federal and regional level, in charge of managing the property, and include representatives of the civil society. The State Party agreed with the need to set up this body and announced that this structure would be officially established by the Minister for Natural Resources.

f) Development of a corridor to Teberdinsky Strict Nature Reserve, extension of Sochi National Park and reintroduction of the Persian Leopard (Panthera pardus saxicolor) to the property

The State Party announced to the mission team that in early May, a decree was signed by the Prime Minister to establish an ecological polygon, creating a strictly protected corridor linking the property with Teberdinsky Strict Nature Reserve, thus creating a continuous strict protected area over a length of 200 km in the Caucasus Mountains. In addition, a decision was also made to extend the Sochi National Park, thereby connecting the two components now forming the park. The State Party also informed the mission of an on-going reintroduction programme for the Persian Leopard into the Caucasian Mountains.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome these important developments and note that the creation of a large protected area cluster is necessary to guarantee the success of the leopard reintroduction project. They note that the reintroduction will significantly add to the value of the property under criterion (x) and that the connectivity to Teberdinsky and the extension of Sochi National Park will also strengthen the overall integrity of the property. They further recall a proposal of extension of the property to include Teberdinsky as a serial extension, which was deferred by the Committee i.a. because of the lack of connectivity to KSNR. The Committee recommend that the State Party consider re-submitting a proposal for extending the property and including Teberdinsky and the corridor within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the State Party has made noteworthy advancements in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 mission, in particular in limiting the impacts of the 2014 Olympic Games, preparing the overall management plan of the property, efforts to establish a buffer zone in the south and the delimitation of the property. However, while the integrity of the KSNR is considered good and while it will be further strengthened through the corridor to Teberdinsky, they remain very concerned about the integrity of the Nature Monuments and Nature Park as well as the northern buffer zone and Lagonaki plateau which are part of the property, and stress the need for an urgent and full implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 mission on this issue.

The recommendations of the 2008 mission were updated to take into account the progress made.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.29**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*

3. Commends the State Party for its decision to relocate the Biathlon Complex, sliding venue and the Olympic mountain village away from the ecologically sensitive Grushevy ridge and upper Mzimta valley, in order to limit their impacts on the World Heritage property;
4. Welcomes the progress made in implementing some of the other recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, in particular the development of an overall management plan for the property, the restoration of the legal protection of the northern buffer zone which is part of the property, the development of a southern buffer zone and the delimitation of the property;
5. Expresses its concern about the continued threats to the integrity of the Nature Monuments, Nature Park and northern buffer zone as well as on the Lagonaki plateau, which are all part of the property, as a result of planned or existing development activities such as logging, tourism infrastructure developments and road developments;
6. Requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2010 mission, which update the recommendations of the 2008 mission, in particular:
 - a) Establish a comprehensive programme to monitor the impacts of all Olympic facilities and tourism facilities on wildlife population trends and movements around the property and ensure continued cooperation and consultation between the Sochi 2014 organising committee and the Reserve authorities,
 - b) Halt all infrastructure developments which are affecting the integrity of the property (in particular tourism and road infrastructure), in particular in the Nature Monuments, Nature Park and northern buffer zone situated in the Adygea Republic and abandon any plans for recreational use and development of the Lagonaki plateau,
 - c) Stop logging activities, including so-called sanitary cutting, in particular in the Nature Monuments, Nature Park and northern buffer zone situated in the Adygea Republic, rehabilitate the logged areas and monitor their recovery,
 - d) Upgrade the protection regime of the Natural Monuments and Nature Park, either by including them in the Strict Nature Reserve, or by ensuring that all development activities in contradiction to their World Heritage status are prohibited,
 - e) Finalise urgently the exact definition of the geographic coordinates and legal documentation of the boundary of the property and the establishment of a buffer zone on its southern boundary and submit an updated map of the property to the World Heritage Centre,
 - f) Establish a coordination body for the entire property, to ensure the implementation of the overall management plan, and develop and implement operational plans for its implementation,
 - g) Develop an overall sustainable tourism strategy and comprehensive plan for the property and adjacent protected areas, privileging low impact tourism activities which can be developed without affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Invites the State Party to consider addressing the issue of overall management plans, management frameworks and management standards for all natural World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation composed of federal and regional protected areas through a national law for the management of natural World Heritage properties that meets the State Party's obligations to the Convention;

8. Welcomes the decision by the State Party to create a strictly protected corridor which will link the property to the Teberdinsky Strict Nature Reserve and invites the State Party to complete its designation as soon as possible, and to consider submitting a proposal for the extension of the property to include both these areas;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

25. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(vii) (ix)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

21 COM VII.41; 22 COM VII.27; 33 COM 7B.31

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed gold mining;
- b) Boundary issues.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719>

Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.31** of the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Committee's previous consideration of this property was related primarily to the excision of a portion of the property to create an enclave for gold mining. The State Party provided supplementary information on this proposal during the session of the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Committee decision expressed serious concerns about this proposal, requested the State Party to not proceed with any development that would impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, to comply with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and to state unequivocally that no commitment had been made on mining concessions within the boundaries of the inscribed property.

In addition to reporting on the main issues that were raised by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party report contains information regarding the general land protection

regime for the property, the monitoring regime and planning and management arrangements. These provide useful background information regarding the property and have been noted by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

Creation of mining enclave

The State Party reports that in 2008 the Federal Real Estate Cadastre Agency marked out the boundaries of the national park, resulting in an increase in total area of the National Park. This exercise appears to be the same exercise that was mentioned in supplementary information submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 26 June 2009, immediately before the discussion on state of conservation at the 33rd session of the Committee, stating that *“as a result of land-marking [...] the “Chudnoe” area was recognised as located out of the “Yugyd Va” National Park.”*

The State Party report states that *“the problem of mining operations carried out in the northern section of the park remains one of the most severe up to the present moment. It notes that “there were some plots that were under development long before the park opening”* and refers to a quartzitic sand field named Zhelannoye, two granitic sand fields named Obeiz and Skyviu, the mine Chudnoye, a gas pipeline (SRT0-Torzhok), and a drinking water pipeline. The report notes that the environmental safety regulations had been toughened after the opening of the park, and that the mentioned activities are in operation *“practically without any environmental damage”*. Moreover, the State Party notes that these areas are outside of the Park, implying that the boundary exercise has also excised these other areas.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are deeply concerned by the report of the State Party, and that none of the requested actions in the previous decision of the World Heritage Committee have been undertaken. Since modifications to boundaries of World Heritage properties must be considered by the World Heritage Committee, the results of the national exercise to modify the national park and remove former mining areas from protected status appears to have result in legalizing mining activity within a World Heritage property. No information was received from the State Party regarding these developments, although this is requested in Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN understand that the changes to the boundaries of the Yugyd Va National Park, which lies within the World Heritage property, were legally adopted on 18 January 2010. On 30 of December 2009 Gold Minerals, CJSC a subsidiary of GV GOLD (Vysochaishy, OJSC) obtained a license for exploration and production of hard rock gold at the Chudnoye deposit (Komi Republic). The area of the license is 19.9 km² and the license is valid until 2029. The Company's website report of February 2010 (available at <http://www.gvgold.ru/en/press/news/article.aspx?article=9c537f40-8ecd-4265-9cee-83b2b39215a5>) notes that *“at the moment the Company proceeded to designing of the exploration operations, preparation of permits, licenses and approvals and elaboration of the feasibility study for investments into the commercial development of the deposit. The first explored gold reserves of the deposit amount to 2.3 tons. The deposit has a significant exploration potential of 80.3 tons. It is characterized with high gold grades in ore (4-9 g/t) and may be developed using the open cast mining method. [...] On the first stage, the Company plans to invest about US\$ 71 million into development of the Komi project, including: US\$ 12.2 million - into the exploration operations, and US\$ 58.8 million - into construction.”*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that it has been determined that the Chudnoye area lies well within the boundaries of the National Park and would result in direct and indirect impacts on the property if reactivated for mining. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recall that in the previous report on the state of conservation of the property it was noted that these issues had been previously considered at the 21st session of the World Heritage Committee, and that at the 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998), the Observer Delegation of

the Russian Federation had confirmed that all gold mining activities had been halted and that the areas concerned were under rehabilitation. IUCN understands that in 1998 a plan to exclude lands associated within industrial activities from the territory of the national park was assessed by a Russian expert commission as a threat to the park, including the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. A negative decision was passed by the State Environmental Committee (Order 408 of 3 July 1998). No details of the other developments referred to are provided by the State Party, and whilst the presence of a pre-existing water supply may not pose a large ongoing threat, the impacts of a gas pipeline and three other quarried areas could be more significant.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that permitting mining the property is also directly contrary to the clearly stated policy that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, as recognised by the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) and other industry lead bodies, and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee. Proceeding with a 20 km² open cast gold mining development within the World Heritage property would have significant potential to lead to impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value. Considering the past advice of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the *de facto* licensing of mining within the Virgin Komi Forests World Heritage property could potentially present a basis for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.31**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Strongly regrets that the State Party appears to have licensed a significant open cast gold mining operation within the World Heritage property, and has also excised other areas from protected status, and also regrets that the State Party did not take into account the previous requests of the World Heritage Committee in taking these actions;*
4. *Notes that the boundaries of the World Heritage property as inscribed by the Committee have not been amended, and therefore requests the State Party to reconsider its recent boundary demarcation exercises in order to restore the protected status of all areas within the World Heritage property, including all areas that have recently been excluded from the Yugyd Va National Park;*
5. *Strongly urges the State Party of the Russian Federation to take all necessary steps, with provincial and local government as appropriate, to immediately halt mining activities within the property;*
6. *Calls on all companies holding licenses for mining in the World Heritage property, with the support of their investors, to not proceed with mining activities, in line with the international policy statement of the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties, as also endorsed by the World Heritage Committee;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, in order to review the mining threats to the property,*

to confirm the integrity of its boundaries, and to advise on the effectiveness of the protection and management of the property;

8. ***Further requests** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, focusing specifically on the halting of mining and the restoration of all areas of the property to protected area status, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

30. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1984

Criteria
(vii) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.31; 31COM 7B.38; 32 COM 7B.31

International Assistance:
Total amount provided to the property: 2001: USD 20,000: oil spill impact evaluation; 2003: USD 30,000: Joint integrated management workshop with Iguazu National Park Authorities (Brazil)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
September 2006 UNESCO Mission; April 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of hydropower dams;
- b) Illegal logging and hunting;
- c) Uncoordinated developments;
- d) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- e) Lack of sustainable financing;
- f) Problems associated with public use;
- g) Lack of a comprehensive public use plan.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/303>

Current conservation issues

On 29 December 2009, the State Party submitted a report (in Spanish) on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides an update on scientific research on the key values of the property, which is useful as baseline data for monitoring as well as for reviewing the management plan. It also provides a brief overview of the progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre/ IUCN monitoring mission, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.32**.

a) *Trans-boundary cooperation*

The State Party reports that an international agreement with Brazil has been developed covering joint management and monitoring of Iguazu and Iguazu National Parks, which is in the process of being signed. The report notes that this agreement will give priority to the revision of the management plan for the properties and focus on issues of public use in the area of the waterfalls, as well as capacity building to enhance the management of the

properties. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the development of an international agreement between Brazil and Argentina is a positive step towards creating a permanent and effective mechanism for transboundary cooperation; however it is considered essential that the Parks' administration at the local level in both countries be empowered and resourced to ensure the effective implementation of this agreement. The State Party is invited to submit a copy of this agreement to the World Heritage Centre when it is signed.

b) *Coordinated revision of management plans*

The report notes that during 2009, the Iguazu and Iguazú National Parks' administrations met several times to discuss joint management and key issues relating to public use and visitor management. It was agreed that a joint public use strategy should focus on how to address the following issues: (a) increasing visitation; (b) impacts from public use on biodiversity and aesthetic values; (c) prevention and mitigation mechanisms; (d) capacity needed to effectively address these measures; and (e) how to enhance the quality of the visitor experience, in keeping with the World Heritage status of these properties. Whilst the report notes that an Action Plan has been prepared between Argentina and Brazil to jointly address key management issues, it does not provide information on its implementation status. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the input of an external expert may be beneficial to the joint management plan revision process, and that the State Party could be invited to submit an International Assistance Request to organise a series of joint management planning workshops. IUCN is willing to facilitate expert advice through the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) in this regard.

c) *Hydroelectric dams*

The State Party report noted the results from a study on variations in the water volumes of the Iguazu River and Falls carried out in 2008. This study clearly shows that the variations in the water-level at the falls are dependent on the water released from the dams, and that in general the level of water is lower than would be expected based on normal variations in rainfall. Whilst this study has not assessed the impacts on biodiversity, it shows that the quality of the water released from the dams does not show high levels of pollution. It is noted in the State Party report the need for joint monitoring of water flows and their impacts on the biodiversity and aesthetic values of the properties. However, no information is provided on the timeframe for the development of joint monitoring activities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not report on point 5 of Committee Decision **32 COM 7B.32** concerning the implementation of an early warning system to alert the World Heritage Committee of any plans to develop a hydroelectric project on the Iguazu River that would adversely affect the property. They also note that the 2008 mission reported that a dam (programmed within the National Development Plan of Brazil) is planned somewhere within the 25km between the falls and the existing Salto Caxias dam.

d) *Biodiversity*

As noted above, the State Party report provides a number of scientific studies on the flora and fauna of the property. These studies conclude that these values are generally in a good state of conservation. However, it is noted that conservation could be substantially enhanced by linking the property with remaining forest areas in the Paraná ecoregion through the development of biological corridors.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome these studies, which provide important baseline data for monitoring biodiversity, and recall that the "Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck", a stretch of privately owned land in Argentina that is a key biological corridor between the two properties, is threatened by agricultural development and should be jointly

monitored by both State Parties, as its deforestation is increasingly limiting genetic flows between certain species' populations, which is increasing the vulnerability of jaguar populations and the resultant shifts in forest ecosystem dynamics.

e) *Public use and development of alternative tourism activities*

The report notes that the Project Araucaria XXI – Atlantic Forest, funded by the *Agencia Espanola de Cooperacion Internacional para el Desarrollo* (AECID), is supporting a number of actions aiming to enhance the management of the property through different models of sustainable tourism including the involvement of local communities. This project is complemented by the Caburei Project, funded by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), which is promoting sustainable development activities, including tourism, in the buffer zone of the property, thus creating additional options for visitors in order to reduce the pressure from tourism to the property. Furthermore, the report notes that a new regulation (Resolution APN No. 146/09) on nautical excursions and boat services has been approved and introduces rigorous measures on environmental control, capacity and types of boats, and frequency of activities that will contribute to limit the visual impacts in the area of the falls. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved by the State Party in developing alternative tourism activities in the buffer zone surrounding the property, and note that if these are further developed they may contribute to reducing the unmanageable peaks in visitation currently experienced at the property.

In conclusion, while the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved in the implementation of some of the recommendations of the 2008 mission, many of these remain only partially implemented. They urge the State Party to fully implement the mission's recommendations.

Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.30**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.32**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Welcomes the development of an international agreement between Brazil and Argentina covering the joint management and monitoring of Iguaçu and Iguazu National Parks, which when signed and effectively enforced, should provide a permanent and effective mechanism for transboundary cooperation, and invites the State Parties of Argentina and Brazil to submit a copy of this agreement to the World Heritage Centre once it is signed;
4. Notes the initial meetings between Iguaçu and Iguazu National Parks to jointly revise both properties' management plans, and also invites the State Parties of Argentina and Brazil to submit an International Assistance Request to organise a series of joint management planning workshops;
5. Encourages the State Party of Argentina to develop a more detailed research and monitoring strategy for key species and to ensure that adequate funding is secured for its implementation;

6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party of Argentina to fully implement the recommendations of the 2008 mission, including the communication of information to the World Heritage Centre regarding any plans for the development of further hydroelectric projects that could affect the property*
7. *Further requests the State Party of Argentina, in coordination with the State Party of Brazil, to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress on signing the joint management agreement, progress in joint revision of both parks' management plans, studying the impacts of weekly variations in the water volumes of the Iguazu River and Falls on the property's scenic and biodiversity values, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

31. Iguazu National Park (Brazil) (N355)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(vii) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

1999- 2001

Previous Committee Decisions

30COM 7B.31; 31COM 7B.39; 32 COM 7B.32

International Assistance:

Conservation, total amount: USD 30,000.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Approximately. USD 50,000 under the Brazilian World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for fire fighting planning.

Previous monitoring missions

March 1999 IUCN mission; April 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of hydropower dams;
- b) Pressure to re-open illegal road;
- c) Illegal logging and hunting;
- d) Uncoordinated developments;
- e) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- f) Lack of sustainable financing;
- g) Problems associated with public use;
- h) Lack of a comprehensive public use plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/355>

Current conservation issues

On 11 March 2010, the World Heritage Centre received the State Party's Portuguese language report on the state of conservation of the property. Upon request, a French

language translation was subsequently delivered on 6 April 2010. The report provides a brief overview of the progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre/ IUCN monitoring mission. To date, the State Party has not submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.32**.

a) *Trans-boundary cooperation*

The State Party reports that an international agreement between Brazil and Argentina has been developed covering joint management and monitoring of Iguazu and Iguazu National Parks, which is in the process of being signed. However, the report does not specify whether the agreement also covers research, resource protection, and public use oriented towards preserving the values of the property, as recommended by the 2008 mission. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the development of an international agreement between Brazil and Argentina may be a positive step towards creating a permanent and effective mechanism for transboundary cooperation; however it is considered essential that park administrations at the local level in both countries be empowered and resourced to ensure the effective implementation of this agreement. The State Party is invited to submit a copy of this agreement to the World Heritage Centre when it is signed.

b) *Coordinated revision of management plans*

The report notes that during 2009, the Iguazu and Iguazu National Park administrations met several times to discuss joint management and monitoring issues, and in particular the immediate actions required to reduce the impacts of public use in both parks, as recommended by the 2008 mission. As a result of these meetings, the State Party reports that some management actions were immediately undertaken, but does not specify which ones. The report also notes that a number of longer-term joint management actions are currently being planned, but does not indicate when the coordinated revisions of the two management plans will be completed and what the mechanism for its approval would be as to ensure its further implementation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the input of an external expert may be beneficial to the joint management plan revision process and that the State Party could be invited to submit an International Assistance Request to organise a series of joint management planning workshops. IUCN is willing to facilitate expert advice through the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) in this regard.

c) *Hydroelectric dams*

The State Party reports that studying the impacts of weekly variations in the water volumes of the Iguazu River and Falls on the property's scenic and biodiversity values is a priority. The 2008 mission recommended that the aim of this study should be to develop a monitoring process to track water-level change and regularly inform decision-making. Due to budget restrictions the park authorities are seeking to undertake this study through various research institutes, which are currently developing project proposals and investigating funding opportunities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the weekly variations in water volumes across the Iguazu River and Falls due to the closure of the Salto Caxias dam on weekends (when energy demand is low) has significantly degraded both the scenic and biological values of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not report on point 5 of Committee Decision **32 COM 7B.32** concerning the implementation of an early warning system to alert the World Heritage Committee of any plans to develop a hydroelectric project on the Iguazu River that would adversely affect the property. They also note that the 2008 mission reported that a dam (programmed within the National Development Plan of Brazil) is planned somewhere within the 25km between the falls and the existing Salto Caxias dam.

d) *Biodiversity*

The report indicates that a research project focused on the carnivores, and in particular the jaguars, of Iguazu began in October 2008. This study is based on the collection and collation of information from previous jaguar studies carried out in Iguazu National Park. The project also intends to evaluate the landscape within and around Iguazu National Park in order to propose potential habitat improvement measures. During the course of 2009, the management team of Iguazu National Park defined a number of research priorities, including research on endangered species and those species noted in IUCN's 1986 evaluation report. The report notes that researchers investigating endangered species benefit from the support of the Iguazu National Park management team, particularly as regards lodging, transport and guides.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the carnivore research being undertaken in Iguazu, as well as the identification of research priorities, but consider that a more detailed research and monitoring strategy for key species should be developed, and adequate funding secured for its implementation. They recall that the "Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck", a stretch of privately owned land in Argentina that is a key biological corridor between the two properties, is threatened by agricultural development, and should be jointly monitored by both State Parties as its deforestation is increasingly limiting genetic flows between certain species' populations which it is considered increases the vulnerability of jaguar populations to collapse, and resultant shifts in forest ecosystem dynamics.

e) *Public use and development of alternative tourism activities*

The report notes that the Iguazu National Park team is undertaking a programme to identify and develop sustainable tourism potential in the areas surrounding the park, as recommended by the 2008 mission; however the report does not provide information on the timeline for finalising and implementing this programme. The objective of this programme is to develop tourism activities in surrounding municipalities in order to divert visitation away from the falls area. In one of these municipalities, the programme has developed a tourism circuit through which visitors can discover organic food production and participate in adventure activities. In this way, and taking into account the specificities of each municipality, the State Party hopes that tourism activities will create alternative livelihoods which may in turn alter the pattern of resource use in the areas surrounding the park. The programme also aims to disseminate information on tourism potential in surrounding municipalities to tourism operators based around Iguazu Falls.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved by the State Party in developing alternative tourism activities in the municipalities surrounding the property, and note that if these are further developed they may contribute to reducing the unmanageable peaks in visitation currently experienced at Iguazu Falls.

f) *Developing a qualified ranger corps*

The State Party reports that members of the Iguazu National Park's management team have proposed that a ranger corps training programme for the park be developed based on similar successful programmes in Argentina and the United States of America. The report recalls that decree n.6515 of 22 July 2008 instituted environmental security programmes in national parks. The State Party notes that these programmes have been complex to implement as they require the participation of the military police, which are not legally permitted to undertake environmental protection activities. The State Party concludes that it is therefore difficult to implement the 2008 mission recommendation to develop a qualified ranger corps that is specifically trained to address conservation issues. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that despite the acknowledged difficulties in training and deploying a qualified

ranger corps, it will be necessary to fulfil this recommendation as there are ongoing threats to the property's biodiversity values due to the lack of a qualified ranger corps. Therefore it is important to explore legal options, including the potential revision and amendment of the existing decree, to ensure the implementation of this recommendation.

In conclusion, while the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved in the implementation of some of the recommendations of the 2008 mission, many of these are still only partially implemented, or have not yet been implemented. They urge the State Party to fully implement the mission's recommendations.

Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.31**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.32**, adopted at its 32th session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the development of an international agreement between Brazil and Argentina covering the joint management and monitoring of Iguaçu and Iguazu National Parks, which when signed and effectively enforced should provide a permanent and effective mechanism for transboundary cooperation, and invites the State Parties of Brazil and Argentina to submit a copy of this agreement to the World Heritage Centre once it is signed;*
4. *Notes the initial meetings between Iguaçu and Iguazu National Parks to jointly revise both properties' management plans, and also invites the State Parties of Brazil and Argentina, to submit an International Assistance Request to organise a series of joint management planning workshops;*
5. *Encourages the State Party of Brazil to develop a more detailed research and monitoring strategy for key species and to ensure that adequate funding is secured for its implementation;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party of Brazil to fully implement the recommendations of the 2008 mission, to inform the World Heritage Centre of any plans regarding the construction of hydroelectric dams that may affect the property, and to explore legal options, including the potential revision and amendment of the existing decree, to ensure the development of a qualified ranger corps specifically trained in conservation issues to address the ongoing threats to the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party of Brazil, in coordination with the State Party of Argentina, to submit to the World Heritage Centre a Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 and, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report, on the state of conservation of the property, including progress on signing the joint management agreement, progress in joint revision of both park's management plans, studying the impacts of weekly variations in the water volumes of the Iguaçu River and Falls on the property's scenic and biodiversity values for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

34. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

1996-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7A.13; 32COM 7B.38; 33COM 7B.37

International Assistance

Conservation: 190,025 USD

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (in addition to approximately USD 100,000 of in-kind technical assistance) under the management effectiveness assessment project "Enhancing our Heritage"

Previous monitoring missions

1995 and 2000: IUCN monitoring missions; 2003 and 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal settlements;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing and agricultural intrusions;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Poaching;
- e) Invasive exotic species;
- f) Management deficiencies;
- g) Potential impacts from hydroelectric development project Patuca II.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/196>

Current conservation issues

In July 2009 the World Heritage Centre received a report from the State Party regarding the state of conservation of the property. The property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996 and removed from that List in 2007. In Decisions **32 COM 7B.38** and **33 COM 7B.37**, the Committee noted a number of remaining conservation concerns and urged the State Party to: fully implement the 2006 World Heritage Centre/ IUCN mission recommendations, expedite efforts to complete the action plan required for the effective implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 mission, and respond to the report on illegal logging by Global Witness. The State Party report provides an overview of the implementation of the 2006 mission recommendations as follows:

- a) *Assure swift and strict enforcement of the law regarding illegal settlement, land use and logging, particularly by ensuring the implementation of the full cycle of the law*

With regards to the increase in encroachment by agricultural and land use changes, the State Party reports that illegal settlement by a limited number of families has been detected and that their relocation is underway. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received various reports concerning large scale illegal settlement within the property, including the return of previously re-located and compensated families. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that this relocation alone is insufficient to address the larger issue of illegal settlement within the property. The report also mentions a recent study on the economic

valuation of environmental damage in Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve. While the study sheds light on the long term environmental costs of ecological damage, it does not constitute a response to ongoing violations of the law with regards to illegal settlement, land use and logging.

The State Party acknowledges that illegal logging continues to be a concern, and notes that in many cases the individuals involved in illegal logging activities have been identified by the authorities. IUCN has received reports that there is insufficient follow-up on violations of existing laws, including illegal logging, despite recognized enforcement efforts on the ground. IUCN considers that, although the precise details are subject to some debate, the data presented in the 2009 Global Witness report is by and large an accurate presentation of illegal logging practices affecting the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that despite the State Party's efforts to enforce conservation laws, illegal logging remains a serious threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Under the umbrella of an agro forestry scheme, twelve local cooperatives are permitted to harvest defined quantities of timber in line with specific management plans. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that this is a plausible and promising approach to introduce controlled logging in the buffer zone while encouraging local stewardship. The State Party report does not specify and discuss the achievements under the agro forestry scheme but is instead limited to tabular overviews of licenses granted to local cooperatives. Furthermore, the State Party report mentions and quantifies a number of confiscations of timber, in part supported by the military, but does not specify the follow-up and implications for the property.

Forest monitoring plots, in particular of big-leaf mahogany, are being set up by ICF (El Instituto Nacional de Conservación y Desarrollo Forestal, Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre), the national institution in charge of forests, wildlife and conservation, and supported by the United States of America (USA) through its Forest Service and United States Aid Agency (USAID). The State Party also reports that an independent monitoring system (Proyecto Monitoreo Forestal Independiente or MFI) covering timber and non-timber forest products, is being introduced. MFI involves a broad number of actors beyond the forestry sector and intends to increase participation and transparency in the illegal logging and trafficking of timber. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that these initiatives could contribute to addressing illegal logging and mitigate its impacts on the values and integrity of the property. However, as these measures are at an early stage of implementation, they are unlikely to yet have led to perceptible reductions in, or mitigation of, illegal logging.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the efforts underway to address illegal logging in Rio Platano Reserve, and note that law enforcement does take place despite logistical difficulties. The establishment and promotion of local cooperatives is widely considered a positive step towards establishing more sustainable forms of managing forests and land. However, they note that the lack of sanctions imposed on individuals involved in conversion of forests into cattle pastures, and illegal logging continues to be a barrier to effectively addressing this issue. They further note that the governmental institutions addressing illegal activities are isolated and receive limited support from other sectors and higher political levels. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party of Honduras take decisive action to discourage illegal activities which continue to occur on a large scale, and are reported to have increased lately.

b) Complete the cadastral process of all lands surrounding the property, and provide legal titles to the owners of these lands

In the buffer zone of Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve there is a scheme to negotiate and grant forest usufruct contracts to local residents based on a participatory process (usufruct is the legal right to use and derive profit or benefit from land that belongs to another person, as long as the land is not damaged). The lack of clear title to lands has been identified as one of the main challenges in regulating the advance of the agricultural frontier, and investment in

land stewardship. Community representatives have repeatedly requested modifications and amendments to this scheme, which were considered by the State Party. The State Party reports that negotiated settlements were usually reached and that overall, approximately 70% of usufruct contracts had been awarded to eligible residents in the various administration sectors of the property's buffer zone. The remaining land parcels remain under review. The State Party reports that a self-appointed "Lands Committee" (Comité de Tierras) and its lawyers have created unnecessary obstacles to progress in terms of regulating land tenure. It is acknowledged that the process of organizing land tenure is time-consuming with obstacles including logistics, and communication. It requires the building of trust and thus considerable time. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that while the awarding of usufruct contracts is not yet completed, and that other challenges remain with regards to the provision of legal titles to the owners of the land, the State Party's efforts in this regard are a positive step forward and should be continued and that the contracts should reflect a fair negotiation of interests.

c) Demonstrate effective participation of local organizations and communities in the management processes of the property

The State Party report notes that there is a strong legal basis for consultation in the realm of forests, wildlife and protected areas based on the establishment of "Community Consultation Councils" (Consejos Consultivos Comunitarios). The State Party expresses the hope that through the transboundary project "Heart of the Corridor" (supported by Global environment Facility (GEF), World Bank and the Central American Commission on Environment and Development), extending across to neighboring Nicaragua within the regional Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, there will be funding opportunities for increased participation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this initiative and consider that a strengthened and structured approach to involving local resource users will be essential to its success. This would also assist the effective response to the previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee, and related reactive monitoring missions.

d) Demonstrate that decommissioned wood is not re-entering the market, but disposed of in a manner that eliminates all profit incentives

The State Party report notes that legal tools have been established to prevent commercial use of confiscated timber. The report also notes that a manual providing guidance on the tracking of the chain of custody of timber has been prepared. However, the on the ground results are not clear from the report: i.e. whether the legal framework and the development of timber tracking methodologies have prevented the illegal selling of confiscated timber or discouraged illegal logging. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there is a need to further consider this issue and assessment of the effectiveness of the legal tools aimed at preventing commercial use of confiscated timber.

e) To quickly identify any new intrusions into the property and to deal with them swiftly, so as to further discourage this practice

As mentioned above, there is no specific feedback relating to this question which is in part addressed in points a) and b). From the information provided in the report, and comments provided by independent observers, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that there is no mechanism in place which would serve to quickly identify and react to intrusions. The use of the armed forces to monitor strategic entry points to the property is reported to have been discontinued.

The State Party provides a map in response to the request of the 2006 mission for a map showing the revised boundaries of the property and the rationale used for promoting any changes in the boundaries approved at the time of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. The submitted map does not provide clear information to assess these issues. The report furthermore mentions that the authorities are currently working on a new proposal for the revision of the boundaries of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN understand that despite the lack of clarity in the submitted maps, there are maps

available which do clarify the current situation. Both the maps and a clarification of the current process to re-consider the boundaries are still required.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that no further information is provided on the possible dam construction which may affect the property, and was previously considered an important threat to the property's values and integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note reports concerning cattle within the property (at Waraska) and 45 fishing camps, where commercial quantities of fish were photographed drying on makeshift drying racks. There are also reports of the Wahawala and Tiro valleys being invaded by settlers coming from the Paulaya River.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that despite further implementation of the 2006 recommendations, there remains strong concerns that illegal logging and illegal commercial fishing are not only being conducted, but appear to have increased considerably. There are also indications that families re-settled and compensated in 2002 to 2004 may have resettled in the land they had previously occupied and that the efforts to regulate tenure are facing challenges. Despite strong efforts at the national and local levels, the environmental authorities are somewhat isolated and often not in a position to follow through with their given mandate. Moreover, illegal activities such as logging do not result in appropriate sanctions. Given this situation, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that continued and increased efforts are required on the part of the State Party to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. The absence of a more systematic application of existing laws is a serious issue which is likely to lead to a degradation of the property and re-consideration of its inscription on the List of World Heritage Danger.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.37**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);*
3. *Commends the State Party for its continued efforts in implementing the recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Notes with utmost concern that deforestation is ongoing and appears to have increased considerably, mostly as a result of illegal logging and cattle ranching, and that intensive illegal commercial fisheries are taking place within the property, posing serious threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to strengthen its efforts to fully implement the 2006 reactive monitoring mission's recommendations, and in particular, recommendation (e) concerning effectively identifying and dealing with new intrusions into the property, and considers that further progress in addressing threats to the Rio Platano Reserve will require political recognition and support at the highest levels;*
6. *Strongly urges the State Party to systematically enforce existing nature conservation laws, and in particular anti-logging laws, as continued ineffective enforcement will lead to a degradation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*

7. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission in 2010 to assess the state of conservation of the property and progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2006 mission;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, focusing on i) the implementation of the 2006 monitoring mission recommendations, ii) information regarding any plans for the construction of a hydroelectric dam that might affect the property, iii) the provision of a map unambiguously illustrating the boundaries of the property and iv) an in-depth analysis of the status of illegal logging, land tenure regulation and involvement of local communities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

35. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2008

Criteria
(vii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8B.17

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal logging
- b) Growth in human population
- c) Tourism pressures associated with growth in visitor numbers and heavy concentration in specific areas
- d) Agricultural advances
- e) Forest fires

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290/>

Current conservation issues

On 9 February 2009 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report responds to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee (**32 COM 8B.17**) and provides an overview of ongoing conservation activities, including those aimed at halting illegal logging, promoting sustainable tourism and developing alternative livelihoods for local communities. A second report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 27 March 2010, providing further details.

a) *Illegal logging*

The State Party considers that illegal logging, although present within the property, is decreasing and that effective strategies are being implemented to counter this threat. Several government agencies coordinate anti-logging activities within the property. The budget for these activities was approximately USD 238,000 in 2008, and the State Party estimates that it could reach USD 2 million per year in 2009. Several timber control posts have been operational since 2004, anti-logging patrols are undertaken within the property, transport to and from the property is regulated, timber storage sites and timber mills are controlled, and two seizures of illegal timber took place during the course of 2008.

Community surveillance of illegal logging activities and forest fires supports the conservation and protection of the core and buffer zones of the property. These activities are led by local Environmental Surveillance Committees and covered 21,255 ha in 2008, including 4,681 ha within the core zone of the property. The State Party reports that the Mexican Fund for Nature Conservation also provided MXP 1,615,595 (approximately USD 129,092) for the implementation of two additional Participatory Surveillance Committees during 2009-2010. Additional forest management issues are discussed, including reforestation (13,191 ha had undergone reforestation as of 2008, representing approximately 23% of the property), pest control treatments, management of a disease causing the 'drying out' of trees, and the impacts of strong storms that occurred in October 2008.

The State Party also recalls that the Monarch Fund has implemented a landowner compensation scheme for the core zones of the property. The Fund compensated landowners that had active timber harvesting permits and no longer made use of them. Between 2000 and 2008, direct payments were made to 32 landowners, representing MXP 22,757,000 million (approximately USD 1.82 million). Moreover, between 2003 and 2008, the National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) provided payment for hydrological environmental services of MXP 3,898,857 (approximately USD 311,900) to local communities, which were linked to maintenance of forest cover.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party has attributed a considerable budget to anti-logging activities, and commends the agencies involved for taking a participatory approach to surveillance. They further note that several additional sources of funding directly and indirectly contribute to activities aimed at maintaining forest cover within the property. IUCN recalls that at the time of inscription in 2008, illegal logging was the main direct threat to the Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve and at sufficient levels that IUCN recommended deferral of the inscription. Despite the efforts of the agencies and local communities involved, 479 ha were logged between 2003 and 2005. While the State Party considers that illegal logging is decreasing, it is difficult to judge this trend as no data is provided on the number of hectares illegally logged between 2005 and 2008 in previous official reports. IUCN notes that during this time it has received a range of reports of observed illegal logging in the property. As the State Party report acknowledges that illegal logging is still taking place, whilst the trend may be decreasing, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that this issue clearly remains a critical threat to the property.

b) *Tourism impacts and community development*

The State Party reports that MXP 29 million (approximately USD 2,316,180) is being invested in creating and strengthening ecotourism and community development projects, with the support of the Program on Conservation for Sustainable Development (Programa de Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible - PROCODES), the Temporary Employment Program (Programa para el Empleo Temporal - PET), and other investors. A *Programme of Public Use* and a *Tourism Programme for Sustainable Development* are currently active within the property. The first programme covers control and mitigation of negative tourism impacts, and the second programme aims to provide alternative livelihoods to local communities. The State Party indicates that it is attempting to minimise some of the negative

impacts of tourism infrastructure by using local materials, applying bioclimatic architectural techniques and developing environmentally-friendly waste water management methods and renewable electricity. The remodelling of several ecotourism centres, which are the entry point to the property, and a number of additional public works within the property and along access roads are also being undertaken.

IUCN recalls that at the time of inscription in 2008, much of the tourism infrastructure detracted in a major way from the visual integrity of the sites visited by tourists. The Committee requested, in Decision **32 COM 8B.17**, that the State Party develop and implement, in the context of the 2007 Agreement of Collaboration between the Tourism Secretariat (SECTUR) and the National Commission for Natural Protected Areas (CONANP) on the Development of Nature-based Tourism, a detailed plan for sustainable use of the property and an effective benefit sharing mechanism for local communities as an incentive to enhance their support for its conservation. While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for securing considerable funding for creating and strengthening ecotourism and community development projects, they note that it is unclear whether an effective benefit-sharing mechanism is being developed. They request the State Party to submit the above tourism plans to the World Heritage Centre for review.

In addition to the above, the State Party reports that the Government of Mexico, Canada and the USA have jointly developed the North American Monarch Conservation Plan (NAMCP), which aims to protect and manage Monarch Butterfly breeding habitats in North America, and their over-wintering sites in Mexico. The State Party reports that during October 2008 a tri-national workshop was held to discuss Monarch Butterfly monitoring, which recommended that joint monitoring protocols be developed. The State Party also notes that the Management Programme, which has been in place since 2001, will be revised during 2010 and a new Programme instated by the end of 2011 for the long-term preservation of the Monarch Butterfly over-wintering sites. Moreover, MXP 8,671,356 (approximately USD 692,618), provided by the Mexican Fund for Nature and *Movimiento Azteca*, is currently being invested in 16 projects relating to community development, sustainable resource management, surveillance and restoration.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for securing new investment in ecotourism and community development. However, as no data is provided on the number of hectares affected by illegal logging since 2005, it is unclear how effective anti-logging activities have been to date, and significant concerns remain in this regard. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the World Heritage Committee (Decision **32 COM 8B.17**) requested a joint monitoring mission to the property prior to the 34th session in 2010 to consider the state of conservation of the property. This mission has been rescheduled due to logistical difficulties and will take place during the second half of 2010. The focus of this mission will be to determine the level of illegal logging ongoing within the property and the level of benefits sharing from visitation activities taking place within communities hosting the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee;

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 8B.17**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),

3. Commends the State Party for attributing considerable financial resources to anti-logging activities and for taking a participatory approach to surveillance, and notes that several additional sources of funding directly and indirectly contribute to activities aimed at maintaining forest cover within the property;
4. Notes with concern that observed illegal logging continues to take place within the property, and that this issue clearly remains a critical threat to the property;
5. Requests the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission scheduled to take place in 2010 to focus on determining the level of illegal logging ongoing within the property;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 November 2010** an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including detailed information on the areas affected by illegal logging, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

37. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(vii) (viii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31COM 7B.42; 32COM 7B.40; 33COM 7B.39

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,950 (Preparatory Assistance)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
20-24 March, 2010

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Development pressures associated with tourism and housing

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1161>

Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2010, the World Heritage Centre received the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property. From 20 to 24 March, 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009). The mission report is available online at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>.

a) *Ongoing development within the property*

The terrestrial portion of this small property (2,034 ha) is comprised of 68% private land holdings. Some of these consist of small lots (e.g. 0.1 ha) on which family residences or holiday homes are located, and a few consist of large holdings of up to 100 hectares or more, with many more of intermediate size. Until fairly recently, the larger holdings had been run as agricultural estates (coconut, cocoa) and some agricultural activity continues. With the advent of tourism, and to a certain extent, inscription onto the World Heritage List, landowners have witnessed rapid rises in property prices. In many cases owners seek to capitalize on these changes by either selling to resort developers, or becoming developers themselves by parcelling out their land and selling individual lots, or by seeking partnerships with international investors.

This property was inscribed in part due to its aesthetic attributes; the combination of the Pitons against the backdrop of green tropical vegetation and a varying topography combined with a marine foreground is an attribute that is essential to the natural beauty of the property. The land use pressures to which the property is currently subjected, if not very effectively managed, risk compromising its superlative natural beauty to the point where its Outstanding Universal Value may be permanently lost.

Whereas at the time of inscription, there were three larger resorts (Jalousie Estate, Ladera Resort, and Stonefield Estate) with a total of approximately 175 units (villas and hotel rooms combined), at the time of the mission four additional resorts had received at least preliminary approvals (Jalousie Enclave, Hotel Chocolat, Malgre Toute Estate and Beau Estate) which would result in a total of approximately 350 additional units, half of which would be located within visually sensitive lands between the two pitons, which are the key features of this property.

The State Party reported that though there was cause for concern over the approvals process for the Mignucci development mentioned in Decision **33 COM 7B.30**, it confirms that steps were taken to remedy the situation. The mission inspected this development, built on steeply sloping lands between the pitons, and noted that should this kind of development multiply in this area, it would be difficult to guarantee the visual integrity of the property and hence its Outstanding Universal Value. The mission also noted the presence of two very prominent telecommunications towers located on the summit of hills within the property and suggests that these be relocated in such a way as to minimize their visibility.

Given the small size of the property and sensitive nature of its values, including the natural aesthetic values that are in part the basis for its inscription, there is little tolerance possible for development impacts within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the need for decisive action by the State Party to immediately halt all ongoing development within the property until such a time that it can be demonstrated to the World Heritage Committee that the tools are in place to guarantee the protection of the viewscape from being disrupted by inappropriate development.

b) *Inadequacy of development control regulations*

There is good professional capacity in the land use planning unit of the Ministry for Physical Development and St Lucia has an established legal framework for land use planning. However, despite recent efforts, the effectiveness of the land use policy framework for the property, and the tools available in the decision-making process remain insufficient to guarantee protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. This situation resulted in an environment where accusations of arbitrary decision-making could be made. This gap was recognized shortly after inscription, and in an attempt to fill it, the State Party commissioned, with its own resources, an Integrated Development Plan for the property. In its State of Conservation Report, the State Party notes that, though having been approved by the Cabinet in 2007, the Plan “*fails to satisfactorily address the requirements for the sustainable development of the Pitons Management Area*”. Despite the admission that development regulations are currently unsatisfactory, large resort development applications

have been approved, in principle, directly by the cabinet (Malgretoute, Jalousie Enclave, Jalousie Estate), some of which were approved at the highest level in 2009. These decisions are clearly contrary to the World Heritage Committee request for a moratorium on further development (Decision **33 COM 7B.39**).

In response to this continuing need for development regulations focusing on conserving the property's Outstanding Universal Value, a set of "Specific Guidelines" has been drafted by the State Party with a view to controlling developmental activities in the property. These are provided in the State Party report in draft form. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have reviewed these draft guidelines and do not consider them to provide sufficient assurance that the visual integrity of the site will be protected. For example, the most visually fragile part of the property (e.g. around the base of, and between the pitons), minimum lot sizes of as low as 1,000 square metres are recommended, and a blanket "20 foot" height limit to buildings is recommended, regardless of terrain or location of the proposed building. Should this policy be exploited to its fullest, it could potentially result in several hundred additional homes between the two pitons (there were currently approximately 150 individual residences between the pitons at the time of the mission), many on very steep slopes. The State Party has been requested by the World Heritage Centre to await formal feedback from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN prior to formally adopting these guidelines. They reiterate that additional development incompatible with the property's Outstanding Universal Value will result in the loss of those values.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party immediately revise both the "Specific Guidelines" and any relevant land use plans and development control regulations to ensure that development within the property is strictly limited and any further development is not permitted, except under exceptional circumstances. Any exceptional permitted development should have no adverse impact on the integrity of the property, including in relation to its aesthetic values. A suggested approach would be to undertake a thorough study of topography and vegetation as a function of preserving the aesthetic values of the property. This information should serve to establish detailed and strict development policies, applicable at fine ground level resolution, strictly regulating the type, location and size of a limited number of any exceptional new constructions, and a clear basis for exceptional justification of development.

c) *Perceptions of World Heritage status*

Beyond the issue of development regulations, the mission team noted that the property would benefit from a regional development and public use planning exercise. Currently, there is no apparent overall vision for the property and its surrounding lands. Decisions are made in reaction to development applications, and there is some discord amongst various stakeholder groups as to what World Heritage status should mean for them. These groups (e.g. landowners, and resort owners within - and surrounding the property, the surrounding communities of Choiseul and Soufriere, government agencies and tour operators) should work together to develop a coordinated longer term vision for the region, focusing on conservation and economic development based on the natural attributes of the property.

The State Party reports that the current Pitons Management Area office will be transformed into an authority, giving it a greater mandate and decision-making powers. The mission team noted that, in its current state, this office is considered as a project under the Ministry of Physical Development and Environment, with a mandate limited to little more than communication. Giving this office a more pro-active role in the area, combined with assuring sufficient skills, staffing and resources, particularly in regards to promoting community development and conservation, could contribute to consolidating the integrity of the property.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that utmost concern exists regarding the Pitons Management Area. The pattern of insufficiently regulated development that has taken place, and the possibility of significant development proposals, may already have created a situation where the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be lost, a situation that would imply the eventual deletion of the property from the World Heritage List. Although efforts have been made to address this situation, the State Party itself has recognized in its report to the World Heritage Centre that these have been unsatisfactory. Despite this, it has continued to approve major developments with the potential to significantly and irreversibly affect its Outstanding Universal Value.

IUCN notes that it recommended that the World Heritage Committee defer the property at the time of inscription, due, in part, to its evaluation that there was a lack of effective capacity to protect the property from threats. IUCN regrets that the concerns it raised in this regard appear to have become a reality, and is additionally concerned that premature inscription of the property on the World Heritage List appears to have increased damaging pressures on the property, due to additional development pressures that have been experienced due to its World Heritage status. IUCN considers that the challenges facing this property illustrate starkly why effective protection and management, including in relation to the potential impacts of World Heritage Site status, is an integral part of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, and thus should be a material consideration of the World Heritage Committee when taking the decision to inscribe a property on the World Heritage List.

The lack of an effective system of development control, combined with significant shortcomings in relation to the management of the property, means that no guarantee of the protection of the property can currently be made. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that clear development regulations, which include specific consideration for the maintenance of the property's Outstanding Universal Value, are urgently required. In addition the management of the property needs to be reviewed and strengthened, including better engagement with communities and stakeholders. Under these circumstances, inscription onto the List of World Heritage in Danger is considered as a useful approach to ensure the full engagement of stakeholders at the national, and ideally, at the international level, so that the situation can be rectified as soon as possible.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with concern that despite the World Heritage Committee's request for a moratorium on development, the State Party has continued to approve major development applications;*
4. *Further notes with concern that the property's Outstanding Universal Value may have already been significantly, and potentially irreversibly, compromised by recent development approvals;*
5. *Reiterates its request for the State Party to urgently place a moratorium on the creation of new lots and on the construction of all new residential and hotel development until such a time as new effective regulations are in place to determine if and where such developments could be permitted;*

6. Strongly urges the State Party to immediately revise both the “Specific Guidelines” and any relevant land use plans and development control regulations to ensure that development is strictly circumscribed in order to avoid any deterioration of the property’s integrity, including in relation to aesthetic values. The draft planning and development control documents prepared to this end should be communicated to the World Heritage Centre prior to being formally adopted;
7. Urges the State Party to carry out a comprehensive regional development and public use planning process focusing on achieving a consensual multi-stakeholder vision on conservation and economic development, with specific regard to the property’s Outstanding Universal Value;
8. **Decides, in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines, to inscribe Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
9. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop corrective measures and a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the list of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, focusing specifically on progress in halting existing development permits within the property and establishing an effective development control system, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the event of continuing inappropriate development within the property, the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.**

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

42. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(i) (iii) (vii) (ix)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Reinforced monitoring mechanism applied to the property in 2008 (Decision 32 COM 7B.44) and discontinued in 2009 (Decision 33 COM 7B.42)

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.45; 32 COM 7B.44; 33 COM 7B.42

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 103,825 for fire suppression equipment; Master Plan development; and consultancies, such as a stone specialist for assessment of restoration work required on the Intihuatana stone sculpture.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for the social participation workshop requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **30 COM 7B.35**).

Previous monitoring missions

October 1997: IUCN/ICOMOS mission; October 1999: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission; February-March 2002: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission; October 2003: World Heritage Centre visit; April 2005: World Heritage Centre mission; April, 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reinforced monitoring mission; February 2010: World Heritage Centre urgent technical mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Delays in reviewing the Master Plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support for effective implementation;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail;
- d) Delays in the development and implementation of a public use plan;
- e) Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for the Machu Picchu village, immediately adjacent to the property and its main point of entry, which has impacted on the visual values of the property;
- f) Lack of effective management of the property;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;
- h) Inadequate governance arrangements including lack of adequate coordination of activities between different institutions and stakeholders involved in site management;
- i) Uncontrolled visitor access to the western part of the Sanctuary, related to the construction of the Carrilluchayoc Bridge.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/587/>

Current conservation issues

A joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reinforced monitoring mission to the property was carried out from 19 to 23 January 2009 (The report of the mission is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM>). The objectives of the mission were to assess the current state of conservation of the property and to develop jointly with the State Party an Action Plan to effectively and adequately address immediate issues that could potentially threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, focusing mainly on governance, risk preparedness, development at Machu Picchu Village and public use at the western access. The Action Plan, with timelines and costs for its undertaking, was agreed on and recommended for implementation in Decision **33 COM 7B.42**.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 2 February 2010 that provides detailed information on the actions implemented in response to the World Heritage Committee's decision at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

a) Implementation of participatory and conflict resolution workshops to improve governance at the site

The State Party reports that during 2009, Machu Picchu Historic Sanctuary Head Office, from the National Service of State-Protected Natural Areas (Servicio Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas por el Estado-SERNANP) and INC/Cusco (Instituto Nacional de la Cultura) Machu Picchu Archaeological National Park Head Office implemented several participatory workshops with the population of rural areas to examine conflicts regarding housing, applicable regulations, dissemination of the Master Plan, etc. It provides a list of workshops implemented, topics addressed and number of participants.

The World Heritage and the Advisory Bodies take note of the State Party's continuing activities focused on awareness rising and recognize their importance as a means to engage in participatory decision-making for the property. The results still need to be integrated into a revised management plan, as has been requested by the World Heritage Committee.

b) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and desired state of conservation, through a participatory workshop

The draft for the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was sent to the World Heritage Centre on 8 March 2010 in Spanish for formal review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the development of the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value and will review it in collaboration with the State Party upon the official definitive submission. They note that a desired state of conservation was also requested in light of the conditions that have been highlighted in previous decisions by the World Heritage Committee.

c) Emergency Action Plan for risk reduction and disaster recovery

The State Party completed the Emergency Action Plan for Risk Reduction and Disaster Recovery for Machu Picchu village in 2009. The plan is included in the state of conservation report and includes vulnerability and risk analysis related to floods and landslides.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the Action Plan provided, but note that many of the proposed actions are still in the planning phase and need to be further developed. Clear and precise courses of action can be established to inform visitors and residents of the potential risk and, as far as possible, to set up actions to mitigate risks and to ascertain adequate responses to possible disasters.

In January 2010, torrential rains caused major flooding and landslides in a large area including the location of the property, thus affecting the property, resulting in two fatalities, seriously affecting local populations, tourists, damaging infrastructure, roads and rail links, and impacting Machu Picchu town, Puente Ruinas, Piscakuchu, numerous archaeological complexes, access points to the Citadel, and water reservoirs. Graphic images are available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/documents/> (February 2010 technical mission report):

From 7 to 9 February 2010, a mission was carried out by the World Heritage Centre to review information provided on the geodynamic and hydro meteorological phenomena that caused the disaster, and the ways in which the national authorities had warned of the imminent dangers, as well as clarifying the measures the State Party was going to undertake to: (a) assess the damage; and (b) mitigate the adverse effects on natural and cultural heritage by identifying immediate actions to restore normal conditions. The mission considered that a range of natural factors, land management issues, and weaknesses in planning and response contributed to the severity of the event.

The mission met with a representative of the National Institute of Civil Defence (Instituto Nacional de Defensa Civil – INDECI) who explained that, since the introduction of the Organic Law of Municipalities of 2008, Civil Defence matters have been decentralized to the regional governments. The representative noted that following a technical visit to the Sanctuary by INDECI in August 2009, a report was submitted to the Mayor of Machu Picchu town, informing him of the risks and recommending that no further constructions be carried out and that possible evacuation procedures be identified in the case of landslides. It also noted the process of establishing the warning system and the difficulties in implementing an evacuation and contingency plan in the area. The mission was concerned that there has been a lack of response to these recommendations.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express their grave concern at the state of conservation and effective management of the property. Management of areas within and surrounding the property was inadequate to reduce risks and prepare for and respond to disasters. A range of actions identified in the Emergency Plan of May 2009 which could have helped to avoid these impacts have not yet been implemented.

During the World Heritage Centre mission in February 2010, discussions took place between the Ministry of Environment, the Director of INC, the Director of SERNANP, and other Peruvian authorities, on how to coordinate the governance of the Sanctuary to include changes in the designation of the roles of various institutions and the subsequent decision-making processes within the Machu Picchu Management Unit (Unidad de gestión de Machu Picchu-UGM). Various strategies were proposed, namely to establish an institution of the highest management hierarchy composed of Ministers and chaired by the Ministry of Environment, and a technical body coordinated by INC and SERNANP. Both institutions would work urgently on a preliminary text of the Emergency Decree, encompassing the operational activities for a one year, with the intention of clearly establishing a national authority for the Sanctuary and a law that decrees the Sanctuary as a Special Protection Area. This highlighted the need for urgent action to provide safety and protection of residents and tourists as well as the preservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu and its buffer zone, and the urgent need to regulate land use and activities taking place in the District of Machu Picchu (Aguas Calientes) and surrounding areas of the Sanctuary. Unfortunately, the Emergency Decree was not approved.

In March 2010 the State Party submitted additional information on the areas of the Sanctuary that were significantly impacted by flood waters, and the efforts undertaken in the restoration of access to the property and to the region.

On 16 March 2010 the Ministry of the Environment presented to the Secretary of the Council of Ministers a draft of a Presidential Decree in defence of natural heritage protected areas at

the Sanctuary, which was approved by the Congress of the Republic on 30 March 2010. The text of the Decree underlines the mandate of the national policy structured around four key themes of environmental management. One of the main themes is the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and biological diversity through appropriate land-use planning guidelines to strengthen mechanisms to prevent settlement of population and socio-economic development activities in areas with high potential risk to natural hazards. The Decree does not propose changes to the composition of the UGM or in terms of governance nor refers specifically to the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu.

On 1 April 2010, the Sanctuary was reopened, with access to Machu Picchu provided by road from Ollantaytambo, 82 km from Machu Picchu and from there on the restored railway to Machu Picchu town.

d) Implementation of a management effectiveness assessment and agreement of a three-year plan to address the improvement of its effectiveness

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism currently chairs the Management Unit; changes in the Vice Ministry have delayed the implementation of tasks so the new authority will assume the implementation of the three-year plan for the management effectiveness.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the operational changes at the institutional level. They wish to underscore the importance of implementing the management effectiveness assessment to identify with precision the current status of management and the identification of gaps as a basis for improving management processes for the property. They reiterate the need to build capacity among managers and other stakeholders in this process.

e) Establishment and implementation of regulatory measures for the western access to the Sanctuary and definition of public use regulations

The State Party reports that statistics on visitor access through the western sector have been compiled and that the INC and SERNANP have erected a control station at the Puente Hidroeléctrica. They also report that a meeting with the Public Tender Committee of the Regional Government of Cusco was held on 23 December 2009 for consultancy on the elaboration of the Public Use Plan for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. The tender documents were approved in this meeting. In accordance with the Contracting Annual Plan for fiscal 2009, from the Cusco Regional Government Head Office, Executing Unit 001 Cusco, approved through Regional Executive Resolution Nº 057-2009-GR CUSCO/PR, a Consultancy Process "Public Use Plan for Machu Picchu Historic Sanctuary" must be implemented through a Public Tender Selection Process.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies reiterate their concern about the lack of significant progress in formulating a plan to manage the development of the western access as agreed in the Action Plan, which constitutes a threat to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to visitors.

f) Harmonization of existing legal frameworks and regulatory measures and definition of strategies for efficient implementation

The supervising institutions of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu jointly prepared the report. It states that the responsibility for the preservation, protection and defence of both cultural and natural heritage of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu or the National Archaeological Park of Machu Picchu, rests with the National Institute of Culture (INC) and the National Service of State-Protected Natural Areas (SERNANP).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that there are extensive measures in place but remain concerned about the efficacy and adequacy of their implementation. They also highlight that issues such as duplicity of functions, and overlapping mandates, amongst others, continue to hinder the effective protection of the property and its governance mechanisms.

g) Analysis of land tenure status and mapping of current uses to identify adequate measures to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property

The State Party reports that work began in 2009 to identify lands used by rural inhabitants for agriculture and housing. In addition, activities were implemented with the Municipality of Machu Picchu and the Commission for the Regularization of Informal ownership (Comisión de Formalización de la Propiedad Informal-COFOPRI) to grant land titles to inhabitants who are within the demarcation of the 2000 Urban Organization Plan. Due to increasing illegal occupation of land at the Intiwatana and Huayllabamba Districts, additional activities were implemented to prepare quantitative information on the properties, occupants, title holders and other occupants of the sector.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize the progress made on this issue and urge the State Party to continue its efforts so that land tenure and use can be comprehensively analyzed and a strategic response developed to sustain the Outstanding Universal value and integrity of the property, including the identification of potential safe access points and routes for visitation.

h) Other issues

The State Party submitted a detailed activity schedule for the fiscal year 2010 that includes actions to be implemented both by the INC and the SERNANP. The proposal includes actions responsive to provisions made in the management plan for the conservation, maintenance and management of the property as well as the ones highlighted during the reinforced monitoring mission of January 2009.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain strongly concerned that a spectrum of pressing concerns continues unresolved including access and transport, risk management, public use, uncontrolled urban development and crowding at Machu Picchu village, inappropriate land uses, sporadic stakeholder participation and governance issues. These issues have been previously highlighted in numerous reactive monitoring missions and in decisions by the World Heritage Committee. Many of the actions reported by the State Party have yet to be taken from planning stages to implementation and after 10 years of recommendations and proposals for actions there are not yet effective nor adequate measures in place to systematically and holistically address threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The emergency situation of January and February 2010 further evidenced the inadequacy of the management arrangements and the lack of disaster preparedness or disaster response procedures. It has also exacerbated existing problems and highlighted the overall vulnerability of the property at both national and international level, especially with regard to access.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the threats to the property are impacting adversely on its Outstanding Universal Value and are pushing the property towards imminent danger. They also note that the reinforced monitoring mechanism was previously applied to the property and led to the preparation of a programme of actions to address the most pressing threats and management weaknesses of the property and its estimated costs. They consider that the State Party should be assisted in securing a greater

level of support at the international and national level to increase the rate of implementation in all recommendations, as set out in the Action Plan. The establishment of an international support panel, as has been successfully implemented in other properties such as Angkor (Cambodia), is recommended to focus the international support that is required. The combination of the Presidential Decree at the national level, and more focused technical cooperation and support at the international level, should be centred on ensuring the political will and resources to address governance and sustainable finance issues, effective stakeholder involvement, implementation of the 2009 Action Plan, and steady resolution of the backlog of unaddressed management issues before the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2011. In the absence of this essential progress, they suggest that it might be appropriate for the World Heritage Committee to consider inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.42

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.42**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Expresses great concern at the considerable damage caused to the property by the recent floods and landslides affecting both, the fabric of the property and access to it, and considers that the lack of adequate regulatory measures and disaster response plans appears to have exacerbated their impact;*
4. *Urges the State Party to improve the implementation of the actions requested at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), and recommended by the reinforced monitoring mission, in particular:*
 - a) *Definition and implementation of provisions to be included in a revised management plan, derived from participatory processes, to address threats derived from unregulated access to the site, absence of a public use plan and inadequate urban planning,*
 - b) *Further development of the submitted risk reduction and disaster recovery plan to include clear and precise course of action to inform visitors and residents of the actual and potential risks and to provide mitigation strategies as a matter of urgency,*
 - c) *Undertake a management effectiveness assessment and integration of the results into a revision of the management plan and related capacity building programmes,*
 - d) *Establishment and implementation of regulatory measures for the western access to the Sanctuary and finalize the commissioned public use plan,*
 - e) *Implementation of strategies to strengthen decision-making processes and governance at the property;*
5. *Considers that unresolved issues including access, risk management, public use, uncontrolled urban development at Machu Picchu village, inappropriate land uses, and governance issues constitute an imminent danger to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and requests the reapplication of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism;*

6. Recommends that, given the major natural and structural threats facing the property, the State Party establish an international support panel to provide technical advice and support to the State Party, in order to advocate for the political will and resources needed to address governance and sustainable finance issues, to guide effective stakeholder involvement, to seek support for the implementation of the 2009 Action Plan, and to address the backlog of unaddressed management issues;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

43. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

1985 - 2007

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7A.1; 31 COM 7A.14; 32COM 7B.45

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000 in 2000 and USD 17,000 in 2005.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 400,000 was granted by the Government of Japan in 1998; USD 50,000 granted in 2005 by the Riksanstikvaren (Norwegian Cultural Heritage Directorate).

Previous monitoring missions

2004 and 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre / CRAterre-ENSAG / Getty Conservation Institute monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Absence of a national legislative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage;
- b) Major deterioration of almost 50% of the earthen structural components;
- c) Lack of presentation and interpretation at the site.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its state of conservation report on 28 March 2010. The report provides information on the major rehabilitation, capacity building, and other related activities undertaken in the framework the State Party's effort to pursue the safeguarding works started in 2007. The described activities undertaken are hereafter summarized.

a) Progress in conservation works undertaken on the remaining components still under threat
The State Party reports on the achievement of four major reconstruction activities since 2008:

- The reconstruction of Houegbadja Palace which included reconstructing 200 linear meters of fencing walls, the *Logodo* covered entrance, and the *Tassinonxo* royal priestess' house. It was co-financed by Germany and the State Party through the Public Investment Plan.
- The reconstruction and enhancement of the Honnuwa of Agadja Palace. The project was co-financed by the City of Albi (France), Norway Cultural Heritage Directorate (Riksanstikvaren) through UNESCO, and the Africa 2009 Programme, and involved on-the-job training of ten young professionals to ensure the transfer of restoration techniques and know-how for a sustainable result.

- Reconstruction of the Akaba Palace which included 1496 linear meters of wall, as well as several buildings amongst which the *Logodo* entrance to the inner court yard, the *Djéxo* spirit houses, and the *Adjalala* Ministers' counsel room. This particular reconstruction was funded by the National Public Investment Plan.

b) 21 January 2009 fire

A fire which occurred on 21 January 2009 damaged five tombs and one shrine of the property and required immediate action for urgency restoration works. The event attracted wide public attention through national media coverage and visits of several high level national representatives and personalities, who called for support among the stakeholders. Subsequently, damage repair works of the walls, the roofs, the bas-reliefs, the electrical installations and the traditional *ahlihans* decoration was financed by the State Party through the Public Investment Plan, and supported by several private donors, among which members of the Royal Family, and the School of African Heritage (EPA).

c) Conservation and management

The report states that the main priority objectives of the management plan (2007-2011) have been achieved through the reported activities. Identification and development of best conservation practices are ensured through the daily supervision and maintenance of the site as a systematic practice for preventive and curative conservation. In terms of capacity building for regular maintenance and visitors' services, diverse workshops in cooperation with EPA's, ISESCO's and the Louvre Museum of France, and two sessions of the management counsel were organized at the site. A historical research project in preparation of an exhibition at the Museum of Quai Branly in Paris (November 2009 – January 2010) further contributed to this objective. The objectives of both were improved knowledge of the tangible and intangible values of the property, the progressive improvement in the state of conservation, better visitor services and improved income generating processes.

d) Pursuance of funding strategy for conservation activities and enhancement of the property

Several statistics in the report set out a continuous increase of visitors and sales income in the past years. This positive trend is explained as being the results of a successful approach aimed at increasing income in line with the objectives of the conservation and management plan. Further to sales income, and the *Museums' development fund* benefiting the site by 75% of the generated income (e.g. for promotion, maintenance, and security purposes) the Ministry of Culture provided technical equipment to the site management team (power unit, motorbike, etc). By means of a diversification of cultural events and the opening of yet inaccessible buildings to the public, the property should attract more visitors, and the increased income should serve to finance the remaining desired conservation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the state of conservation of the site has improved considerably, and are of the opinion that the objectives set out in the management plan are well met by the State Party through careful daily monitoring of the site, capacity building and promotional activities as well as through the successful completion of restoration works. The State Party should therefore hold on to its strategy and efforts in keeping up this positive trend of the last years since removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007. However, risk preparedness management measures should be put in place in order to avoid again incidents like the 2009 fire. Further, in the endeavor to increase visitor's frequency and the properties' public accessibility and enhancement, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it could be beneficial to develop a cultural tourism strategy as an adjunct to the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies reiterate the need for a reconstruction policy document for the palaces that takes into consideration the objectives of the 2007-2011 management and conservation plan.

Draft Decision : 34 COM 7B.43

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.45**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the accomplishment of several rehabilitation projects and the successful cooperation with international partners;*
4. *Also notes the appliance of the principles set out in the management and conservation plan in terms of optimizing and taking advantage of the socio-economic potential of the property and capitalizing on its tangible and intangible cultural values;*
5. *Reiterates its encouragement to the State Party to pursue its funding strategy for conservation activities and presentation through income generated at the property and to seek additional funding to complete the pending restoration works e.g. of the walls as set out in the current conservation and management plan;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to consider the development of a cultural tourism strategy as an adjunct to the 2007-2011 management and conservation plan;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to submit as a matter of urgency and before **1 December 2010**, a reconstruction policy document for the palaces, that takes into consideration the objectives of the 2007-2011 management and conservation;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

46. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2

47. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.38 ; 31 COM 7B.51 ; 32 COM 7B.50

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 2007, USD 30,000, Technical Cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 110,000 (Italy Funds-in-Trust); USD 23,100 (Croisi Europe); USD 86,900 (European Commission)

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) No management and conservation plan;
- b) Pressure from urban development;
- c) Deterioration of dwellings;
- d) Waste disposal problems;
- e) Encroachment of the archaeological sites.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116>

Current conservation issues:

In response to Decision **32 COM 7B.50**, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, on 22 March 2010. This report provides information of progress achieved in the fields of management and conservation, and makes particular mention of the following activities:

a) State of conservation of architectural heritage

The report noted that the property continued to suffer changes as regards its buildings. As already emphasized in its 2008 report, the recent report again indicates that the reason for these changes is essentially due to the modification of the original plans of the houses because of new needs for comfort and the increase in the size of some family cells, the escalation in cost of the materials used for traditional livelihood (rice and millet, baobab fruit, shea butter), to the introduction of inappropriate solutions using cement and terra cotta, the abandonment of numerous buildings that have fallen into ruin, and the appearance of new constructions in the inscribed periphery. In the face of these changes, the Cultural Mission has questioned the contraveners and called upon the cooperation of the municipal and administrative authorities. But clearly, and according to the report, the involvement of these bodies is not yet fully secured for the task of protection assigned to the Cultural Mission of Djenné. The report also indicates efforts of collaboration with actors such as the corporation of masons « Barey Ton », the Djenné Heritage Association, the Association of Guides, the customary authorities and opinion leaders. Exemplary restoration has been carried out in 2009-2010. The Djenné Mosque has been restored in the framework of a Programme for the rehabilitation of Earthen Architecture, established between the Mali Ministry of Culture and the Aga Khan Foundation for Culture.

In the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, a number of activities is also being implemented since January 2010 at Djenné including a rehabilitation project for the Youth House, financed by the Government of Italy, and the preparation of town planning and construction regulations adapted to earthen architecture. This project will enable the production of a technical guide for the rehabilitation of earthen architecture to assist in the control of interventions at the property and in its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the absence of clear working tools (town planning and construction regulations) to control the growth of new constructions and

poor rehabilitation in the property, despite the positive initiatives of the State Party. As already mentioned in previous Committee reports, if these tools are not made available very rapidly, these changes will most certainly compromise the coherence of the urban fabric of Djenné. While applauding the support and intervention of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture in the restoration of the Mosque, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, would nevertheless welcome assurance that major restoration projects will be based on adequate documentation, a clear shared understanding of conservation approaches, and respect for traditional conservation practices. They also consider that all major projects should be tied into the management plan and respect its priorities.

b) State of conservation of archaeological sites

The report mentions a topographical survey of the archaeological sites, carried out in January 2008. This survey provides different information regarding the areas of the various sites, in comparison to that communicated at the time of inscription in 1988. The site of Hambarketelo was originally estimated at 9.24 ha is now estimated at 4 ha. That of Kaniana on the other hand is reduced from 28 ha to 22 ha. The site of Tonomba, initially estimated at 2 ha, is in reality only 1.23 ha. According to the report, these differences are justified by natural and anthropic factors such as the use of some parts as crop growing areas or rubbish dumps (Kaniana), gulying and erosion by bad weather (Djenne Djeno, Hambarketelo and Kaniana), and the destruction of some stony cordons that were installed in 1996. In particular, the report indicated the threats that weigh on the integrity of Tonomba: the construction of a building for the future Police Commissariat, the presence of a farm pond, and a market gardening strip, and the use of the site as a quarry for the manufacture of earthen bricks to maintain the houses. Currently, only the site of Djenne Djeno has benefited from protection actions provided by the Cultural Mission of Djenné. Indeed, a guardian is now posted at the site, and trees have been planted to restore the hedge around the site. With regard to the issue of looting, financial assistance provided by the United States, through the Ambassadors' Fund for Cultural Heritage Preservation, has enabled the organization of a series of training and awareness raising activities for the elected members of the twelve municipalities around Djenné as well as the guides, on the need to combat looting of the archaeological sites.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies emphasize the danger that the construction of a new building on the archaeological site of Tonomba would constitute, altering the integrity of this site. They also recall that the archaeological sites contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It is therefore recommended that the State Party seek an alternative location for the new building for the Police Commissariat. Finally, it is recommended that the State Party inform the Committee on the revision of the boundaries of the archaeological sites following the topographical surveys of January 2008.

c) Waste disposal problems

The report notes that waste disposal problems remain a tricky issue to resolve, in view of the considerable increase in the quantity of solid and liquid waste posing serious environmental problems. The banks of the River Bani surrounding the town are increasingly transformed into a dump for solid rubbish and an outlet for waste water, causing numerous environmental problems, including degradation of the water quality of the Bani and the proliferation of waterborne diseases. According to the report, efforts have been made to resolve the problem of the evacuation of domestic waste water with the assistance of the Service responsible for waste disposal as well as pollution and nuisance control. Initiatives have also been undertaken in the framework of the Niger-Loire Project for the establishment of a transit rubbish tip for solid waste on the northern periphery of the property. A larger project is also under preparation in the framework of a One-UN project that would also involve three other agencies of the United Nations system, (UNDP, WHO, UNICEF).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider it extremely urgent to find appropriate solutions for the waste disposal problems present at the property.

d) Management plan

The 2008-2009 management and conservation plan prepared by the National Direction for Cultural Heritage, was completed and submitted to the World Heritage Centre in October 2008. This management plan aims at encouraging the establishment of an integrated conservation and management system involving the living site (the town of Djenné itself) and the archaeological sites, promotion of expertise and local know-how of the populations in the field of conservation of earthen architecture, improvement of tourism and continued efforts for the revitalisation of the ensemble of the ancient fabric.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.50**, adopted by its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes with satisfaction the completion of the 2008-2012 conservation and management plan, and the initiative of a pilot project for conservation in the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme;*
4. *Reiterates its concern with regard to the absence of control tools (town planning and construction regulations) to mitigate the changes operating on the ancient built fabric and threats to the integrity of the archaeological sites;*
5. *Recalls that the archaeological sites are an integral part of the property and that their loss would alter the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requests the State Party to halt all construction projects planned in these sites;*
6. *Calls upon the international donor community to support actions to provide responses adapted to the waste disposal problems in the ancient fabric;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the prepared town planning and construction regulations as well as clarifications on the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone following the topographical survey of January 2008, by **1 December 2010**;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress achieved to resolve the waste disposal problems as well as the problems experienced at the archaeological sites, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

49. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2006

Criterion

(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30COM 8B.33

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1227>

Current conservation issues

In January 2010, the World Heritage Centre was informed of repetitive demolition of historic buildings within the buffer zone. Amongst the most important buildings were the Merchant Navy Club buildings, one of the oldest buildings, built in 1850.

On 9 April 2010, the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party expressing its concerns and requesting a state of conservation report of the property, which had not been received at the time of drafting of this report.

Since the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 2006, 16 buildings were demolished in the buffer zone - nearly 7% of the total number. These included 6 Grade 1 (10%); 1 Grade 2; and 9 non-graded. The demolitions were mostly located in the immediate surroundings of the Immigration Depot with strong physical and architectural links to the property. In addition, 4 graded buildings had been subjected to major interventions and 6 to minor interventions, with 10 other minor interventions to non-graded structures.

Information was also received that a Planning Policy Guidance is under preparation and should be submitted soon to the Ministry of Housing and Lands for consideration and approval. This document aims to address the negative changes created by development impacting on the visual and historical links of the property. It is urgent that the Guidance be officially enacted, and that a number of financial incentives be examined by the Government to encourage the retention of heritage buildings in the property and its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that the potential threat in the buffer zone identified at the time of inscription has in part been realized in terms of demolition of monuments of national value and that furthermore, no information has been received to indicate that the buffer zone has legal protection or is regulated by the Planning and Development Act.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are also concerned that this repetitive demolition could threaten the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value. They recall that criterion (vi) stresses the tangible links with traditions of outstanding universal significance.

Draft Decision **34 COM 7B.49**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30COM 8B.33**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a progress report as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Notes with concern the recent high degree of loss of historic buildings within the buffer zone through demolitions, the apparent lack of legal protection of the buffer zone and lack of planning policies;*
5. *Urges the State Party to halt any demolitions in the buffer zone until adequate planning and legal policies are in place;*
6. *Also notes the development of the Aapravasi Ghat Planning Policy Guidance document, and encourages its official adoption at the earliest opportunity;*
7. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to complete the Management Plan for Aapravasi Ghat to include the development and conservation of the buffer zone, and archaeological and tourism strategies, and to regularise restoration work undertaken to date;*
8. *Also reiterates the recommendation that the State Party undertake research on indentured labour to consider the extent, scope and impact of the indentured labour Diaspora around the world and that the detailed archives connected with the property be considered to be put forward for the UNESCO's Memory of the World Register;*
9. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular on actions taken to halt demolitions within the buffer zone, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

50. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2

52. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a proper buffer zone
- b) Lack of a management plan
- c) Mining activities
- d) Development pressure

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1099>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies were alerted through press reports to the granting in February 2010 of a coal mining permit to an Australian company, Coal of Africa Ltd (CoA), in an area immediately to the east of the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape World Heritage property. The proposed Vele Colliery is located 50 km west of Musina, an area about 7 km from the property boundaries. The mining licence is for the extraction of coal that will be used to feed a coal-fired power station for which there is also a proposal. The press reports indicated that the mining permit was issued by the Department of Minerals and Energy against a recommendation of the Department of Environmental Affairs that overseas the Limpopo-Shashe Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) and the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape.

On 9 March 2010 the Director of the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party requesting them to provide, as a matter of urgency, a report on the state of conservation of the property that addressed the mining issue. At the time of drafting this report (May 2010), no state of conservation report has been received from the State Party.

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape extends to 30,000 ha and to its north borders the Limpopo River that separates South Africa from Botswana and Zimbabwe. The property is protected by a buffer zone of 100,000 ha that was stated in the nomination to surround the property south of the international border. At the time of inscription, a Trilateral Memorandum of Understanding had been drawn up between South Africa, Botswana and Zimbabwe with the objective of establishing the TFCA; this very extensive area of some 5,040 km² would surround the property when established, and would, it was said, constitute a very effective buffer zone. Subsequently an agreement of understanding between the three countries has been signed and what remains to be done is for the treaty to be compiled. It appears that

land claims by the Machete family have held up progress. They laid claim to the whole of the Mapungubwe Cultural landscape and 56 nearby farms and their claim has apparently been upheld in the courts. The proposed location of the mine and power station will be in the middle of the planned TFCA.

No formal map was submitted as part of the nomination for either the buffer zone or the TFCA – only the description of both areas. At the World Heritage Committee, the property was recommended for referral to allow for better maps to be provided but in the event a decision was made to inscribe. Subsequent maps have been produced within South Africa of both the buffer zone and the TFCA, but these do not show either area surrounding the property, and both having exclusion areas to the east of the property where the proposed mine and power station are to be sited. These proposals therefore appear to be at variance with what was put forward at the time of nomination.

The proposed mine was the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). However according to information received by the World Heritage Centre, this appears to have failed to adequately assess the full impact on the cultural and natural environment. The base-line data appears to be deficient, many ancillary aspects of the development have not been addressed, inadequate mitigation proposals have been put forward and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have not been consulted.

In terms of the natural environment independent consultants undertook a desk assessment of the relevant documents and concluded that the impact assessments had not adequately identified the impact on quantity and quality of water resources and as a result mitigation measures were lacking. For instance proposed de-watering of an aquifer could have a severe effect on farmers on the South African side of the Limpopo River who use the aquifer for irrigation and subsequently on food security.

In terms of the cultural environment, the impact assessment was based on a superficial survey of the area and did not consider the impact on the World Heritage property. On 18th March 2010, the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) lodged an appeal against the decision to grant the mining right. The Appeal is on the grounds that the EIA was insufficient and that the link between the study area and the World Heritage property was not fully considered. Recent research has indicated that the area to the east of the property has strong links to the areas within the boundary such as the extensive rock art both within the property and in the proposed mining area, and extensive Stone Age and Iron Age remains. The Appeal also states that it considers that the development will lead to industrialization of the area, that it will have a permanent negative impact on the integrity of the heritage and natural landscape, that the impact on the archaeological sites and places of intangible significance will be permanent, and that there will be a profound negative impact on the sense of place of the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape. Overall they conclude that the entire Vele Basin area is of great importance and the potential development of a coal mine on even a small portion of this landscape is detrimental in terms of the generation of knowledge of the archaeological heritage of the whole region.

The Appeal also highlights the international implications of the proposals as both the Botswanan and Zimbabwean Governments are investigating the possibility of extending the World Heritage status to include areas related to the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape in their respective countries as part of the TFCA process.

Two locations have been considered for a power station near Musina. An environmental impact assessment of the sites concluded that little is known about the occurrence of heritage resources in the study area per se although it was likely that Stone and Iron Age sites would be found. It recommended that the proposed development could continue subject to an archaeological survey once work commences.

In April 2010 it was reported in the press that the order for the mining right was finalised on 12th March 2010 giving CoAl "unconditional" approval to start development of the Vele

project which it was stated would be completed by the third quarter of the year. However on 12th May 2010 the press reported that 'Giant baobabs and several hectares of indigenous forest' had been flattened by the mining company, without having obtained the necessary water licence or environmental approval or approval for the building of a road to the site where the mine will be built.

Further press reports have suggested that mining companies have acquired farms even nearer the boundary of the property with a view to extending mining operations.

No information has been forthcoming about the status of the Appeal nor the position of the Department of Environmental Affairs that has responsibility for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are extremely concerned about the potential impact of the proposed mine, power station and ancillary development on both the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape property and on its hinterland. The mining area is a highly sensitive cultural area that relates closely to the attributes within the property and provides its context and approach and is also a highly sensitive natural area that is inextricably linked to the wider landscape. In terms of both culture and nature, any development of this site could have far reaching implications for the sustainability of the Limpopo Basin, could de-rail international agreements on the TFCA and could completely destroy a landscape that has the potential to contribute significantly to an understanding of the wider settlement history of Mapungubwe. It could also pollute the Limpopo river which crosses the property.

The proposed development highlights the lack of clarity over responsibilities for the protection of the property, as set out at the time of inscription, and the lack of clarity over the buffer zone, as described at the time of inscription. The developments also appear to put into question future possible collaboration with Botswana and Zimbabwe over the proposed TFCA.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Regrets that the State Party has not provided a report on the mining project and its implications as requested by the World Heritage Centre in its letter of 9 March 2010;*
3. *Expresses extreme concern at the granting of a mining licence for coal some 5 km from the boundary of the property, in a highly sensitive area adjacent to the Limpopo river and in the proposed buffer zone that was submitted at the time of the inscription, and which is fundamentally linked to the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in terms of both cultural and natural attributes;*
4. *Recognises that the proposed development does not appear to have the support of the Department of Environmental Affairs that has overall responsibility for the property, and also takes note of the concerns raised by NGOs and the appeal against the licence that has been brought by the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists;*
5. *Also notes that it has been reported that the ownership of the property has been claimed by a private landowner and requests the State Party to clarify what implications*

this might have for the management of the property as well as to clarify the exact delimitation of the buffer zone;

6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission to consider the implications of the proposed mining on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and the establishment of an effective buffer zone for the property;*
7. *Urges the State Party to halt the mining project until the joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies mission has assessed the mining impact, and to submit as soon as possible details on the status of the mining licence, the status of the Appeal, the position of the Department of Environmental Affairs and fuller details of ancillary projects;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** an updated report on the state of conservation of the property including response to the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

53. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(i) (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
N/A

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: 39 950 USD: training for the conservation of the Tombs (20 000 USD in 1998); research programme on the conservation of thatched roofs (19 950 USD in 2005).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Fire is mentioned in the ICOMOS evaluation of 2001 as the main threat to the property:

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1022>

Current conservation issues

On 16 March 2010, a fire devastated the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building, a major component of the World Heritage property. This building housed the four royal Buganda tombs. The large, circular thatched building, supported on wooden columns wrapped in bark

cloth, was originally built in 1882 as a palace and then became a royal tomb. The building had been significantly repaired since its construction including the insertion of steel and concrete supports in 1938.

As a first response to this tragedy, the Director-General of UNESCO decided to dispatch a mission led by the World Heritage Centre and including experts from the African World Heritage Fund and CRATerre-ENSAG. The mission was undertaken from 7 to 9 April 2010. Its primary objective was to assess the extent of the damage, and discuss with the relevant authorities actions to be taken, including the possible reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building. The mission observed that almost the entire building was destroyed. The entire vegetal structure (wooden poles, rings), the thatch, the bark clothes and part of the royal artefacts and kingdom symbols had been consumed by the fire. The steel roof structure introduced in 1938 bent completely due to the high temperatures, and the concrete poles which were supporting the steel structure were deformed. Only the peripheral and partition brick walls were still standing. The reed fence and trees all over the property have been also seriously damaged. The mission observed that many traditions and practices could no longer be performed as a result of this destruction. In addition, the royal tombs that are considered sacred were now exposed to outside elements such as rain, causing a traumatism amongst the people of Uganda.

The mission was informed that immediately after the incident, the State Party had established a Cabinet Committee, which has been requested to investigate the cause of the fire. The Buganda Kingdom which is the main site's custodian also established a Technical and Building Committee to oversee the reconstruction process and organized a mourning ceremony and performed a series of traditional ceremonies in the tombs.

The mission supported the general agreement that the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga should be reconstructed.

The mission stressed the importance of not hastening the reconstruction. The mission considered that the overall reconstruction process should be seen as an educational and training opportunity. The mission particularly stressed the need for time to be taken with the reconstruction, in spite of pressure from the general public to see the place reconstructed as soon as possible, as an over-hastened reconstruction would be detrimental, because of the complexity of the structure, the intangible components associated with it, and the shortage of traditional skilled labour. It advised the State Party that reconstruction without proper studies could bring irreversible changes and might impair the remaining Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Therefore a reconstruction strategy, that clearly states how the building is to be constructed and the evidence base that is to be used would need to be agreed by both the Uganda Government and the Buganda Kingdom authorities.

The following recommendations were made by the mission team:

1) Emergency assistance request

The mission recommended that an Emergency assistance request be submitted by the State Party in order to allow implementation of the following activities:

- Professional sifting of the wreckage ;
- Construction of temporary shelters over the royal tombs to allow ritual ceremonies and practices to be maintained;
- Mounting a temporary exhibition to present Muzibu Azaala Mpanga as it was before the fire incident;
- National sensitization workshop on the reconstruction process and the implementation of the management plan;

- Purchase of equipment required to ensure proper documentation of the reconstruction process;
- Preparation of an overall conservation project document to be submitted to donors, including costs of international expertise to advise on the reconstruction strategy;
- Reprinting a revised version of the 2006 booklet on Kasubi tombs with 2 pages on the fire incident included;

The State Party submitted the request at the end of May 2010 to the World Heritage Centre. The Advisory Bodies strongly support the principle of this property benefitting from Emergency Assistance along the lines set out by the April 2010 mission. They do however consider that the request needs to be reformulated so that it reflects the urgent work that is needed in the short-term to respond to the emergency. They consider that the workshop needs to be reformulated to focus on the emergency. They also consider that some of the costs should be revisited and where possible reduced. They consider that the exhibition should be a short-term immediate production rather than a formal exhibition with formal opening.

2) Reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga

The mission, which proposed a short term action plan that foresees the complete reconstruction by December 2011, also recommended:

- The production of complete documentation before the start of the works which should include:
 - Architectural survey of the wreckage;
 - Study of the traditional construction techniques and their associated intangible values
 - Identification of skilled people and sourcing of materials (where and how they were traditionally sourced);
 - Compilation of existing archives (plans, drawings and photographs);
- Consideration of what constitutes the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the property when undertaking reconstruction:
- The preparation of a detailed reconstruction strategy which will have to be submitted for approval to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS before any action is undertaken;
- An estimate of the overall cost of the reconstruction project to be undertaken (cost of the main structure, cost of the roof, cost of the internal finishes, management, etc.);
- That reconstruction process should be used to train more thatchers who will also be able to maintain other Ganda thatched roofs on associated sites
- That the reconstruction project integrates both a fire prevention system and a fire fighting strategy;

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building at Kasubi was an outstanding example of an architectural style developed by the Buganda Kingdom since the 13th Century.

With its complete destruction by the 16 March 2010 fire, they consider that the property's Outstanding Universal Value is seriously threatened.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the significance of the building lay partly in the way it reflected typical Bugandan traditions but also in its size, elaboration and sacred use which set it apart from other structures. Buildings such as this need constant maintenance and irregular renewal. Their fabric cannot all be maintained over time; the authenticity of their structures lies more in a reflection of traditional materials and practice than in the age of component parts. They consider that a case can thus be made for the reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building provided that a clear reconstruction strategy is set out and agreed in advance that sets out the rationale for the chosen approach,

gives due consideration to the various options, such as re-building as in 2010, 1939, 1911 (for which photographic evidence exists) or as in the 1880s, and provides clear documentary evidence.

They also consider that the overall reconstruction process needs to be carefully managed, requires detailed documenting, and also needs close monitoring by the World Heritage Committee in order to ensure full recovery of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Finally, they consider that as the property face a serious deterioration of its architectural components, it therefore meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as defined in Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling that the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building at Kasubi was an outstanding example of an architectural style developed by the Buganda Kingdom since the 13th Century, due to its design and spatial organization, but also to its elaboration and size,
3. Thanks the Director-General of UNESCO for having dispatched a mission in April 2010 immediately after the fire that resulted in its destruction, led by the World Heritage Centre and including experts from the African World Heritage Fund and CRATerre-ENSAG, with the primary objective to assess the extent of the damage, and discuss with the relevant authorities actions to be taken, including its possible reconstruction;
4. Takes note of the results of the 2010 mission, which observed that the entire Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building has been destroyed, and the wish of the State Party to undertake its reconstruction;
5. Considers that, with the unfortunate destruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga, the property faces a serious deterioration of its architectural components and therefore meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as defined in Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
6. Further considers that the reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga could be justified provided that a clear justification for the overall project is set out and agreed in advance that sets out the rationale for the chosen approach, gives due consideration to the various options, such as re-building as in 2010, 1939, 1911 (for which photographic evidence exists) or as in the 1880s, and is based on sound documentation and traditional materials and techniques, in order that the new structure might be seen as having authenticity in relation to design, materials, and techniques as well as continuing use;
7. Invites the State Party to submit, as soon as possible and before any reconstruction work commences, a reconstruction strategy to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;
8. Considers furthermore that reconstruction of Muzibu Azaala Mpanga without proper studies and the development of an agreed reconstruction strategy could impair the remaining Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

9. Considers moreover that the overall reconstruction of Muzibu Azaala Mpanga building, will need close monitoring through the Advisory Bodies and detailed documentation;
10. Encourages the State Party to appoint a site manager for the property and to establish a coordination mechanism which will enable the Buganda kingdom and other stakeholders to work together and share responsibilities during the reconstruction process;
11. **Decides to inscribe the Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
12. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the recently revised 2009-2015 management plan, and to ensure its implementation in close collaboration with the main custodians of the property;
13. Also requests the State Party to invite as soon as possible a joint World Heritage Centre/ICCROM/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation of the property, and develop in cooperation with the State Party the corrective measures to address the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value as well as a time frame for their implementation, and to advise on the overall reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga;
14. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, describing progress made in the reconstruction of the Muzibu Azaala Mpanga and in the implementation of the 2009-2015 management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.49; 32 COM 7B.54

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 24000 for the inventory of the public spaces in Zanzibar (Netherlands Funds-in-Trust).

Previous monitoring missions
2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Development pressures;
b) Environmental pressures in relation with the Malindi port project;

- c) Natural disasters and lack of risk-preparedness;
- d) Visitors/ tourist pressures;
- e) Lack of resources;
- f) Lack of legal framework;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173>

Current conservation issues

a) *Planning and Legal Framework*

The State Party report, received on 1 April 2010, notes that there has been a recent positive progress in developing plans and legal frameworks for the management of the Stone Town of Zanzibar.

As a part of a Swedish International Development Assistance (SIDA) initiative, a Heritage Management Plan was developed in a participatory process and the final document has now been submitted to the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority (STCDA). The State Party states that the Heritage Management Plan proposes new integrated strategies to control land uses, open spaces, traffic planning and visitor management and that a clear action plan has been proposed. Overall, the lack of public awareness of heritage value has been perceived as contributing to the gradual erosion of the historic town, but that the process of preparing the Heritage Management Plan is reported to have empowered and informed stakeholders.

However it is noted that there remain considerable challenges for the management and conservation of the historic town and the work with the Zanzibar Municipality Council. As a parallel initiative, SIDA is reported to have assisted in improving capacity in human resources and equipment, specifically with the Documentation Centre, which is intended to serve as a research and coordination unit and host for the proposed GIS database.

At its 32nd session meeting, the World Heritage Committee requested that the State Party review their 1994 legislation. SIDA has now also financed this initiative, which is reported to cover issues of STCDA empowerment and the design of a structure for stakeholder involvement in development issues. The STCDA Act was passed by the House of Representatives on 25 March 2010, and awaits assent by the President.

b) *Conservation of the urban fabric*

The State Party notes the difficulties encountered with the rapid development of tourism, the increasing numbers of vehicles, and the material deterioration of 'soft' building fabric.

An inventory of the public spaces in Zanzibar was completed in January 2010 by the Centre for World Heritage Studies of the College of Design at Minnesota University, in coordination with the STCDA and the World Heritage Centre in the framework of the UNESCO Netherlands Funds in Trust.

This inventory was undertaken with the input of Tanzanian university students and civil servants and should serve as an additional management tool for the conservation of the property.

The State Party reports that it is 'programming the possibility' of documenting the rest of the historic warehouses remaining in the Port area so as to ensure that they are not demolished or altered without its approval. The State Party reports that traffic planning for one-way streets is in progress as well as planning for parking spaces with a concern for ample provision of open spaces for children. The Forodhani Park Project is shown completed with the support of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the overall 2010 State Party report conclusions mirror those presented in 2008, with an emphasis on requesting financial and technical assistance for training, analysis and planning. They also note that as recommended in the 2008 joint UNESCO/ICOMOS Mission Report the work of recording the warehouses is urgent, and a commitment for their documentation is needed.

c) *Malindi Port Project*

At its 32nd session meeting (Quebec City, 2008) the World Heritage Committee requested that the State Party carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment which would include a 3-5 year monitoring project, in order to assess, and enable measures to mitigate, potential negative impacts of the 2008 Malindi Port project, which it regretted had already commenced. Similarly, at its 31st session meeting one year earlier, the World Heritage Committee had requested an independent Environmental Impact Assessment, prior to any approval of the proposed port project which it requested to be developed in consultation with the World Heritage Centre (**31 COM 7B.49**). The State Party has not met either of these requests. The port project has now been completed without the requested Environmental Impact Assessment, or related monitoring of the project's potentially negative effects, as identified by the 2008 joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission.

In its April 2010 State of conservation report, the State Party, represented by STCDA, the latter regrets that it could not complete 'all process of facilitating the independent Environment Impact Assessment before the due date as requested by the World Heritage Committee. It also notes that they are 'continuing to take some initiatives in monitoring the impact of the project'. There are no monitoring details provided and the monitoring section of the report (III.2) contains no information, as was the case in the 2008 State Party's state of conservation report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that these statements need to be clarified. The continued lack of any Environmental Impact Assessment or monitoring arrangements for the Malindi Port Project despite several requests from the World Heritage Committee - is of great concern considering that:

- The port development has the potential to alter the waterfront conditions and the coastal morphology,
- There are existing resources, including completed hydraulic baseline studies undertaken by the European Commission during the feasibility-study phase of the wharf project, and a Beach Erosion Study reported to be undertaken by the Department of the Environment Zanzibar, which could have formed a starting point for impact assessments and monitoring actions.

The State Party reports that they would try to include the long due Environmental Impact Assessment of the Malindi Port within the on-going Environmental and Social Impact Assessment undertaken by the World Bank for the proposed Sea Front Project phase II.

Finally, a previous project that included dredging in the Ferry terminal area, and extracting and depositing large amounts of sand into the nearby wetland was also undertaken without an Environmental Impact Assessment.

d) *Sea Front project – Phase II:*

The State Party report notes that a part of the deteriorated seawall was re-constructed in the framework of the Aga Khan Project for the Forodhani Park improvement.

A separate document, Zanzibar Seafront Phase II, was provided to the World Heritage Centre by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture as the second phase to the recently completed

Forodhani Park improvement project; both projects are funded by the World Bank and implemented by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture.

This second project involves the restoration of the sea front wall along Mizingani Road with its grand facades of buildings such as the Old Customs' House and the former Grand Hotel. The document shows 'before' and 'after' views of the sea wall. The after views show an enlargement of the sea front road towards the sea, a reconstruction of the sea front wall and various civic works such as new benches, paving, trees, and road surface. The illustrations show a substantially rehabilitated waterfront, including a continuous and elevated promenade on landfill and a substantial increase in the hard surface area. The waterfront is shown with a new and extended retaining wall, resulting in a higher elevation of the road above these, eliminating the sandy beach edge characteristic of part of the historic Mizingani Road.

STCDA states that there is a further initiative for 'the northern part of the sea wall' to be constructed under the same World Bank project and that it is scheduled to commence this year. STCDA reports that it is working with the World Bank to ensure that all 'safeguards, social, cultural and environmental issues are met'. The World Heritage Centre was informed that an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment would be completed on 24 May 2010 and could include considerations over the 2009 Malindi port wharf project.

The Report notes the State Party's intention to inform the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS of their proposed projects, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Report on the overall Seafront project has a substantial impact on the property and await the results of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for review by ICOMOS. They consider that further work to the foreshore and the seawall project should be halted until a full appraisal can be made of their impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and of their appropriateness.

e) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

Arising from decisions of the 31st session, the World Heritage Committee requested that a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, be developed for examination in 2009. The State Party submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value following its report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the continuing difficulties over progress to halt the gradual erosion of fabric in the historic town and the lack of progress with documenting the historic warehouses in the port area. Although work on the management plan, and protective legislation is to be welcomed and should help to raise awareness and provide the necessary framework for future conservation, they consider that work on documenting the warehouses must be carried out urgently.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express serious concern that there has been no progress to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment on and regular monitoring of the Malindi port project; they wait the submission of the results of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for the Sea Front Project, for review by ICOMOS, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.54

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Expresses great concern that the Malindi port project has been undertaken without details being provided to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and that no environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken or is clearly planned for this project in spite of requests by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st and 32nd sessions;*
4. *Requests the State Party to put in place as a matter of urgency a 3-5 year monitoring project for the port area as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre before **1 December 2010** the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the planned Sea Front project – Phase II, which provides assessment of the potential impact of this project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for review by ICOMOS, in line with Paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines, and to halt further work on the foreshore and sea wall until the review process is completed;*
6. *Welcomes the progress made in putting in place protective legislation and in undertaking the preparation of a Heritage Management Plan to address the ongoing challenges to decay of heritage fabric, traffic and tourism pressure and further requests the State Party to finalise this Plan and implement it as soon as possible;*
7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012** on the progress made on the above points for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

ARAB STATES

56. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
1985

Criteria
(i)(iii)(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
24COM IV.68; 24COM VIII.38

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 79,500 for Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
September 2000: ICOMOS mission; March 2004: UNESCO mission; 2009: UNESCO technical expert missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of management plan for the property;
b) Lack of clear boundary delimitations.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326>

Current conservation issues

Upon a request from the World Heritage Centre, due to information received concerning threats affecting the property, the State Party submitted a report on 12 April 2010 prepared by the Department of Antiquities. It indicates that the Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority was established following a Governmental law (law no. 15) endorsed in August 2009, in order to develop Petra's region in touristic, economic, social and cultural terms, as well as contributing to local development. While this new Authority takes over the duties of the previously appointed Petra Archaeological Park Council, the Law of Antiquities governing the protection and management of the archaeological sites of the country remains in effect.

- a) *Safety concerns pertaining to the crack that had been detected along the south side of the Siq*

The State Party reports that risk of rock fall is a serious threat on the site: a large rock fall incident occurred in the Siq in May 2009, and in March 2010 a tomb facade collapsed. The State Party reports that the Department of Antiquities had in particular noted the risks posed by the cracked rock along the southern side of the Siq and that temporary preventive works were carried out in order to prevent immediate further damages and to eliminate threats linked to visitor safety. The report notes that the crack was sealed in order to prevent water seepage during the winter season 2009/2010. Moreover, a detailed study was completed in January 2010 by the Arab Consultants Bureau which concluded, among others, that it would be necessary to carry out interventions in order to avoid risking an increase of the crack and/or the occurrence of additional cracks. Temporary scaffolding is in place and the State Party report notes that temporary support works need to be installed prior to the stabilization.

Since the crack was detected in March 2009, three missions were undertaken by a UNESCO expert (April, June, and August 2009). These expert missions determined that the rock is in an extremely unstable condition and poses a very serious threat to visitor safety, as it is located in the Siq which is the only entrance path into the site. The UNESCO expert, together with a local expert, prepared the terms of reference for the different stages of works required and also conducted a first visual geological risk assessment of the Siq.

As follow up to the expert's recommendations, the UNESCO Amman office assisted the Department of Antiquities in preparing an International Assistance Request for a geological risk assessment of the whole Siq. UNESCO Amman has undertaken several visits to the site, noting that the necessary anchorage work on the unstable rock has still not started despite the serious safety risk posed by the unstable rock.

b) Building of a conference centre and associated buildings in the Dara area

The State Party report notes that the Department of Antiquities has no information on this issue and notes that, previously, regulations were in place prohibiting any construction in that area. A conference centre and associated buildings exactly adjacent to the Park boundaries would not only severely encroach on the Park but would be located within an area that has been identified as a potential buffer zone for the property. Such situations are related to the fact that while at least two management plans have been drafted since 1994, a final plan has not yet been formally established nor legally endorsed.

c) Actions planned aimed at improving the quality of services provided to tourists

The Department of Antiquities notes that it was informed that the Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority plans to carry out a series of actions targeting services and tourist facilities at the site. However, the Department of Antiquities has expressed concerns regarding the implementation of such activities and their potential impact on the site. To this end, it has submitted an International Assistance Request to the World Heritage Centre for an expert mission to Petra to carry out an impact assessment study and recommendations on the provision of electric cars for tourism purposes, the extension of an electric cable along the road leading from Um Sayhun village to the central basin, the installation of portable power capacity and an integrated tourist market in Petra.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned by the state of conservation of the Siq and consider that the necessary remedial work should be carried out as soon as possible to ensure the safety of visitors as well as to limit any further damage. They are also concerned by the lack of progress in the establishment, legal endorsement and implementation of a management plan for the property despite the numerous studies and drafts elaborated. While the State Party has yet to submit to the World Heritage Centre the required boundary clarifications for the property requested since 2006 within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would recommend the establishment of a buffer zone which would protect the property from further developments. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are further concerned about the lack of a coordination mechanism between the various stakeholders, in particular the newly established Regional Authority and the Department of Antiquities, which might affect the overall conservation of the property..

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,

2. Takes note of the information provided by the State Party and expresses its concern regarding the state of conservation of the Siq and the lack of a comprehensive conservation and management policy, for the property coordinated among stakeholders;
3. Requests the State Party to take all appropriate measures as soon as possible to ensure that the necessary work is carried out on the unstable rock on the south side of the Siq in order to ensure the safety of visitors as well as to limit any further damage;
4. Also requests the State Party to carry out adequate studies to determine the impact of the planned tourist related activities on the property, to inform the World Heritage Centre of any construction projects planned in the Dara area for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and to refrain from initiating any activity which may affect the integrity of the property;
5. Urges the State Party to finalise the Management Plan for the property, integrating the successive draft management plans and studies, and have it legally endorsed and implemented;
6. Also urges the State Party to establish as early as possible a clear management mechanism and adequate structure with the priority of maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property ;
7. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Petra to assess the state of conservation of the property, the advancement of the works on the Siq and to discuss the planned actions, as well as the progress in the finalization of the Management Plan ;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

57. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
1984

Criteria
(i) (iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.62; 32 COM 7B.60; 33 COM 7B.63

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 for Technical Assistance in 2001

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,173 from 1997 to 2001 for the International Safeguarding Campaign

Previous monitoring missions

2004: Evaluation mission by the UNESCO Beirut Office; September 2006: UNESCO mission following the 2006 summer conflict; February 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Major, and often illegal, urban development;
- b) Major highway development near the property and the redevelopment of the port
- c) Unplanned tourism development;
- d) Lack of management and conservation plans;
- e) Insufficient maintenance.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on 30 March 2010 for the first time since 2007. This report consists of a chart which documents the requests made by the World Heritage Committee during the three previous sessions and notes actions taken by the State Party in response.

In response to the World Heritage Committee's request that the State Party invite a joint mission during 2009-2010, the State Party notes that it has not done so due to the delay in receiving the final version of the 2009 reactive monitoring mission report, and because it did not see any new developments which would justify a mission. The State Party suggests that once the Directorate General of Antiquities (DGA) has established its action plan, it would welcome a joint mission.

The State Party report notes the submission of a Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (see Document *WHC-10/34COM/8D*). In addition, within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, the State Party also submitted a map for clarification of boundaries at the time of inscription (see Document *WHC-10/34COM/8E*).

The State Party report does not comment on any of the substantial issues or recommendations made by the 2009 mission. The chart submitted only refers to earlier requests by the World Heritage Committee. For example, the World Heritage Committee had, at its 31st session, encouraged the State Party to prolong the three year moratorium on construction in areas presenting an archaeological potential. The report indicates only that at present the DGA (that is, three years after the Committee's request) is planning to send such a request to the relevant authorities.

The report also states that the DGA is preparing the archaeological interventions needed for the construction of the highway, deviated in 2002 following the establishment of an archaeological map prepared after a geophysical survey. This archaeological map has not been forwarded to the World Heritage Centre for examination.

The State Party report is however accompanied with a number of appendixes which include the CHUD (Cultural Heritage and Urban Development- World Bank) project report (Nov. 2008) prepared by Italian experts A.R.S. Progetti for the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a colour coded aerial photograph without date on legend, a geophysical survey prepared by Mr Ghassan Ghattas (undated but presumably 2002 as the report mentions such survey), and a decree in Arabic related to the Master Plan of the Old City of Tyre and containing a site map. These do not add materially to the State Party's efforts to respond to the requests of the World Heritage Committee, except for the geophysical survey which provides relevant analysis of the archaeological sites adjacent to the proposed highway, and within the adjacent urban context. However this latter document does not draw definitive conclusions, calls for review by an archaeologist and does not map areas of high potential in a clear way.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned that, in the absence of new information in the State Party report, the property is still under continuing high levels of threat to its Outstanding Universal Value arising from highway construction plans, the continuing urbanization, and the lack of an effective management system, all identified in the 2009 mission. They believe that the need for a defined recovery programme is still crucial and that the State Party should be encouraged to invite the joint mission proposed by the world heritage comette center at its 33rd session as a matter of urgency.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.57

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.63** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Remains concerned by the threats from the highway construction plans, continuing urbanization and the lack of an effective management system;*
4. *Regrets that the recommendations of the 2009 joint reactive monitoring mission have not been reviewed, commented or responded to in the State Party report;*
5. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2009 mission report, and in particular the development of a comprehensive management plan with adequate financial and human resources, the extension of the building ban, the formal establishment of the maritime protection zone, and the adequate archaeological impact assessment of the planned highway;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS monitoring mission to the property to help the State Party develop a recovery programme to address the key issues identified by the 2009 report and the previous requests of the World Heritage Committee;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and progress made in preparing a recovery programme, as set out above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

58. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.53 ; 31COM 7B.63 ; 33 COM 7B.58

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; August 2008: World Heritage Centre mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need to complete the Management Plan in order to co-ordinate actions in the short- and medium-term;
- b) Need to provide a detailed map at the appropriate scale showing the boundaries of the property and buffer zone;
- c) Threat to rock-hewn monumental tombs as a result of inadequate protection, leading to vandalism and the development of agricultural activities in the rural zone and urban constructions;
- d) Inappropriate earlier restoration work;
- e) Problem of discharge of sewage from the modern town into the Wadi Bel Ghadir;
- f) Inadequate on-site security and control systems;
- g) Need for a presentation and interpretation system for visitors and the local population.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190>

Current conservation issues

During its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to complete the Management Plan already under preparation, to provide a map indicating the precise boundary of the property, to inform the World Heritage Centre of any new project, in particular the establishment of a new urban settlement adjacent to Shahat. The State Party was also requested to reinforce the staff of the Department of Antiquities at the property and to avoid all harsh cleaning treatments and over restoration of monuments liable to have a negative impact on the authenticity and integrity of the property.

During the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009), no report was transmitted by the State Party. At the time of writing of the present document, the State Party has still not transmitted a report and no recent information has been received otherwise. Indeed, the State Party not having participated in the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States, the World Heritage Centre possesses no information on the state of conservation of the property or progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies regret that no report has been submitted by the State Party. They remain deeply concerned about the absence of management measures for the property, including security and control for the protection of the monuments, the need for appropriate conservation and interpretation, as well as capacity building in order to fully respond to the issues of conservation and management of the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.58**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that the State Party has not submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of its recommendations, nor a map indicating the boundaries of the property;
4. Strongly urges the State Party to implement the measures recommended by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of January 2007 and its earlier decisions;
5. Requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of its Decision **31 COM 7B.63**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

59. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

33 COM 5A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Vandalism

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287>

Current conservation issues

The Tadrat Acacus is a large massif in a remote area near the Algerian border that hosts hundreds of rock shelters containing mainly Neolithic rock paintings and engravings. In April 2009, ten rock art sites in two of the main wadis, including some of the most well-known and highly acclaimed images were vandalised through the application of spray paint.

On 2 February 2010, the State Party submitted a '*Report on Vandalism in the Tadrart Acacus Mountains*' prepared in June 2009 jointly by representatives of the Libyan Department of Antiquities and the Italian-Libyan Archaeological Mission in the Acacus and Messak. The latter has been working in the area since 1955 in close collaboration with the Department of Archaeology.

The report summarizes the damage on the basis of a site visit. Unfortunately some of the most famous and significant masterpieces appear to have been deliberately targeted. Seven distinct sites are known to have suffered 'very high to high' levels of physical damage with black and silver nitro paint sprayed onto the images, either entirely covering them or partially covering them with graffiti. In some cases, such as at the *Ti-n-Asching II* site (among the best known in Saharan rock art in the Horse/Bitriangular style), the nitro spray paint completely covers all the rock art scenes.

In the 1983 nomination, the State Party documented that a programme of protection of these outstanding, remote and vast sites from man's destruction was of the highest priority. However the scale of the area – it covers around 7,500 sq kilometres; and the increasing number of tourists, which the report notes has taken the authorities by surprise, make the protection of the area a massive challenge given the limited resources available. In recent years, as a first response, some sites have been fenced off.

The report concludes by saying that a detailed assessment should be undertaken as a matter of urgency by the Department of Antiquities, in collaboration with UNESCO and the University of Sapienza, Rome, in order to understand what sites might be susceptible to restoration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express great concern and sadness at the damage to some of the most widely known Saharan rock art images. They agree that an expert mission is urgently needed. Regrettably, the arrangements for a proposed reactive monitoring mission scheduled in April could not be made in time to report to the World Heritage Committee.

It is clear that the first priority of the mission must be to consider how a detailed assessment of the physical damage might be undertaken, which sites might be the subject of conservation work, and how such work might be undertaken. It is also clear that the mission needs to consider future protection of this extensive property, including through possible collaboration with the local communities, how the significance and sensitivity of the area might be better promoted to tourist agencies and individual tourists, how the permit system for visitors might be strengthened and monitored and how overall access might be controlled.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.59

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 5A**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Expresses its great concern at the damage inflicted on some of the most widely known Saharan rock art images;

4. *Regrets the delay in the agreed joint reactive monitoring mission visiting the property and requests the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to organise this mission before the end of 2010;*
5. *Urges the State Party, after discussion with the mission, to undertake a detailed assessment of the damage in association with experts who have worked on the sites, and to explore which sites might be susceptible to conservation and how this work might be undertaken;*
6. *Also urges the State Party to consider the protection of the property, and establish an adequate management system, including possible collaboration with the local communities, with means notably to promote the significance and sensitivity of the area to tourist agencies and individual tourists, to strengthen the permit system for visitors and to improve the overall access control;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the above-mentioned issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

61. Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2010: World Heritage Centre emergency mission

Main factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/793>

Current conservation issues

On 19 February 2010, during Friday prayers, the minaret of the Khnata Bent Bekkar Mosque (formerly known under the name of Berdieyinne Mosque) at Meknes collapsed, crushing some adjacent buildings and causing a large number of victims. At the request of the Moroccan authorities, a World Heritage Centre expert mission visited the site on 19 April

2010 to assist Moroccan specialists in the evaluation of the damage and the emergency measures to undertake to prevent further risks and to identify the priorities to be considered for the development of a restoration project.

The mosque backs onto the ancient rampart, dating back to the Almoravids, and is harmoniously integrated into the centre of a dense urban district, grouping houses, shops, artisans as well as some public buildings. Somewhat sober in its exterior and interior decoration, the mosque comprises important architectural qualities and proportions. Its minaret, attaining 37 m in height, played a particularly remarkable townscape role, as an urban landmark in the general silhouette of the medina.

The collapsed building, visited on 19 April just two months after the catastrophe, had been left undisturbed except for the removal of rubble limited to the immediate need to extract the victims. Consequently, this state appeared as particularly significant in the appreciation of the extent of the accident and in making an initial diagnostic appraisal of elements likely to have been affected and also the objective causes of the collapse.

The analysis of work, visible earlier, or uncovered following the collapse, reveal in particular certain heterogeneity of the constitutive masonry structures of the buildings. Earlier photographs taken prior to the accident show the presence, on the western angle of the minaret, of a vertical open scission of about 10 m in length, particularly revealing of this original heterogeneity at the level of the foundations of the construction. The interior structure of the minaret also appears to have very particular characteristics which it would seem, differ from the usual construction styles used for most of the other similar buildings. The origin of the collapse could be attributed to a combination of different factors such as insufficient dimensions for the foundations, instability of the ground, probable gradual degradation of the land through lack of drainage and/or possible leaks in urban water pipes of the surrounding area of the building, and finally, sudden infiltration of this ground due to very heavy rainfall a few days prior to the accident.

A few days after the catastrophe, H.M. King Mohamed VI issued instructions to the Government to proceed as soon as possible with the reconstruction of the mosque, whilst respecting its original architecture. This principle of identical reconstruction is considered as acceptable insofar as the different criteria of historic value of the monument, the permanence of the function for which it had been built, the quality of image and integration into its urban environment are maintained. Nevertheless, this principle is only valid if, avoiding the pitfalls of a reconstruction "de style" more or less well interpreted; it is based on documentary and archaeological rigour, a genuine approach of identical reconstruction that must totally respect the authenticity of the form, material, and ancient substance of the parts of the building affected by the accident. However, the initial « defects » in the construction, decisive in triggering-off the collapse, should not be perpetuated or reproduced in the conception and implementation of the future project.

Hence, there is an immediate need for the implementation of the following main measures:

- a) Removal and examination of the rubble, sort through the material and carry out shoring up activities;
- b) Documentation: detailed recordings, collection and analysis of archives;
- c) Investigations: careful dismantling, clearing of foundations with archaeological assistance, geotechnical soundings, search for possible drainage networks, recordings of outside ground cover;
- d) Project: overall justification for the reconstruction, including principles to be followed with respect to authenticity;
- e) Technical details of proposed intervention principles according to the different types of work, definition and technical implementation of work and materials, possible interior functional development annex to the work, outside development of the

reinsertion of the building into its immediate urban environment, work estimates, implementation planning.

This draft reconstruction proposal will need to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, before there is any commitment to the overall approach or the execution project.

To respect the authentic character of the monument, in its different dimensions, this reconstruction must be based, following the prior in-depth study, on a rigorous approach aiming, on the one hand, at the conservation of the maximum amount of original parts still in place and at the restoration of the ancient structures, even degraded. On the other hand, for the reconstruction of the destroyed part, to seek as far as possible, in terms of external image and construction principles, to reemploy the recuperated ancient material in addition to using new material, in perfect conformity with the ancient methods, prior to the accident. The implementation of contemporary techniques and materials appears, nevertheless, to have been accepted, even advisable, for the specific reinforcement of several initial points of structural weakness of the building (in particular the foundations), and for that purpose only. Nevertheless, it should be invisible on the exterior and the interior. The rehabilitation of works destroyed by the accident must furthermore be the opportunity for the whole mosque to benefit from an adequate restoration programme, responding to qualitative criteria and heritage principles applicable to a building of this type, major constitutive part of the property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the expert report and its conclusions. They still wish to receive regular reports of progress of the recommended measures and in particular the draft restoration / reconstruction proposal that should set out the overall principles and technical details, including an assessment of the remaining evidence, in order for an assessment to be made on its impact on the authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.61

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Deplores the collapse of the minaret of the Khnata Bent Bekkar Mosque at Meknes and addresses its condolences to the families of the victims;*
3. *Takes note of the report and the conclusions of the expert's visit on 19 April 2010;*
4. *Urges the State Party to undertake the measures recommended by this report, particularly the need to define a reconstruction proposal, including overall principles and technical details, for submission to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies, before any commitment has been made to the project, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to ensure that the Moroccan experts are accompanied by an international expert during the development of the restoration and reconstruction project and during its execution;*

6. *Requests the State Party to submit, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property and progress in the implementation of the measures recommended in the April 2010 mission report, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

63. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
2003

Criteria
(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 8C.31

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 68,900 for Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration as a result of exposure to difficult environmental conditions such as wind with sand and floods;
- b) Urban encroachment;
- c) Absence of a management plan with government commitment.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1073>

Current conservation issues

Upon a request from the World Heritage Centre, due to information received concerning threats affecting the property, the State Party submitted a detailed report on 21 March 2010 prepared by the National Corporation for Antiquities and Museums (NCAM), addressing the following issues:

a) Management plan

The report notes that at the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to finalise the Management plan and draw up a conservation programme with priorities, budget, appropriate staff and timelines. Such a plan was prepared with the assistance of UNESCO experts and officially endorsed in 2009 by the Sudanese authorities. However, it appears that the NCAM does not have the means to ensure the implementation of the Management plan.

b) Buffer zone

The report notes that the property has been mapped and the buffer zone established.

c) State of conservation

Gebel Barkal

(i) Mut Temple

The report notes that there is some damage, such as collapsed structures and stones, caused by natural factors and that some wall paintings are darkened by bat secretions and vandalism, whereas others are totally destroyed by water erosion. It also notes that some damage also occurred from old inadequate restorations which made use of cement. The report proposes some activities for the restoration of the paintings of the Temple, but it underlines that it requires assistance in determining the optimal actions for the collapsed structures of the Temple.

In 2005, the following activities related to the mural paintings of the Mut Temple at Gebel Barkal were undertaken under an International Assistance Request to the World Heritage Fund: (a) the detailed assessment and mapping of the state of conservation of the mural paintings; (b) the application of immediate and selected conservation actions to slow down the deterioration process; (c) the training of NCAM staff for the conservation of mural paintings; (d) the testing of conservation techniques and materials; and (e) the elaboration of a project proposal for the complete conservation of the Mut Temple, for potential donors.

(ii) The pyramids of Gebel Barkal

The State Party report notes that the damage incurred is mostly due to wind erosion, vandalism, fragile sandstone, inadequate previous excavations and restorations, and building techniques. The report notes that a preliminary study of the pyramids situated in the western part of Gebel Barkal is being carried out in order to envisage a restoration project.

Sanam

The report notes that Sanam suffers from wind erosion, and that it is protected by a fence.

El Kurru

The report notes that the mural paintings of the decorated tombs are in a relatively good state of conservation. It also mentions, however, that they are in need of cleaning and consolidation.

Zuma

The State Party report notes that the site is threatened by the passing of vehicles, people and animals.

Nuri

The State Party report indicates that Nuri is affected by the same deterioration factors as Gebel Barkal and that an agreement between NCAM, Dongola University and the University of Rome has been signed in order to establish a centre for the study and the restoration of the site. It is stressed that a great deal of research must be carried out, especially regarding the painted burial chambers and in particular after the construction of the Merowe Dam.

A UNESCO mission rapidly visited the property in November 2008 at the occasion of a mission to the site of Meroe, in the framework of the preparation of its Nomination file, a UNESCO mission rapidly visited the property in November 2008. The mission noted that it faces crucial management, conservation and protection issues. This is largely due to a lack of human and financial resources of the NCAM. Indeed, the mission clearly noted that the property was in great need of conservation and protection which ought to be coupled by the effective implementation of the Management plan. Urban encroachment from the nearby village is expanding and a major project for a tourism complex very close to the pyramids of Gebel Barkal would severely compromise the visual integrity of the property. The World Heritage Centre alerted the State Party about the risks of accepting such a project and, in a letter dated 20 January 2010, the State Party announced that the building activities had been

discontinued and assured the World Heritage Centre that it would be informed of any further developments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned by the various information received indicating the alarming state of conservation, protection and management of the property. They consider that assistance to the State Party should be provided in order to identify conservation priorities and develop a conservation plan, improve the management process and draw up a capacity building plan. In addition, the State Party should submit the mentioned buffer zone around the components of the property as a means of controlling adverse developments, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **27 COM 8C.31** adopted at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2007),*
3. *Recognizes the State Party's efforts to ensure the conservation and protection of the property;*
4. *Welcomes the decision to discontinue the building activities of the tourism complex near the pyramids of Gebel Barkal and urges the State Party to continue preventing such a project in the vicinity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any restoration or construction projects planned at the property prior to their implementation for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies ;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the revised and missing information related to the cartography of the property and the proposed buffer zone ;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to submit an International Assistance Request aiming at improving the protection and conservation of the property;*
8. *Also urges the State Party to take all measures in order to implement the Management Plan;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region to assess the state of conservation of the property and assist in drafting an action plan for its preservation;*
10. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

65. Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1992

Criteria
(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1992-2004

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 7A.22; 28 COM 15A.23; 30 COM 7B.61; 32 COM 7B.65

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD142,193,

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: Approximately USD 52 million

Previous monitoring missions
September 2005: technical advisory mission concerning the protection of Zones 1 and 2 of Angkor; In addition, the *ad hoc* experts of the International Coordinating Committee (ICC) carry out monitoring of the property and of ongoing projects in the complex of Angkor, twice per year, on the occasion of the ICC technical and plenary sessions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Uncontrolled urban expansion;
b) Lack of an appropriate management system.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/668>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a comprehensive “Rapport sur Angkor”, dated January 2010 to address the Committee’s requests and reporting progress as follows:

- a) *Clarify, including through new legislation if necessary, the rules regarding property rights, ownership and building codes applicable to zones 1 and 2*

In a section entitled Management and Occupation of Land, the State Party report notes that sub-decree 50 ANK/ BK expressly created a Department of Environmental Planning of Territory and of Management of the Habitat of the Park of Angkor, charged with analysis, evaluation, monitoring and action related to the situation of the World Heritage inscription, in consideration of the population resident on the site. The report notes actions taken for juridical protection (including a series of decrees, laws and governmental decisions from 1994-2004), territorial protection (including a project to establish community learning centre, projects for community development (encouraging villagers to develop their lands for their use rather than for sale), territorial protection measures to reduce pressures on the Park (including adoption of a Siem Reap Master Plan, severe application of relevant laws, establishing new settlements outside zones 1 and 2, heritage protection awareness building etc.), social protection measures (including efforts to increase public awareness concerning

the importance of conservation, and communications links with the A.N.A. and local communities.

b) Enforce existing laws regarding illegal occupation, unauthorized construction and development and park-land appropriation/alienation

The State Party report notes that the sub-decree 50 ANK/ BK has expressly created a Department of Order and Co-operation to deal with such issues. The report documents the efforts of the new Department and its predecessor agency to control, limit and reverse illegal activities. The report quantifies the problem, documenting many hundreds of illegal acts stopped in both 2008 and 2009, including removal of illegal kiosks, removal of sand, etc. The report also notes the importance of balancing control activities with education activities to fully address the scale of illegal activities present on site.

c) Strengthen the capacities of the “Agence pour la protection et la sauvegarde d’Angkor” (APSARA) to enable effective land use planning and management, including by providing it with the necessary resources

The State Party report highlights the importance of “Anukret” (sub-decree) 50 ANK/BK of May 2008 which brought new modalities to the organisation and functioning of the Directorate General of APSARA [the Agence pour la protection et la Sauvegarde d’Angkor]. The report also documents the augmented numbers of staff (professional, operational, security and maintenance) presently employed by APSARA – close to 1600 people, and provides an organisational chart showing their disposition.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the report provides an insightful and integrated overview of the social, economic and cultural complexity of the site, and attempts to position conservation efforts and their effectiveness in that larger context. The report emphasizes the improvements for site management brought about by sub-decree 50 ANK/ BK and its re-ordering of institutional arrangements for care of the property. As well, in an effort to acknowledge challenges and shortcomings, the report emphasizes at several points that the characteristics of the site (large size – 401 square kilometres, rural population of 100,000 people whose aspirations to upgrade their living conditions place them in continuous direct conflict with many of the conservation objectives of the Park) make rapid achievement of the conservation objectives underlined by the Committee quite difficult.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note as well that the State Party has strengthened its institutional framework to enable effective land use planning and management and begun to enforce controls and reverse encroachments within the property. They also note that the project for the development of a heritage management framework for the property has finally been launched, with support from Australia and Cambodia and consider that it would be important that this process takes into account the above issues.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.65

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.65**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),

3. Notes with satisfaction the efforts of the State Party to restructure institutional arrangements and the action of the Agence pour la protection et la sauvegarde d'Angkor (APSARA), facilitated by issuing of sub-decree 50 ANK/ BK in May 2008, and to bring increased emphasis to increasing heritage awareness among local communities;
4. Also notes the progress made by the State Party in controlling illegal activities within the property, and requests the State Party to continue these efforts in the future;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the progress made on the issues mentioned above, including on the results of the project for the development of a heritage management framework for Angkor, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

66. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2

67. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1986

Criteria
(i) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1999-2006

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.81; 32 COM 7B.70; 33 COM 7B.71

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 122,370 for Technical co-operation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: Funding under the France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement for expert missions (2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009) for a total amount of 20,000 Euros.

Previous monitoring missions
2000: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2001: expert technical assessment mission; 2003 and 2004: World Heritage Centre and expert advisory missions; August 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; January 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; March 2009: UNESCO New Delhi Office technical mission to the property.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of an operational site management plan;
b) Lack of traffic regulations limiting heavy duty vehicular traffic.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010, the State Party submitted a draft Integrated Management Plan (IMP) for the “Hampi World Heritage Area” with two annexes and some maps. However, the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property providing information on the progress achieved with regard to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its decision taken at the 33rd session.

The State Party did not either submit a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value nor a request for the extension of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.71**.

With regard to the Integrated Management Plan (IMP), the draft submitted by the State Party is an impressive document of over 500 pages, complemented by a “Tourism Development Strategy”, a study on transportation in Hampi, a “Heritage conservation & development plan for the Anegundi Village”, as well as several annexes and maps. The draft Management Plan is structured around 14 chapters, including consideration for the conservation of the archaeological areas, community development and tourism. It contains also an extensive Action Plan and provisions for monitoring.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies understand that the IMP has not yet been adopted and needs to be finalised by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority, in conjunction with the Archaeological Survey of India and other stakeholders.

Whilst revealing a considerable range of aspirations and significant challenges that need to be addressed in the management and future well-being of the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the draft IMP – a profoundly detailed material - does not make for easy interpretation of what actual managerial, technical, pragmatic and operational actions will be taken to resolve the plethora of issues raised in the property. For ease of working, implementation and monitoring, the relevant recommendations covering the plan period need to be comprehensively prioritised, condensed from the weighty documentation, and set out in a summary of the operational IMP document. The draft IMP, moreover, does not seem to provide details on building regulations applicable for each category of zones within the new proposed boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as well as the related urban design guidelines, as requested by the Committee. It does not either contain a clear proposal on traffic regulations limiting heavy duty vehicular traffic (requested by the World Heritage Committee by its Decision **32 COM 7B.70**).

With regard to the other issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7B.71**, notably the encouragement to demolish the remaining pillars of the collapsed bridge, the consideration of a new more appropriate location for the bridge, and the concern over illegal constructions and other developments within the areas that are being considered for the possible extension of the property, no information has been provided by the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has not been submitted, that the IMP has not yet been fully adopted, implemented and resourced. They note that the property boundary has now been delineated, significantly larger than the one defining the inscribed property, although no request has been submitted by the State Party to obtain formal approval by the Committee for an extended World Heritage site and buffer zone.

Many of these issues relate to the recommendations of the 2007 mission report. Given the vulnerability of this property from development and the commitment expressed by the State

Party when the property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, in 2006, that the IMP would be finalised and fully implemented, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the decisions taken by the Committee at its 31st, 32nd and 33rd sessions have not yet been fully implemented. These works need to be undertaken with some urgency in order to have in place robust management systems that can address the conservation, protection, development and management challenges.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.67

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the progress made by the State Party in developing a draft Management Plan;
4. Requests the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to:
 - a) Prepare a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and submit it to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee, by **1 February 2011**;
 - b) Submit an official request for the extension of the buffer zone boundaries of the property according to the procedure of the Operational Guidelines by **1 February 2011**;
 - c) Complete the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) and submit it to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** together with a condensed synthesis and, prioritisation of the existing recommendations and intentions, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;
 - d) Provide confirmation that the IMP has been approved, is fully resourced and will be implemented;
 - e) Stop illegal constructions within the property and the buffer zone area (namely in Hampi Village and Virupapura Gada Island), and control and manage other planned developments, such as social housing projects, to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on the integrity of the landscape;
5. Recalls its request to the State Party to:
 - a) Demolish and remove the remaining debris, pillars and carriageway of the collapsed bridge;
 - b) Consider a new more appropriate location for a vehicular bridge outside of the current and possible future boundaries of the property, and
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** a report on progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

68. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

Taj Mahal: 1983
Agra Fort: 1983
Fatehpur Sikri: 1986

Criteria

Taj Mahal: (i)
Agra Fort: (iii)
Fatehpur Sikri: (ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.58; 29 COM 7B.59; 31 COM 7B.80

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 38,753 (Taj Mahal)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 158,200 under the UNESCO/Aventis project "Preservation of Taj Mahal and other Monuments in Agra".

Previous monitoring missions

2004: Joint World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

In 2003: Development project negatively impacting the World Heritage value of the properties of Taj Mahal and Agra Fort ('Taj Heritage Corridor Project'). The project was suspended by the Indian authorities in 2004.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252>
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/251>
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/255>

Current conservation issues

No progress report has been received from the State Party, as requested by the Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

In August 2009, the World Heritage Centre received written and photographic information concerning the construction of a new bridge over the Yamuna River in the vicinity of the Taj Mahal, which might impact adversely on the Taj Mahal and the Agra Fort World Heritage properties.

In accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, in December 2009 the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with comments on the information received and, if the project was confirmed, it further requested the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, detailed information about the project, together with any impact assessment studies that might have been undertaken. No response has been received from the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regret that no details have been provided by the State Party on the apparent proposals to construct a rope bridge near to the Taj Mahal and consider that information on whether this project is still being considered, and if so its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, need to be submitted as a matter of urgency to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory

Bodies, before any commitment is made, in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also regret that no further information has been received from the State Party on progress with integrated management plans for the Taj Mahal and Agra Fort, and for Fatehpur Sikri, nor has information on boundaries for all three properties been submitted, in connection with the retrospective inventory.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.68

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a progress report on management and boundaries as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;
4. Encourages the State Party to continue progress in the development of an integrated management plan for the Taj Mahal and the Agra Fort, and for Fatehpur Sikri, and of a Visitors Facilitation Centre, and requests that it to submit the plans when completed to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;
5. Reiterates its requests the State Party to provide the information to the World Heritage Centre concerning the boundaries and area of the three World Heritage properties in the Agra District, as requested by the World Heritage Centre within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory project in 2006;
6. Also requests the State Party to provide urgently detailed information, and any associated impact assessment studies that have been undertaken, on the proposed construction of a new bridge over the Yamuna River in the vicinity of the Taj Mahal, and for any other development proposals, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines before any commitment has been made;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on all of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

69. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.51; 31 COM 7B.79; 33 COM 7B.70

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Lack of management structure and management plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1101>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit neither a state of conservation report nor copies of an adopted Management Plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). Therefore the progress on the implementation of the decision is difficult to assess.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party in 2009 did also not provide information on progress made on the development of the management plan for the site, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), although it did address other issues, notably conservation work carried out on individual buildings of the site.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the lack of information provided by the State Party and the lack of progress in meeting the requirement of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.69

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.70**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report and the adopted management plan as requested at its 31st and 33rd sessions;
4. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the decision taken at the 33rd session, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

71. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 115)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.71; 32 COM 7B.72; 33 COM 7B.75

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 2,752 (Training assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: 5,710 Euros (France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions

July 2002: ICOMOS and France – UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; June 2004 and May 2005: UNESCO Tehran Office fact-finding missions; May 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June, December 2006 and April 2007: UNESCO Tehran advisory missions; March 2010: joint WHC/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex;
- b) Subway route through the historical axis of Esfahan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/115>

Current conservation issues

On 19 February 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the Meidan Emam, Esfahan was submitted by the State Party. The report directly addressed the issues outlined in the Decision **33 COM 7B.75** of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

a) Reduction in height of the Jahan-Nama building

The State Party reports that this was delayed by structural difficulties but demolition of the remaining parts has now restarted and is expected to be finished soon. The joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission (28 February - 7 March 2010) observed that the 12th floor had been demolished and that demolition of the 11th floor was under way. The mission also reported that the official communication promised by the Iranian authorities to be addressed to the World Heritage Centre before 15 April 2010 with information on and evidence of the completed demolition of two additional floors (12th and 11th) of the Jahan-Nama building complex has not been received. The mission also found that large-scale, ad hoc construction and development projects continue to be planned (for instance, the Atiq Square development project close to the Jama'a Mosque), without prior impact assessments, adequate consultation with concerned stakeholders, or public participation.

b) Impact assessment of the Metro Line project

The State Party has provided the "Report on Environmental Measures taken for Protection of the Chahar-Bagh Historical Boulevard Properties" prepared by consulting engineers ZAFa.

This report concluded that settlement along the Chahar-Bagh historical boulevard would be negligible, as would the impact of the subway construction on the groundwater regime in the project area. It also concluded that other environmental disturbances such as creation of noise, dust, vibration, air pollution, surface and underground utilities breakdown and traffic jam creation along the proposed metro line could be mitigated by the use of a specific tunnelling method - the Earth Pressure Balance (EPB) Shield made by the TBM Company. The disturbances would be restricted to the station site and to the shaft needed to launch the shield.

The 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission found that 90% of the construction work had been completed at the time of the mission. The mission was informed that during the excavation, ground settlements were observed at five sites. Unfortunately, no monitoring was performed on the ground and on the foundation of the Chahar-Bagh School and the Si-o-se Pol Bridge. The team made a visual inspection of specific ground locations adjacent to the School and the Bridge, and found no cracks or physical deformations. Some cracking was noted in the exterior recessed panels of the front wall of the School but it was not clear when these occurred. The mission, recognizing that this area falls outside of the inscribed property but within an area which has been considered for possible extension by the World Heritage Committee, makes recommendations for ongoing monitoring. It also indicated that further development of the metro line system (Metro Line 2) is envisaged.

c) Nomination of the Historic Axis of Esfahan (Chahar-Bagh)

The State Party report notes that work on the nomination is proceeding and that it is considering carefully the possible impacts of the metro line on the historic buildings and sites within the zone of the historic axis and the remedies if any that should be considered in the execution. The mission was informed that the authorities intended to nominate the extension within 3 years. However it is the mission's view that unless clear planning and control regulations are in place and strictly respected, there is no guarantee that the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed extension will be properly protected. The State Party continues to approve development projects with the potential to affect the cultural and historic significance of Esfahan, yet there are still no established mechanisms for undertaking systematic cultural, social, environmental impact assessments prior to designing large scale development projects close to World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies concur with the conclusions of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint monitoring mission as regards the lack of vision for the management of Esfahan as a whole and its surrounding historic fabric. Decisions appear to be made in reaction to development applications, and there is some discord amongst various stakeholder groups. As the mission concluded, there needs to be a carefully considered and managed balance between urban development and heritage protection. In view of the proposed extension of the property to include the Historic Axis of Esfahan, a strategically coordinated long term vision for the protection and management of Esfahan as a historic city needs to be developed to ensure, in turn, a values-based approach to the protection and management of the World Heritage property. Because the overall development pressure on the property is so strong, regional cooperation between all government and religious bodies with an interest in the World Heritage property is essential.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee requests that the State Party develop a management plan for the current World Heritage property including its proposed extension, and the historic city as an encompassing buffer zone. This should be developed in consultation with all stakeholders, and should define a strategic vision and establish the needed coordinating processes. The Management Plan should consider the transport needs of the city, traffic management and parking provision, tourism management, housing and other infrastructure needs as well as the conservation of the historic fabric. It should set height limits in defined areas, and indicate

areas where infill development is desired. A precursor should be a view line study to identify where height restriction is absolutely necessary. The Management Plan should include a process for sound heritage impact assessment and adequate consultation to control major development projects. It is also essential that ongoing monitoring of the historic buildings around the Meidan and along Chahar-Bagh continues.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.71

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009),*
3. *Notes the reduction in height of the Jahan-Nama building under way and requests the State Party to confirm as soon as possible, in writing, to the World Heritage Centre, that the demolition has been completed;*
4. *Takes note of the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and also requests the State Party to implement them;*
5. *Acknowledges the information provided on the geotechnical investigation of the proposed location of the metro line, while recognising that it does not relate directly to possible impacts on the historic buildings and sites;*
6. *Also acknowledges the information that work is being undertaken on assessment of the impact of the metro line on the historic buildings and sites in the context of the proposed Nomination of the Historic Axis of Esfahan;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to develop a Management Plan for the property, in consultation with all stakeholders. This should define a strategic vision for the World Heritage property as a whole, and its buffer zone, and establish the needed coordinating processes. The Management Plan should consider the transport needs of the city, traffic management and parking provision, tourism management, housing and other infrastructure needs as well as the conservation of the historic fabric. It should set height limits in defined areas, and indicate areas where infill development is desired. A precursor should be a view line study to identify where height restriction is absolutely necessary. The Management Plan should include a process for sound heritage impact assessment and adequate consultation to control major development projects. It is also essential that it includes provisions for the monitoring of the historic buildings around the Meidan and along Chahar-Bagh in the context of the Metro Line developments;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the progress made with the above and on the monitoring and further development of the Metro Line project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

72. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.56; 32 COM 7B.77; 33 COM 7B.82

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; November 2007: UNESCO expert advisory mission; April/May 2008: UNESCO New Delhi Office advisory mission; World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission February 2010;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need for development and management plan;
- b) Intrusive and illegal constructions within the Galle cricket ground impacting on the integrity of the property;
- c) Potential impacts of a proposed port construction on the integrity of the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. However, a mission was invited and took place from 14 to 20 February 2010. Its report, which can be accessed at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM>, provides the basis of this report. The report notes that the mission team was unable to adequately address all issues because documentation including plans showing the revised boundaries of the property and buffer zone, a final comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan and a detailed report on current intentions with regard to the International Cricket Stadium and proposed new port, was not available. However, the mission was able to report as follows:

a) Proposed port development

The proposed scale of the port development has been reduced but details of the proposal are not available. Its impact on the World Heritage site cannot yet be properly assessed. The mission was told that a major new commercial port is being constructed at Hambantota (121 km from Galle – just over two hours by road). Consequently the Galle harbour development will now include a yacht marina, and a single berth for cruise ships in the non-monsoon tourist season (October to March), which will accommodate commercial shipping at other times.

The mission notes that as well as a possible adverse visual impact on the World Heritage property when viewed from the east, the new port may impact adversely on the important marine archaeology in the bay, which is still to be fully identified.

b) Cricket Stadium

A municipal building on the cricket ground has been demolished, but there is no intention to demolish the dominant Mahinda Rajaprasa Pavilion or other buildings. The Pavilion was built after the 2004 tsunami and opened in December 2007 by the President of Sri Lanka, whose name the Pavilion bears. The Cricket Stadium is within the buffer zone.

The mission suggests that the World Heritage Committee should seek a binding assurance from the State Party that no further buildings or structures will be erected on or surrounding the Cricket Stadium, and that the State Party consider removing the building to the eastern side of the Cricket Stadium (closer to the bay) within a reasonable timeframe such as 2020, when the renewed lease of the ground from the Municipality will have expired. This would give the State Party and Sri Lanka Cricket time to transfer allegiance to the much larger new stadium being constructed at Hambantota for the 2011 Cricket World Cup. However, the mission report did not include a photograph of the relationship between the Cricket Stadium buildings and the ramparts of the World Heritage property.

c) Conservation and management capacity of the Galle authorities

While repairs to a number of buildings in the Old Town have been completed since the 2008 mission was undertaken, and repair of the storm water drainage system (not sewerage, as all buildings have cess-pits or septic tanks) is 60% complete, other significant buildings continue to decay and inappropriate illegal alterations and constructions are taking place. Conservation objectives need to be accepted by the local community and residents and property owners need to be educated in this respect. However resources including both funds and skills are lacking in this area.

The mission considers that it could be beneficial to create a Conservation and Development Authority with delegated executive authority to manage all planning and development issues within the World Heritage Site, including the buffer zone, as the Galle Heritage Foundation (GHF), which was created as a legal entity to coordinate the conservation of Galle, apparently lacks the status, funding and resources needed for overall management of the property.

d) Property boundaries and buffer zone

The mission understood that following a maritime archaeological survey of Galle Harbour, which identified a number of wreck sites, a proposal to extend the buffer zone to include the bay to the east of the site had been gazetted but had not yet been given legal status. No map showing the area was provided. However an earlier buffer zone proposal that included this area is shown on the map of Galle in the Periodic Report summary included in the 2003 publication 'State of Conservation of the World Heritage Properties in the Asia-Pacific Region'.

The mission considered that the areas of the bay which contain or are likely to contain significant marine archaeology should be protected either by an extension of the property or as part of an extended buffer zone.

e) Overall conservation of the property

The mission acknowledges the considerable work that has been undertaken to conserve individual buildings but also noted the apparent lack of control of some of this work which did not follow appropriate conservation standards.

A list of 87 buildings to be classified as of international importance is stalled because of objections from owner occupiers.

f) Management Plan

The mission was handed a draft Management Plan during its visit. However, the mission considers that this requires considerable further work.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a further request for information on the details of the proposed new port needs to be made. The possible impact on the maritime archaeology of the bay is a major concern. The mission reported (4.4.6) that documentary evidence indicates that at least five ships were wrecked in the vicinity of Galle harbour between 1659 and 1776, only two of which, including *Hercules* have yet been located. Given that the shipwrecks are important tangible attributes of the outstanding universal value of the property as a 17th-18th century fortified port on maritime trading routes, it can be argued that they should be included as part of the World Heritage property, rather than protected only by a buffer zone.

In the absence of convincing evidence of the visual impact of the cricket ground buildings on the ramparts of the World Heritage property it would be preferable to wait rather than request removal of the buildings by 2020 at this stage.

An alternative to the setting up of a new management authority for the World Heritage property as recommended by the mission would be to properly fund and resource the Galle Heritage Foundation, which as noted by the mission is already empowered by Act of Parliament [1994] “to promote the preservation, conservation and development of the Galle Fort together with its historic hinterland...”. It would perhaps be preferable to encourage the State Party to support its existing agency, the GHF, and empower it (through further legislative enactment if necessary) to stop illegal construction, initiate conservation projects, take on a much more proactive role with the other government agencies and stakeholders and become an agency in relation to the World Heritage property. In addition as recommended by the mission, the GHF should educate the public and property owners, provide conservation guidelines and establish a skilled building conservation team to undertake projects and set standards.

Finally, as recommended by the mission, in view of increased tourism since the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka, and consequent burgeoning accommodation and retail development, completion of the Conservation and Management Plan for Galle must be an urgent priority.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.72

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.82**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with regret that the requested state of conservation report including plans showing the revised boundaries of the property and buffer zone, a final comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan or a detailed report on current intentions with regard to the International Cricket Stadium and proposed new Port was not received;*
4. *Reiterates its encouragement to the State Party to consider an extension of the World Heritage property boundary to include the maritime archaeology of the bay, and if agreeable to prepare a minor modification request to that effect;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to review the buffer zone surrounding the Old Town of Galle, its fortifications and maritime archaeology in the context of protecting its setting from the adverse effects of any future development;*

6. Encourages the State Party to further empower (through further legislative enactment if necessary) and support the Galle Heritage Foundation to carry out its currently legislated function in relation to Galle and specifically the World Heritage property.
7. Requests details of the reduced proposal for the new Port including a statement regarding its impact on the maritime archaeology and the World Heritage property;
8. Also requests advice in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, Paragraph 172, of any proposed developments that may impact on the World Heritage property, including any further building on the cricket ground;
9. Further requests that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a report on progress with the above and in particular the finalised comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, including details of institutional arrangements for management of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

76. World Heritage properties of Vienna

- **Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)**
- **Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

Vienna: 2001

Schönbrunn: 1996

Criteria

Vienna: (ii) (iv) (vi)

Schönbrunn: (i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

Vienna: **28 COM 15B.83; 32 COM 7B.82; 33 COM 7B.89**

Schönbrunn: **32 COM 7B.83; 32 COM 8D; 33 COM 7B.90**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise construction project of Central Vienna;
- b) High-rise construction project of Vienna Central Train Station.

Illustrative material

Vienna: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033>

Schönbrunn: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/786>

Current conservation issues

In response to the decisions by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, the State Party provided the requested *Visual Impact Study (VIS) for the UNESCO World Heritage Sites "Historic Centre of Vienna" and "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"*, dated January 2010. This study offers an examination of the potential visual impact of the projects "Vienna Main Railway Station" and "Kometgründe" on the Outstanding Universal Value of the two World Heritage properties. It was carried out from July 2009 to January 2010.

The study and its methodology was founded on a wide range of surveying technologies that allowed accurate field-of-vision analysis. These include laser scans, façade point clouds, a 3D topographical terrain model, accurate city maps, a 3D building information model and a 3D "roof model". Due to the emerging data, the State Party indicates that it was possible to

map all points within the city from where the planned high-rise structures would be visible at an eye level of 1.6m.

The presented VIS visualisations illustrate that the height reduction for the two tallest structures at the main entrance to the Vienna Main Railway Station, from 100m to 88m, proposed by the State Party to the Committee last year, will lead, in the opinion of the State Party, to the southern rear section of the Belvedere complex being minimally visually impaired. Contending, that this part of the property has a subordinate role, the State Party considers that the current status of the railway station project does not impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property.

The State Party recognises that, even after reducing the planned building height from 120m to 73m, the study indicates that the Kometgründe project will create an alien element in its urban context, and notes that the project is located at a point in the cityscape less suited for high-rise buildings. The visualisations show that the visual impairments of the “Schönbrunn Palace” property on its primary north-south axis are relatively slight, and concludes that the Outstanding Universal Value authenticity and integrity are not principally and substantially jeopardised, but the State Party also recognises that the west to east axis of the Schönbrunn property would be directly affected. It also notes that, since the Vienna City Council had already issued its approval for the Kometgründe project, this legal obligation will only become null and void if the project has not been implemented by autumn 2013.

The State Party indicates that, due to the tight time schedule imposed for the submission of the Visual Impact Study, and the significant technical input involved, it was not possible to develop visualisations of all points of view requested by ICOMOS.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that it is unfortunate that the visual impact of the Kometgründe project on the west to east and diagonal garden axis of the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn property is only minimally considered and represented in the VIS.

Whilst giving the impression that the VIS fulfils the requirements of the Committee's decision, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that several aspects and angles should have been further examined. Specifically, the views of Vienna by night with illuminated high-rise buildings have not been given any weight, and the views in winter were not sufficiently considered.

In addition, the VIS does not dwell on any aspect that would create a negative view of the two identified projects and omits placing any emphasis on an awareness that both Schönbrunn and Belvedere Castle relate to the Vienna City Centre. The VIS study considers only 1.60m high pedestrian viewpoints and all higher-level vantage points from across the city have been overlooked. If these had been taken into account, a different, negative perspective that could show an adverse impact on Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and visual integrity of the World Heritage property might emerge. Furthermore, other important viewpoints have not been identified or considered. It is understood that a number of new high-rise projects that could affect the property have already received building permission and these have not been mentioned in the VIS study, nor was the World Heritage Centre informed about these developments in accordance with §172 of the Operational Guidelines. These buildings include the 80m high Raiffeisenhaus, the 8-9 storey Fiat Property and Marillental in Vienna-Meidling and the three proposed 110m high buildings in the Monte Laa area in Vienna Favoriten.

As required by Decision **33 COM 7B.89**, the State Party also submitted a brief state of conservation report, dated 23 March 2010. This confirmed that the existing railway station buildings were being demolished; successful negotiations regarding building height reductions; no decisions regarding buildings had yet been taken; and that high-rise buildings in the project had been subjected to the VIS. The report also notes that several buildings have been recently demolished and, following architectural competitions, fill-in buildings have been constructed, or were about to be realized. In addition, the report indicates that several projects to add floors on top of historic buildings had been completed, or were under way,

and concludes that the State Party considers that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property remains intact.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.76

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.89** and **33 COM 7B.90**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes the considerable technical work involved in preparing and submitting the Visual Impact Study and that the authorities try to ensure compatibility of new architectural and facade design with the requirements of the protection of the World Heritage properties of the Historic Centre of Vienna and the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn;*
4. *Welcomes the commitment of the authorities of the City of Vienna to ensuring that the visibility of the new railway project does not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of both World Heritage properties;*
5. *Also notes that the Main Railway Station project was reduced in height as a result of the decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee and requests that a further height reduction of the western towers and related features be carried out to completely eliminate any visual impacts on the Belvedere property;*
6. *Also requests that the World Heritage Centre be informed of any further changes to the current planning of the Main Railway Station project that could alter the findings of the Visual Impact Study;*
7. *Urges the State Party to further consider the adoption of local architectural forms and roofscape colours and improve architectural volumes of the railway station complex when viewed from distances across the city;*
8. *Further notes that the Kometgründe project will create an alien element in its urban context, and that the project is located at a point in the cityscape less suited to the construction of high-rise buildings and that this will impact adversely on the diagonal axis of the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn World Heritage property;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to reconsider the approved 73m height of the Kometgründe project tower-shaped section, to the previously recommended reduced 60m height;*
10. *Also urges the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to inform the World Heritage Centre of details of the various other recently approved and proposed new high-rise developments that could impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of both properties;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS a further Visual Impact Study that addresses all views required to ensure the protection of important views from and to the World Heritage properties and to*

submit a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties of the Historic Centre of Vienna and the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn to World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2011.

78. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 8B.34, 33COM 7B.93

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1196>

Current conservation issues

Since its construction in 1582 the Nesvizh Castle complex was variously altered until the end of the 19th century. In consequence, it reflects different architectural styles from Renaissance, Baroque, and Classicism to Modern. Despite State Party assurances to the contrary, since June 2008 significant concerns have been raised regarding the different approaches to work being adopted on the property.

The State Party was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to review work in progress, consider the conservation approaches, and review the overall state of conservation. It was also requested to submit details of the methodology to be adopted in rebuilding the Eastern Gallery, the types of proprietary materials and technologies being used in the conservation work, and the intended degree of conservation, restoration and reconstruction work in the adopted approach to the project. On 12 October 2009, the State Party provided a report on work undertaken on the Eastern Gallery.

The mission took place from 20 to 24 February 2010 and reported on its main observations and recommendations as follows:

- a) The mission was informed that efforts were being made to strengthen the capacity of national heritage organizations, professionals and their accountability, in addition to receiving an increase in their budgets, with special conservation work funding being disseminated in 2010.
- b) The mission noted that the palace complex had seriously degenerated during the period it was used as a sanatorium, and that the restoration and rehabilitation, financed by the Republic of Belarus, was a significant improvement on the state of conservation.
- c) The mission further noted that building repair work used traditional materials and techniques, and was organised following in-depth historical research, and a thorough analysis of condition. Stabilisation measures for foundations, walls and load-bearing systems involved necessary rehabilitation and modernisation work, and the employment of manual skilled workers ensured that the standard of conservation/restoration measures was adequate. Extensive reconstruction plans for individual rooms were based on photographs which illustrated their final-documented historic state, whilst the restoration approach for the exterior largely reflected the mid-18th century period, when the original 16th century court façade was totally remodelled.
- d) The mission noted that the Eastern Gallery was taken down and rebuilt for structural reasons, as described in the Information report presented by the State Party on 12 October 2009. Initial work on rebuilding internal walls and vaults opened up what were considered to be more fundamental structural problems. The Gallery apparently collapsed for the first time in 1755 and was later stabilised with metal bonds and a buttress. It was pulled down after attempts had been made to at least preserve the outer walls. After the demolition, which in principle is regrettable, the now rebuilt Eastern gallery is an unavoidable partial reconstruction of the palace complex of Nesvizh.
- e) In reviewing the adopted rebuilding methodology, the mission noted that the Eastern Gallery reconstruction used salvaged brick material from the “dismantled” historic structure; that the Gallery was surveyed prior to “dismantling”, and was re-erected with the same floor heights and fenestration, with walls set on foundations, complying with modern standards. In assessing the type of materials and technologies being used in the conservation work, the mission noted that the internal walls and vaults were plastered, with sparingly applied stucco decoration on the courtyard elevations.
- f) In principle, the mission noted few difficulties in agreeing with the standards and approach adopted for the rebuilding: some parts had been repaired and safeguarded; missing parts replaced; disfiguring 20th century additions removed; and an earlier state reconstituted. In the process, it noted however that there have been conservation, restoration and renovation approaches to the work where, in some circumstances, the conservation and renewal approaches intertwined.
- g) The mission also noted that it would be appropriate to remind the personnel in charge of the property of the necessary balance between repair and renewal which needs to be part of clearly set out policies and approaches for conservation, restoration and reconstruction in the Management Plan. Furthermore, projects such as this needed to be notified to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.
- h) Evaluating the technical stability of structures, apart from the desolate condition of the small 19th-century north-east corner tower of the arsenal wing, the mission observed that the stability of most structures has been secured, and those parts threatened by unstable foundations had been thoroughly investigated.
- i) Evaluating the status of the management plan for the property, and a review of the policy of restoration and reconstruction, requested by the World Heritage Committee at

its 29th session (Durban, 2005) the mission noted that the management plan conforms with the new Law of the Republic of Belarus on the Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage, passed on 24 July 2006. The plan does not however include a policy for restoration and reconstruction, as requested by the Committee.

- j) The mission considered that in view of the enormous tasks of protecting and conserving the Belarusian monuments and sites, the Department of Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage and Restoration should increase its staff of specialists in conservation, restoration and documentation.
- k) The mission noted that proposals were being drawn up for installing heating in the Corpus Christi Church and considered that an overall conservation plan would be needed before this work was undertaken. It further noted the need for greater protection to the urban setting of Nesvizh, where in the past few decades new buildings have been erected that are out of scale with the urban grain and impact adversely on the visual integrity of the setting of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern at the demolition of the Eastern Gallery for structural reasons in the light of the fact that details of this project were not notified to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS, in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*, in order to allow discussion on whether further advice on structural engineering might have been provided. They nevertheless consider that the approaches to its rebuilding were adequate.

They note that the mission was generally satisfied at the approaches to restoration in terms of research, materials, techniques and documentation but that restoration and renewal seem to be inextricably intertwined without a clear rationale for their differing justifications. Although a Management Plan has been prepared for the property and accords with national law, this does not set out a clear approach for restoration, conservation and renewal as requested by the World Heritage Committee. Such a clear approach needs to be put in place before work projects are undertaken such as for the installation of heating in Corpus Christi Church.

Draft Decision 34 COM 7B.78

The World Heritage Committee

1. Having examined document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.93** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009)
3. Acknowledges the results of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of February 2010;
4. Deeply regrets the demolition of the Eastern Gallery and its rebuilding without prior information being submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,
5. Requests the State Party to update the Management Plan clearly setting out approaches to conservation, restoration and renewal, in particular concerning rehabilitation and modernisation works;
6. Urges the State Party to develop an overall conservation approach for the restoration of Corpus Christi Church and the installation of heating, including the advice of experts

on wall painting and heating, and to submit this to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS, before any commitments to the work are made;

7. Encourages the State Party to explore the possibility of reinstating, documented original furnishings for the former residence of the Radziwill, and also original paintings from Nesvizh, currently held in the National Art Museum to support the authenticity of the property;
8. Also encourages the Department of Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage and Restoration to increase its staff of specialists in conservation, restoration and documentation in view of the enormous tasks of protecting and conserving the Belarusian monuments and sites;
9. Further encourages the State Party to adopt other planning measures, in order to protect the urban landscape of the town of Nesvizh where a number of new buildings erected in past decades impact on the historic centre and the visual integrity of the property;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including all above-mentioned points, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

79. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(ii), (iv), (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
33 COM 7B.94

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2010 : World Heritage/ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Potential impacts of new construction projects

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/996>

Current conservation issues

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place from 23 to 25 March 2010 in response to the Committee request made during its 33rd session. On 19 April 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property inscribed on the World Heritage List containing detailed information concerning the « History Museum » and the «Casselberg, Sept Tours and Bouclier Français» projects; the report had been studied by the mission team. The mission report is available at the following Internet address: <http://whc.unesco.org/fr/sessions/34COM/>

As requested by the Committee, the mission studied the «History Museum» and «Casselberg, Sept Tours and Bouclier Français» projects, and also examined the overall conservation of the property.

a) History Museum

This development project planned at the site of the ancient St John's Hospital site (Oud Sint-Jan) by a private company is to build a History Museum (digital) and an underground parking and transform the recovered space into a vast urban park. An initial proposal (2006) only required the listing of a coach house as a historic monument to be revoked to permit its demolition: this revocation which was accepted by the local authorities, was twice cancelled by the State Council. A new concept far more idiosyncratic and contemporary than the earlier proposal was presented in 2008. As this did not receive approval from the Flemish Immovable Heritage Administration, the investors withdrew their proposal and chose to establish the museum in a listed building on the market place. The State Party report indicates however that the future of the Oud Sint-Jan site remains uncertain.

The joint reactive monitoring mission considers that the general concept for development of this area represents a threat to the integrity of the social and religious institutions of the St John's Hospital. Therefore, any future project (including the proposed underground parking) should be subject to rigorous assessment of impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property.

b) Casselberg, Sept Tours and Bouclier français Project

This project concerns the transformation of some historic houses in the centre of Brugge into a hotel complex comprising 120 rooms. To guarantee the cost-effectiveness of this project, more recent buildings judged to be of low heritage value have been demolished to make room for a contemporary wing, the concept of which has been revised several times to take account of the views of the different bodies consulted. The project was finally approved by the consultative organizations, including the Flemish Immovable Heritage administration and the Commission for Urban Aesthetic. The hotel complex became operational towards the end of 2009.

According to the mission report, restoration work on the historic buildings has been carried out with professionalism, under the supervision of the Department for the Preservation of Monuments and Sites, and Urban Renovation. The new contemporary wing respects the volume and proportions of the ancient telephone centre. However, the conflictual situation that marked the beginnings of this project highlights the weakness of the current legal and administrative framework as regards conservation of the built heritage.

c) General state of conservation of the property

While considerable resources have been allocated in the long-term to restoration projects, to the improvement of public spaces and to the revitalization of cultural life in the city, the joint reactive monitoring mission noted, nevertheless, signs of gradual erosion of the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. The mission identified the following factors that contribute to this erosion:

- The ambiguous legal status of the property inscribed on the World Heritage List within the national legal system
- Local policy towards buildings perceived as being of « minor value »
- A liberal approach to the transformation of urban typology
- Economic development and constructions immediately adjacent to the property
- The visual impact of major projects for industrial installations in the surrounding landscape.

The mission also noted that a 50m protection zone exists around the listed monuments. However, major transformation and demolition work is authorized in these zones. Moreover, buildings of importance in the urban fabric that contribute to its coherence have no heritage preservation status despite their essential role for the integrity of the property; some have even been demolished. It would appear that there is little understanding of how the property as a whole conveys Outstanding Universal Value. Instead, attention is focused on a number of specific buildings within the city. The redevelopment of some areas does not respect the overall coherence and distinctiveness of the city, and the mission noted the large-scale development of commercial and administrative areas in close proximity to the property that were in conflict with urban functions and fabric of the historic city, impacting negatively on the integrity of the property.

Although Brugge does not possess a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the ICOMOS evaluation and the agreed upon justification of criteria, clearly indicate that Brugge's value is associated with its outstanding architectural ensemble. This architectural ensemble reflects the entirety of its medieval fabric and its urban structure and how its historic fabric has evolved over the centuries, the Gothic style being an integral part of the identity of the city. Brugge is extraordinarily coherent and contained within its medieval walls. The general aspect of the city and the area it occupies are crucial to an understanding of how the medieval city has conserved intact its form and architectural details and the way in which the evolution of the city is linked to the Gothic style of the buildings. In Brugge no other style is reflected in its evolution, as opposed to many other cities. It is for this reason that its coherence is of crucial importance.

The mission deemed that there was a need to classify the property within the national legislative framework as an « urban landscape » to protect the coherence of the overall urban form. The mission also considered that the study of specific urban areas should be undertaken to define the urban typology and set out conditions for possible future development. The mission recommends that clearer and more effective links need to be fostered between the development interests of the city and the conservation needs of the Historic Centre of Brugge, by integrating the requirements of heritage conservation into regional planning documents. The mission further recommends that a visual impact study be undertaken for the important views from and towards the World Heritage property, taking into account the historic and principal perspectives and the results incorporated into urban planning documents to avoid a negative visual impact on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the development of these two projects emphasizes the weakness in the planning and management of the World Heritage property that appears to be reactive rather than proactive, and hope that appropriate development within the framework of the approved constraints will be encouraged. They further consider that a better governance could help to reduce these tensions and that an improved management system, defined in an approved management plan, based on the approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, could greatly improve the protection of the historic centre. They also consider that it would be beneficial to establish an advisory panel of experts for the World Heritage property that may be consulted as regards important projects and provide advice on the suitability of projects at a very early stage.

d) *Construction of two wind turbines*

In April 2010 the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre of the construction project, by the Final Energy Company, of two wind turbines in the proximity of the Historic Centre of Brugge with a total height of (mast and rotor) of 113 meters; the wings of the rotor measure 82 meters. An impact study undertaken from different areas in the city demonstrated that the wind turbines would be visible above the historic buildings and this in several places. The State Party therefore requested the advice of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS regarding this project.

In its evaluation, ICOMOS considers that the documentation provided clearly demonstrates that the wind turbines would be visible from within the inscribed property and would negatively affect its integrity and its Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre drew the same conclusion. In view of these comments, the State Party informed that this project has been abandoned.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the gradual erosion of the urban fabric due to the lack of protection of the buildings, the urban landscape and the urban typology, as well as the lack of effective urban planning policies respecting the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

They are also concerned about the threats emerging in the environment surrounding the property and from the commercial and administrative districts.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that an urgent response is needed to the mission recommendations calling for an improved understanding of the specific attributes of the city that convey the Outstanding Universal Value, an improved protection of the historic urban fabric, improved planning policies and a better governance that integrates conservation with development.

They commend the decision of the State Party to withdraw the scheme for the two large wind turbines.

Draft decision: **34 COM 7B.79**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.94** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Expresses its concern regarding the conclusions of the mission that indicate the gradual erosion of the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value and, consequently, threaten the integrity of the property in terms of overall coherence and distinctiveness;*
4. *Strongly recommends to the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission, in particular:*
 - a) *explore ways to list the property in the framework of national legislation as an « urban landscape » to protect the coherence and the overall urban form,*
 - b) *undertake the study of the specific urban areas to define the urban typology and the conditions for possible future development,*

- c) *promote clearer and more effective links between the development interests of the city and the need to conserve the Historic Centre of Brugge, by incorporating the requirements of heritage conservation into regional planning documents,*
 - d) *identify important views from and towards the property and incorporate their protection into urban planning documents,*
 - e) *strengthen governance of the property to make it more proactive and incorporate this into the approved urban plan based on the approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - f) *envisage the establishment of an advisory panel of experts specifically created for the property inscribed on the World Heritage List, that may be consulted as regards important projects and provide advice on their suitability at an early stage;*
5. Requests the State Party to develop by **1 February 2011**, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on progress achieved in the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

81. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1983

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8B.82; 32 COM 8D

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,201 for preparatory assistance (1991); USD 15,000 for technical assistance (1992).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

Current conservation issues

During recent years, the World Heritage Centre has been informed on different issues concerning new developments in the Ancient City of Nessebar, including inappropriate and illegal demolition and construction, the state of conservation of the historic monuments and various interventions to the urban fabric, as well as on possible threats to this World Heritage property by inappropriate tourism development.

In Section II of the Periodic Report for Europe (Cycle 1) on the state of conservation of the Ancient City of Nessebar 2005, the State Party provided information about the threats to the World Heritage property and its buffer zone, as well as on the measures to be undertaken to address these challenges.

On 4 January 2006, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that a joint committee composed of the responsible directors from the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works had been set up in December 2005. This committee decided to start the elaboration of a Management Plan, as well as to update existing regulations, including the Development Plan.

On 28 January 2007, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that a number of constructions were executed without approval by the National Institute for Cultural Monuments (NICM), a consultative body within the Ministry of Culture. Deviations occurred in the architectural elements, details and materials used, as well as in the dimensional parameters of the buildings. The NICM established several commissions for the prevention and abolition of the illegal constructions.

Furthermore, at its 32nd session, the World Heritage Committee took note of the clarifications of boundaries and size of the Ancient City of Nessebar provided by the State Party in response to the Retrospective Inventory (Decision **32 COM 8D**).

Following numerous meetings with the Bulgarian national and local authorities, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party on 27 June 2009 to provide a detailed report on the state of conservation of this property, including the following documents:

- the Management Plan of the property, including the tourism development programme;
- the Master Plan of the city, including the regulations for the construction and restoration works;
- the description of the adopted restrictive measures concerning movable equipment (tourist shops) within the property;
- all relevant legal documents concerning the property and its land use.

On 7 April 2010, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property. The following issues have been addressed in the State Party's report:

a) *State of conservation*

- Archaeological sites: The State Party submitted a report on 18 archaeological sites and remains in Appendix 8. Even though some conservation and restoration works have been carried out in past years, the State Party underlined several threats due to the bad condition of the remains, a risk of destruction of some sections of the wall, and inappropriate use (e.g. fast-food restaurants are placed on the ruins of Hellenistic houses). Emergency measures should be taken to protect archaeological sites, and an overall project to reinforce, protect, restore and present archaeological sites to the public should be prepared and implemented.

- Medieval monuments: The State Party submitted a report on 13 churches in Appendix 7. Emergency measures should be taken to consolidate and restore 6 churches in order to resolve serious structural problems, capillary moisture and partial loss of mural paintings. Among the churches described in the report, the Church of the Assumption is the only one in use. Recent inappropriate works of construction and restoration of mural paintings have been conducted in this church without any agreement with the national authorities. On 19 November 2009, the Municipality of Nessebar informed the national authorities that an inventory of illegal works undertaken in violation of the Cultural Heritage Act has been created. Other churches are used as art galleries or museums. The State Party mentioned the lack of an appropriate approach in organizing exhibitions in those historic monuments.
- Urban fabric and 19th century wooden houses: The State Party's report did not mention the condition of 19th century wooden houses and structures, but included in Appendix 9 a complete description and photos of 132 illegal works carried out in the city despite the Cultural Heritage Act, which illustrate the lack of an appropriate approach to the preservation of authentic urban fabric and to the integrity of the property. The State Party provided a detailed list of proposals to regulate interventions (including urban equipment and commercial activities), as well as measures necessary to preserve the authenticity of the city's urban fabric and its visual integrity. *Legal documents and management*

The State Party's report provided detailed information on statutory acts, directives and regulations in force in Appendices 1-5, such as the 2009 Cultural Heritage Act, 2001 Territorial Planning Act, 2008 Black Sea Coastline Area Planning Act, 1986 Directive "Plan-Concept" for the monuments, 1981 Building Development and Regulation Plan, and the 1991 Building Development and Regulation Plan of the Archaeological and Architectural Reserve of Nessebar.

However, the State Party highlighted in the main part of the report, the limited financial and human resources available, as well as the lack of regional structures, appropriate management system and legal framework specifically focused on the protection of the Ancient City of Nessebar as a World Heritage property (such as an updated strategy for protection of the World Heritage property, a programme for tourism development, protection and management plan and detailed protection area regimes for the Ancient City of Nessebar). A final Regulation and Development Plan for the Ancient City of Nessebar has not been adopted so far. The report mentioned that works were undertaken in violation of the Cultural Heritage Act and the Territorial Planning Act and the regulations of the Municipality of Nessebar due to lack of the supervision at local level needed to avoid and prevent illegal interventions. In addition, the report highlights the crucial need to establish a dialogue between the national and local authorities concerned, and hold consultations with the owners and users.

c) *Main factors affecting the property*

The State Party reports that the main factors affecting the property are still:

- Lack of conservation, restoration and consolidation of monuments and archaeological sites;
- Uncontrolled urban development (demolition, reconstruction, illegal construction);
- Visitor and tourism pressure;
- Lack of a legal framework and management system;
- Threats related to the environment pressure and climate (marine humidity and salinity, erosion of the coast, wind abrasive impact).

d) *Activities undertaken by the national authorities for the protection of the property:*

- from 1960s to 1980s: conservation and restoration of the archaeological remains, the medieval churches and most of the 19th century houses;

- research and periodic monitoring of the churches (control of microclimate; emergency control of humidity; anti-capillary moisture system);
- monitoring of main monuments and urban fabric;
- research of main archaeological sites;
- numerous inspections and meetings identifying illegal interventions in the city;
- establishment of recommendations to remove all illegal constructions;
- establishment of an access regime for some churches;
- regulation of visitors pressure by the Municipality of Nessebar;
- installation of information panels;
- analysis aiming to establish criteria for the establishment of protection zones;
- elaboration of protection regimes for eight city's zones;
- analysis of risks related to the climate (1993);
- study of climatic characteristic of the area.

e) *Proposed measures for protection and management:*

In its report, the State Party proposed main actions to be implemented in order to maintain the World Heritage status of the property, in particular:

- Preparation of a strategy for sustainable development of the city;
- Preparation and adoption of an Urban Development Plan of the city, including detailed protection regimes and regulations;
- Preparation of a project to re-establish the authenticity of the City in line with the protection requirements;
- Modification of the boundaries of the World Heritage property;
- Removing of all movable facilities and advertisements out of the Ancient City of Nessebar and establishment of an overall concept for necessary facilities;
- Preparation of a specialized cadastral map, including archaeological cadastre;
- Preparation, adoption and implementation of a protection and management plan for the Ancient City of Nessebar;
- Preparation of a programme for the development of cultural tourism;
- Preparation of an urban design concept ;
- Establishment of an inventory and of a heritage information system;
- Submission by the Municipality of Nessebar to the national authorities of the sea defense project along the coastline of the peninsula and the architectural project of the sea defense of the coastline of the Ancient City;
- Creation of a specialized body within the Municipality of Nessebar for cultural heritage protection;
- Creation of a joint body (with the participation of non-governmental organizations and representatives of scientific institutes) to coordinate the activities related to the protection of the World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note, with deep concern, serious changes due to inappropriate urban development; the substantial visual impact of some developments; lack of conservation, restoration and consolidation of monuments and archaeological sites; lack of an appropriate management system and legal framework in the urban fabric combined with the lack of coordination among authorities, which is a potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that a mission be sent to enable the World Heritage Committee to examine the state of conservation of this property, with a view to considering the inscription of the World Heritage property of the Ancient City of Nessebar, Bulgaria, on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Takes note of the detailed information provided by the State Party on the state of conservation of the property;
3. Expresses its deep concern regarding the overall state of conservation of the property, and in particular, serious changes due to unacceptable development of the urban fabric that are a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;
4. Urges the State Party to immediately adopt all necessary measures aiming to ensure the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, monitoring and survey of the urban fabric, preparation, adoption and implementation of a Management Plan (including tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments), Urban Master Plan and a Conservation Master Plan of monuments and archaeological sites;
5. Also urges the State Party and the Municipality authorities to immediately stop any development projects which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, and to inform the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, on any intention to undertake or to authorize such projects;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to the property in 2010 to assess the state of conservation of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a detailed progress report on the state of conservation of the property, including the results of monitoring and survey of the urban fabric, monuments and archaeological sites, the approved Management and Urban Master Plans, Conservation Master Plan of monuments and archaeological sites, and a report on the use of the historic buildings and monuments, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

82. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1992

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.94; 32 COM 7B.86; 33 COM 7B.96

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency Assistance in 2003 (floods).

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2008, January 2010: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development of high rise constructions on the Pankrác plain;
- b) Lack of effectiveness of existing planning, management and conservation measures for the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/616>

Current conservation issues

On 8 January 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Prague was submitted by the State Party as well as two letters on high-rise developments and the restoration of the Charles Bridge. The report directly addressed the issues of Decision **33 COM 7B.96** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). An amendment to the report comprising a joint evaluation of the impact of the Blanka Tunnel Complex by the Municipal Department of Culture, Monument Care and Tourism, and the National Heritage Institute, Regional Specialised Department in Prague was submitted dated 24 February 2010. A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the Historic Centre of Prague from 26 to 29 January 2010.

Information provided by the State Party:

- a) *Potential impact of the Blanka Tunnel Complex on the property.*

Construction of the inner city traffic circuit began in the 1980s, before the Historic Centre of Prague was inscribed on the World Heritage List. The need for tunnels was established in the 1990s, when three possible routes were considered in the light of all attendant issues, and in consultation with all relevant and statutory bodies. The Blanka tunnel proposal was assessed as being the best solution to coping with the negative impacts of transit traffic on the Historic Centre of Prague. The history of the urban ring project in Prague is also detailed.

Only 800 metres of the inner city traffic circuit falls within the boundaries of the World Heritage property. This passes beneath the Baroque fortifications at the north-west. The rest is mainly (90%) in the buffer zone as shown on the map (Appendix 1) of the State Party's report. It is noted that the Baroque fortification will be restored as part of the road works (Appendix no. 3 of the State Party's report).

- b) *Reactive monitoring mission to investigate the Blanka tunnel and new traffic proposals, changes to Wenceslas Square, the possible creation of Prague's "Museum Mile" and the issue of historic railway stations*

The State Party reported that the mission had been invited and in the meantime provided the following information:

- i) New traffic proposals: It is proposed to divert the North-East Expressway section of the 'Eastern Highway' in the Historic Centre through a tunnel behind the National Museum. This will enable the reuniting of the National Museum with Wenceslas Square. The intention is to correct the 1970s' introduction of a main north-south traffic artery (the

'Eastern Highway' with its expressway sections) through the Historic Centre, which created an undesirable traffic situation in the World Heritage property.

- ii) Changes to Wenceslas Square: It is proposed to return Wenceslas Square to its historic function of a boulevard with tram transport in accordance with the 2005 winning competition design for the Square. This depends on modifications to the expressway sections of the 'Eastern Highway', which diverges around the National Museum.
- iii) Proposed creation of Prague's "Museum Mile": The aim of this project is to connect museums in neighbouring locations into a common visitor route, including the proposed Railway Museum in the former engine depot at Marsaryk Station (locations are shown on the map-Appendix 4). The former Federal Assembly building has been assigned to the National Museum across Vinohradska Avenue to accommodate additional visitor facilities, and it is proposed to link these with an under-road corridor. It is also proposed to erect a modern exhibition building in the neighbourhood of the City of Prague Museum at Florenc (which is a national monument).
- iv) Historic Railway Stations: A number of (redundant) Historic Railway Stations are proposed for re-use combined with redevelopment of adjacent land.
- v) Restoration of Charles Bridge: Objections to the work currently underway to conserve the Charles Bridge have been countered by the opinion of Czech ICOMOS, which the State Party attached to its report.
- vi) Height controls: The State Party has included a map (Appendix 4) showing the boundaries within which building heights are restricted. This surrounds the inscribed property but does not include all the areas shown as Heritage Zones within the area labelled as the buffer zone. It encompasses an area considerably less than that of the labelled buffer zone, which is in turn less than the inscribed buffer zone shown on the World Heritage Inventory map (#09, cz-616-inv).
- vii) Overall conservation of the property: The State Party has provided information on a large number of projects currently underway including "larger restoration works, changes and new buildings within the preserved area", noting the use of the digitised 19th Century Langweil model of the city to guide restoration and infill works.

Conclusions by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as informed by the January 2010 joint monitoring mission:

a) *The Blanka Tunnel and Baroque fortifications (response to a) above)*

No objection is raised to the construction of the Blanka Tunnel in the context of the city's transportation strategy for Prague provided that:

- The north-west link road is not built before the completion of the Prague Ring;
- The 'Eastern Highway' is physically downgraded as soon as the Blanka Tunnel section of the City Ring provides an alternative route; otherwise the overall volume of traffic will simply increase, leading to the perpetuation of the present severance of the World Heritage property from its context, and the poor street environment and setting of key buildings within it;
- The proposed tunnel behind the National Museum is not constructed (see point b)(i) above) as this would encourage, rather than discourage, through traffic;
- The expressway sections of the Eastern Highway are removed from the eastern edge of the World Heritage property, with a return to city streets 'at grade';
- Policy regarding on-site parking for developments and public car parking within the World Heritage property is reviewed, to minimise both the growth of demand for

vehicles to access the area, and adverse impacts on the integrity of the fabric of the historic city.

The repair and restoration of the Baroque fortifications is welcomed but the reinstated areas in front of them should be appropriate to their historic character and configuration.

b) *New traffic proposals around Wenceslas Square (response to b) (i) and (ii) above)*

The proposals for Wenceslas Square are considered potentially beneficial but depend on parking provision within the historic centre being discouraged as far as possible, and the physical downgrading of the 'Eastern Highway'.

c) *The Museum Mile proposal (response to b) (iii) above)*

The concept of the "Museum Mile" is considered beneficial but the success of the concept depends fundamentally on physically downgrading the 'Eastern Highway'.

d) *Historic Railway Stations (response to b) (iv) above)*

- Development proposals for Maseryk Station should consider its historic role and seek to retain links, physically and conceptually, with the railway network, via the railway museum;
- The current proposal for Vysehrad Station shown in the concept plan and visualisation on p.15 of the 2010 mission report indicates that the proposed flanking buildings are too high in relation to the historic station building. In general they should not exceed the height of the roof ridge of the side wings of the historic building in order to achieve compositional harmony.
- The historic concourse of Central Station should be reconnected with the city through the downgrading of the 'Eastern Highway';
- Development of and around Zizkov Station should preserve, and enhance, the skyline of Prague. However it is essential that the World Heritage Centre be kept informed about emerging development proposals.

e) *Charles Bridge (response to b) (v) above)*

While the initial work was inappropriate the current approach is greatly improved. Future work should be based on adequate documentation, appropriate standards and techniques, and subject to regular monitoring.

f) *Height controls (response to b) (vi) above)*

It was noted by the January 2010 joint mission that the specific recommendation of the 2008 mission concerning new buildings on the Pankrac Plain not to exceed 60 to 70m in height, and the request by the Committee to that effect, has not so far been implemented. The high-rise limitations plan should be completed and adopted in accordance with the request by the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee and the 2008 mission, in order to avoid possible further visual intrusion in the historic urban landscape of Prague.

g) *Overall conservation of the property (response to b) (vii) above)*

In addition to the information in the State Party's report, the January 2010 joint monitoring mission provided information on a large development project near Wenceslas Square and the development flanking Vysehrad Station as indicative of the approach taken by developers within the World Heritage property. The former project involves enclosing the former riding house of the Baroque Savarin Palace within the atrium of the development, which spans across a complete block. Given that the Draft Management Plan 2009/2 (map no. 15) indicates at least eight localities within the World Heritage property where "a structure with a major impact on the Historic Centre of Prague is intended" and several others that either have planning permission or are under study for potential development, this is a matter for concern.

h) *World Heritage property boundary and buffer zone*

The 2010 mission report recommends that Pruhonice Park should be integrated into the overall coordination, management and presentation of the World Heritage property and suggests that the buffer zone should be extended to surround Pruhonice Park.

The State Party transmitted two letters with detailed comments on the mission report both dated 27 April 2010, and noted in particular that: (a) The mission covered more issues than foreseen, (b) that the mission was not proposed to look at buffer zones of the property and the component of Pruhonice Park, (c) welcomed the conclusions on the transport strategy but stated that a reduction of the 4-lanes highway was not realistic and that concerning the parking policy in the historic centre has been already taken into account; (d) on development projects of the railway stations that further studies need to be undertaken (e) on the Charles Bridge that the monitoring has been carried out; (f) that concerning the Museums Mile it is already a successful concept without traffic reductions; (g) and considers the rehabilitation of the Historic Centre a success and (h) and concludes that the recommendations of 2008 for new buildings at Pankrac Plain should not exceed 60-70m would be respected." Further information was then provided on 30 April 2010 on the restoration of the Charles Bridge. Clarifications on the boundaries were provided by letter from the national authorities dated 10 May 2010 as a follow-up to a meeting which took place at the World Heritage Centre on 14 April 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have taken note of the comments by the Czech authorities and underline that a constructive dialogue on all issues covered in the mission report has taken place during the mission and in follow-up exchanges. Concerning the issue of the buffer zone, which was included as a follow-up to the 2008 mission, it is noted that any changes to the delimitations of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone would have to be officially submitted by the State Party.

Draft Decision: **34 COM 7B.82**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.96**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes the outcome of the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Historic Centre of Prague of January 2010;*
4. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the January 2010 joint reactive monitoring mission, particularly in relation to:*
 - a) *the Blanka Tunnel: ensure the downgrading of the 'Eastern Highway, halt the proposed tunnel behind the national museum and remove the sections of the Eastern Highway from the Eastern edge of the property,*
 - b) *the completion of the high-rise limitations plan, and*
 - c) *clarification of the rules presently in force to manage processes such as infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation;*
5. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about emerging major development proposals especially development at Visegrad station and Zitkov stations in accordance with the Operational Guidelines;*

6. *Regrets that the restoration of Charles Bridge was carried out without adequate conservation advice on materials and techniques and also requests the State Party to ensure that any future works are based on detailed assessment and documentation using skilled craftspeople and conservators;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to ensure that Pruhonice Park is protected and managed as an integral part of the World Heritage property;*
8. *Reminds the State Party of the buffer zone adopted at the time of the inscription and that any changes to this buffer zone have to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in conformity with the Operational Guidelines;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the requests above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

88. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.75; 31 COM 7B.96; 32 COM 7B.91; 33 COM 7B.103

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003 and June 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) General need for interior and exterior conservation work on the monuments;
- b) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities;
- c) Lack of co-ordinated management system;
- d) Major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710>

Current conservation issues

The Committee during its 33rd session reiterated its request to the State Party to urgently prepare, approve and submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a management plan for the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, including a boundaries clarification document clearly indicating its buffer zones. The World Heritage Committee

further requested the State Party to provide detailed and complete information concerning the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property as well as the reconstruction project and a progress report on works carried out.

Finally the Committee invited the State Party to initiate an international donors conference designed to address major problems identified for all World Heritage properties in Georgia. The Committee also requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a progress report, including the complete and detailed documentation concerning the new reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

In September 2009, the State Party submitted the *Bagrati Cathedral preliminary rehabilitation project*, the general report on the studies conducted within the framework of this project and the *Report on Bagrati Cathedral rehabilitation works*, requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session. These documents were reviewed by an ICOMOS panel, and on 17 February 2010, their comments were transmitted by the World Heritage Centre to the State Party.

Further, in March 2010 a meeting took place between representatives of the President of Georgia, of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

At the invitation of the State Party, a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM advisory mission visited the property from 11 to 17 March 2010, to review the state of conservation of the property, including the proposed reconstruction of Bagrati Cathedral (mission report available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM>).

On 1 December 2009, the State Party also submitted a document clarifying the boundaries of the property which is included in Working Document *WHC-10/34 COM/8D*.

The mission discovered that major interventions have already been carried out as the first phase of the project of reconstruction of the Bagrati Cathedral.

They noted serious negative interventions (reinforcement of foundations by an underground concrete ring around the monument, construction of reinforced concrete columns, original walls surface partially covered with stone slabs and iron reinforcement).

The future work that is being planned on the existing fabric appears even more drastic. The intention is to reconstruct all the missing parts of the interior and the exterior of the monument, in order to re-create the original building and restore its function as a church. That will be achieved through the installation of a “perimetric” ring of reinforced concrete on top of the existing walls, and through the establishment of new pillars of reinforced concrete in the places of the original stone pillars, reconstruction of the gigantic vaulted volumes and the cupola in reinforced concrete to be covered with a layer of stone cladding that imitates the original stone construction. The mission noted that only a part of the projected reconstruction is based on acceptable documentation while most is based on conjecture. It is possible to extend mouldings and to complete partially collapsed arches through geometrical projection but the heights of the vault, the shape of the drum and the height of the cupola are conjectural.

The Georgian study team in charge of this project informed the mission that the approach in place is the only way that the ruined church can be protected from the strong atmospheric conditions and from any future seismic activities and at the same time recover its full ecclesiastical function as a church.

The mission further noted that the contention of the Patriarchate Technical Office Representative that the monument was inscribed as “*a symbol of national identity and unit*”

did not conform to the reasons for inscription identified by the World Heritage Committee an achievement of medieval Georgian architecture, in half-ruined condition.

The mission recalled that the 2004 ICOMOS mission stated that “We gained the impression however that the determination to rebuild is so great that it may take place despite the risk of the building being removed from the World Heritage List as a result” and added that “We are of the opinion that ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee should make use of every form of persuasion to avoid rebuilding.”

The mission also presented to the State Party the document produced by ICOMOS in February 2010 analyzing the proposed reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral. Reflecting efforts to build consensus among the ICOMOS professional community, the document provides an in-depth consideration of all factors important in evaluating the reconstruction proposition and should be seen as the definitive assessment of this project within a conservation perspective.

The ICOMOS document presents the following brief conclusions:

- What is being proposed could be seen as a repeat of the “Evans case” in Crete Island, Greece one century later. It is not wise to repeat the faults of the past.
- The proposed reconstruction project aims to give back to the ruin of Bagrati Cathedral its authentic function as a cathedral and to create a new national symbol through the reconstruction. However, this will destroy much of its existing authentic substance as well as the authentic craftsmanship present in the ruin. This process will also destroy the authentic spirit and the “breath of history”, which future visitors will no longer be able to experience. Therefore, the project must be rejected on the grounds of being a severe threat to the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property and its authenticity.
- ICOMOS considers that it should be possible to improve the present project in order to preserve the authenticity of the ruin while at the same time allowing it to be used as a church.

The mission expressed strong opposition to the reconstruction, which does not follow scientific methodologies for stone conservation, or the philosophy of the international conservation. The mission also expressed doubts about the “exceptional circumstances” justifying the reconstruction. While there seems to be a popular and political desire for this reconstruction, the building became a ruin many centuries ago and has already taken on a life and a history after its ruin.

The mission also noted that the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Protection has expressed its reservations regarding the reconstruction project.

Concerning Gelati Monastery, the mission noted that the master plan which was presented to the mission gives adequate answers to problems relating to the future needs of the monastic community, and of the visitors to the monastic complex. There is a proper organization of the functions inside the monastery grounds, taking into consideration the fact that the property is a living monument. There is, also, provision in case of a rising number of the monks, for them to be established in a nearby place, outside of the monastery grounds. The master plan very successfully dissociates the visitors’ facilities from the monks’ life, proposing that the new visitors’ buildings be erected outside the monastery grounds, while the visitors would follow an organized route inside the monastic complex.

The mission underlined that it is absolutely necessary to elaborate and implement the management plan of all components of the property, including a complex programme for the

structural conservation and restoration of the monuments, as well as a complex long-term programme.

Following numerous consultations with the national and local authorities and site visits, the mission prepared a draft desired state of conservation for the property based on its Outstanding Universal Value in view of its eventual inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, including the necessary corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation. The World Heritage Centre transmitted this document to the State Party for comments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express utmost concern that work has already commenced on the first phase of the reconstruction project of Bagrati Cathedral without any approval of the overall concept and approach by the World Heritage Committee. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that no adequate state of conservation report including detailed documentation has been carried out before reconstruction work commenced.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the reconstruction project will destroy much of the existing authentic fabric and authentic craftsmanship of the ruins, and would irrevocably impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and could result in the World Heritage Committee considering the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also believe that alternative approaches to reuse the site based on contemporary development integrating the existing ruins are possible and deserve serious exploration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underline that the management plan of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (including a tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments, a Urban Master Plan and a Conservation Master Plan of monuments) should be urgently prepared, approved and submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.88

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the “Bagrati Cathedral preliminary rehabilitation project”, the general report on the studies conducted within the framework of this project and the “report on Bagrati Cathedral rehabilitation works”;*
4. *Notes the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM advisory mission to the property;*
5. *Expresses its serious concern about irreversible interventions carried out by the State Party as part of the preparations for the Bagrati Cathedral reconstruction project prior to any review or approval of the project and its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;*

6. Urges the State Party to halt immediately all interventions at Bagrati Cathedral, which threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;
7. Also urges the State Party to immediately adopt all necessary measures aiming to ensure the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, monitoring and survey of the state of conservation of the property, preparation, adoption and implementation of a Management Plan (including a tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments, a Urban Master Plan and a Conservation Master Plan of monuments);
8. Invites the State Party to organise a consultation with international conservation engineers and architectural conservators in order to consider how the interventions already carried out might be reversed entirely or in part and to consider the overall consolidation of the Bagrati Cathedral ruins;
9. Considers that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by the Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.103**, and that therefore the property is in danger in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines and **decides to inscribe the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger**;
10. Adopts the following desired state of conservation for the property based on its Outstanding Universal Value, in view of its future removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger:
 - a) The reconstruction of the Bagrati Cathedral halted,
 - b) Interventions already carried out at the Bagrati Cathedral reversed (entirely or in part),
 - c) The overall consolidation project of the Bagrati Cathedral ruins, elaborated in consultation with international conservation engineers and architectural conservators, implemented,
 - d) The boundaries and buffer zone of all component parts of the World Heritage property precisely clarified,
 - e) A comprehensive management system including an Integrated Management Plan with tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments, Conservation Master Plan for all components of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone and Urban Master Plan including land-use regulations approved and implemented,
 - f) Long-term consolidation and conservation of the historical monuments of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery ensured;
11. Adopts the following corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation:
 - a) Changes to be carried out immediately
 - The reconstruction of the Bagrati Cathedral halted and a consultation organized with international conservation engineers and architectural conservators in order to consider how the interventions already carried out might be reversed (entirely or in part) and how the overall consolidation of the Bagrati Cathedral ruins might be achieved,
 - b) Changes to be carried out within one to two years :
 - Interventions already carried out at the Bagrati Cathedral reversed entirely or in part (taking into consideration the underground reinforced concrete ring around the foundations of the building),

- *An overall consolidation project of the Bagrati Cathedral ruins elaborated in consultation with international conservation engineers and architectural conservators,*
 - *Monitoring regimes for the physical conservation of all components of the property to ensure the long-term conservation, consolidation and protection of the World Heritage Property developed,*
 - *A clear institutional coordination mechanism, ensuring that the conservation of the property receives priority consideration within relevant governmental decision-making processes, established,*
- c) *Changes to be carried out within two to three years:*
- *Legislation adopted that assures the protection and maintenance of all the component parts of the World Heritage property in order to sustain its Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - *A comprehensive management system adopted that includes an Integrated Management Plan with tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments, Conservation Master Plan for all components of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone and an Urban Master Plan including land-use regulations,*
- d) *Changes to be carried out within five years (after possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2 to 3 year) :*
- *Documentation and recording of all historical monuments as a digitized information database for management, conservation and planning purposes completed,*
 - *A full inventory of paintings including digitalization and reference system for all historical monuments of the property established,*
 - *Agreed restoration of all monuments, including paintings carried out,*
 - *A complex programme for the structural conservation and restoration of the churches, in Gelati Monastery to be carried out,*
 - *A complex programme for the systematic cleaning, conservation and restoration of the interior wall-paintings and mosaics in Gelati Monastery churches, with the involvement and collaboration of international specialists in this domain, to be carried out;*

12. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the World Heritage Committee's decision, including three printed and electronic copies of the draft management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **considering that, if further reconstruction works are carried out on Bagrati Cathedral, the property might be in conformity with Chapter IV.C of the Operational Guidelines for an eventual deletion from the World Heritage List.**

90. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1994, extension 1996

Criteria

(i), (ii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.85; 31 COM 7B.113; 33 COM 7B.109

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2005: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction project of a highway extension in the vicinity of Villa Saraceno;
- b) Uncontrolled development and urban encroachment in the Veneto region;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/712/>

Current conservation issues

Dated 29 January 2010, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report gives detailed information on counter measures for protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in light of the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of 2005 in regard to the ongoing A-31 Valdastico-South highway construction project. The report indicates that further documentation was already provided with their letters dated 24 and 27 November 2009 including maps and plans.

The State Party further reports via letter dated 2 March 2010 that the final design, including the so-called “UNESCO modifications”, was submitted to the Municipality of Agugliaro (Vicenza) for the necessary town planning approval, which was granted with Resolution no. 2 of the Municipal Council dated 28 January 2009. The final design has also been approved by the region of Veneto, and has been forwarded to the National Autonomous Roads Corporation (ANAS), the institution in charge of highway construction under the control of the Italian Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport, for its final approval. The State Party notes that the appropriation of land has begun, but no construction work has started yet.

The State Party has carried out a significant redesign of several sections of the highway near portions of the World Heritage property. In particular, at the planned exit north of Agugliaro, two underpasses have replaced overpasses and the design of the toll station has been modified and simplified. At the southern exit, one of the two overpasses has been removed and the second redesigned, including the lowering of its profile and the introduction of landscaping to minimize its impact. In addition, along the stretch of highway, two additional overpasses have been replaced by underpasses and a third removed entirely. A fourth overpass has been reduced in height to minimize its impact.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have examined the proposed changes relating to issues raised by the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission of 2005 regarding the highway construction. The adjustment to the road, close to the Villa, is acceptable, as are the redesigns of the toll booth infrastructure. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the substitution where possible of the overpasses with underpasses, and the lowering of the profile of those remaining overpasses.

The World Heritage Centre also received information from NGOs concerning the new Dal Molin military base, which is located 1,5km outside the World Heritage property.

On 31 May 2010 the World Heritage Centre was informed by the Italian authorities that the proposed Dal Molin military base will be situated far outside of the buffer zone of the World Heritage property and that it will not have any negative impact on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that details of the proposed Dal Molin military base need to be assessed for any potential impact on the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.109**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on actions taken to counter impacts of the ongoing A-31 Valdastico-South highway construction project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
4. *Notes the measures taken by the State Party to amend the design of the highway and toll infrastructure in line with the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission of 2005;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide plans which allow an assessment of any potential impact of the Dal Molin military base on the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre if any significant changes are made to the plans submitted and reviewed for the highway in the final approval process.*

92. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.89; 32 COM 8D; 33 COM 7B.116

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2000, March 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring missions; January 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of comprehensive management plan;
- b) Lack of conservation of parks and palaces;
- c) Rapid encroachment by urban and infrastructure development;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) Lack of institutional coordination.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/723>

<http://www.parquesdesintra.pt/en/>

Current conservation issues

From 11 to 15 January 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville 2009). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM>.

A report on the state of conservation of the Cultural Landscape of Sintra dated 1 February 2010 was submitted by the State Party after the mission. The report addressed the issues outlined in Decision **33 COM 7B.116** (Seville, 2009). The annexes comprise a total of 483 pages and include restoration projects, Municipal Plans, works executed under the Management Plan for 2005-2009 including fire protection, and actions planned for 2010-2012, continuing the strategic direction set out in the Management Plan.

a) Urban encroachment and visitation pressure

The State Party claims that there was no reason to identify urban encroachment on the property and its buffer zone as a risk. In support the authorities referred to a survey showing that 90% of urban licences granted in the municipality were for rehabilitation of buildings in the core zone.

The mission found that although urban rehabilitation is slow, it is satisfactorily controlled in terms of quality by the permit system of the municipality.

With regard to visitation pressure, the State Party maintains that while there has been growing tourist demand, this has been countered by careful tourism management including the promotion of new centres of interest, new circuits and thematic tours and better distribution of visitors. In support, a favourable comparison of visitor numbers between those for the Palace of Pena (the most visited component of the property) and other components of the World Heritage site is made. For example a table (Annex 1, p.76) shows the number of visitors in an average month in 2009 as 49,104 to Pena Palace.

The mission found that there is an impressive range of events and activities designed to attract tourists. It was concerned about a funded proposal to create a new garden between the Park of Pena and the Chalet of the Countess of Edla as a means of attracting visitors to a less-visited area. The mission suggested instead that the funds could be used to rehabilitate existing redundant buildings to accommodate a school for gardeners, or perhaps a museum about the water systems of the Sintra hills. However, the new garden project is still retained in Annex 3 to the State Party's report, covering actions planned by Parques de Sintra – Monte da Lua (PSML) for 2010 – 2012.

b) Lack of co-ordination between all relevant stakeholders responsible for the management of the property and its buffer zone

The State Party reports that the management company PSML was confirmed in 2007 by the two Ministries (Environment and Culture) in charge as the responsible authority for the property. The Palace of Pena and the management of the Hotel of Seteais have both now been entrusted to PSML, meaning that the Park and Palace of Pena are now under the same administration.

The mission noted that the municipality and PSML need to recognise the importance of motivating the local communities in the processes of managing the property.

c) Establishment of a Steering Committee

The State Party reports that under the 2009 designation of PSML as the executive organ of the World Heritage site consultation is required in relation to the legally binding Plan for the Park administered under the Ministry of Environment and in relation to the Heritage Law administered by the Ministry of Culture. A Scientific Council of specialists in natural and cultural heritage has been set up by PSML to advise on projects and strategies in collaboration with external bodies such as universities. The authorities see this as consolidating the capacity of PSML to co-ordinate the various entities, concluding that "it only requires an efficient process for mutual consultation".

The mission recommended that in addition, a committee of owners and community associations who are stakeholders in the property should be formed and regularly consulted on proposed projects and progress generally, in order to receive their views and suggestions.

d) Setting up a comprehensive Management Plan

The State Party advises that it has set a timeframe to produce a management plan involving all stakeholders and including objectives and actions scheduled for 2010-2014. The PSML proposes to present the Management and Interpretation Plans by the end of December 2010.

The mission found that the progress on dealing with the problems that had detrimentally affected the property is commendable, and largely due to the implementation of the first stage of the Management Plan 2005-2009. In the mission's opinion, ongoing retention of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property depends on the proper arrangement of the next stage of the management plan to 2012, and the review of the boundaries of the buffer zone and transition zone.

The management plan should relate directly to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and should include a plan of action for future restoration and conservation of the parks and gardens, based on a study of the history and evolution of the parks and plants.

The PSML proposes a review of the boundaries of the buffer zone, which surrounds the property, and the transition zone which in turn surrounds the buffer zone, because it finds the three zones do not correspond to the needs of conservation and interpretation of the outstanding universal value of the site.

The mission considers that deletion of the transition zone must be accompanied by an extension of the buffer zone to the north of the inscribed area.

e) Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Following the discussion with the members of the reactive monitoring mission of 11-15 January 2010, the State Party proposed to submit the Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value separately before the end of February 2010. At the time of drafting this report it had not been received.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party has addressed many of the problems identified in 2006 as adversely affecting the property. The implementation of the management plan 2005-2009 has engendered gradual improvement in institutional management arrangements, the conservation of buildings, fire protection measures and control of urban development, thereby enabling some economic benefit to the

community. There remain important areas for improvement including the institutional management system, which requires greater recognition of the role of owners and community associations in the management of the property; the management of parks and gardens, which perhaps requires resourcing from a specialist conservation school similar to that operating for buildings and monuments, and better background research and evidence; review of the buffer and transition zones, and integration of the proposed actions for 2010-2014 into a Comprehensive Management Plan which is specifically related to the attributes identified in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Since the Cultural Landscape of Sintra was inscribed as a cultural landscape for its Outstanding Universal Value as a pioneering approach to romantic landscaping which had an outstanding influence on developments elsewhere in Europe, these attributes must include an understanding of the shape and form of the overall landscape and views and vistas within the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.92

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.116**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Commends the considerable improvement in institutional management arrangements, the conservation of buildings, fire protection measures and control of urban development achieved through the implementation of the first stage of the management plan 2005-2009;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to reconsider the proposals for a new garden between the Park of Pena and the Chalet of the Countess of Edla;*
5. *Also encourages the State Party to make a place within the institutional management arrangements for the owners and community associations who are stakeholders in the World Heritage property in order to benefit of their ideas and cooperation;*
6. *Invites the State Party to submit a minor modification request for extension of the buffer zone of the inscribed property, in order to offer enhanced protection of its setting, in the context of the proposed review by the State Party of the transition and buffer zones;*
7. *Welcomes the timeframe set to produce a Management Plan involving all stakeholders and including objectives and actions scheduled for 2010-2014 for submission together with the Interpretation Plan by the **end of December 2010** for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
8. *Requests the State Party to ensure that the Management Plan relates clearly to the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the progress made with the above and details of any projects that may impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.*

94. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.88; 32 COM 7B.104; 33 COM 7B.117

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 29,540 for Emergency Assistance (2001)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1992, 1993, 1994: ICOMOS mission; 2002: UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission and on-site workshop; 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Structural integrity of the Church of the Transfiguration ;
- b) Absence of an integrated management plan that addresses overall management of the World Heritage property ;
- c) Tourism development pressures affecting the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/544>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session, appreciating the continuing efforts by the Kizhi Museum Reserve to improve maintenance, monitoring and presentation of the World Heritage property, regretted that the State Party had not implemented any of the activities requested by the Committee and strongly urged the State Party to establish a Special State Group to coordinate the implementation of all Committee decisions concerning this property. The Committee, concerned about the continuing deterioration of the structural fabric of the Church of the Transfiguration and management of the property, reiterated its request to the State Party to increase progress on all issues mentioned over the last decade including the submission of a detailed report on the main restoration works for the Church of the Transfiguration, of a draft integrated management plan for Kizhi Pogost including a tourism strategy and risk preparedness measures, and revised boundaries for the property and its buffer zone in relation to protected areas of the Kizhi Museum Reserve. The Committee, requested the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a desired state of conservation, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, a set of corrective measures, as well as a timeframe for their implementation and to submit them to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, with a view to considering in the absence of substantial progress the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

As requested, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 29 January 2010 an informative report whose details responded to some of the requests made by the Committee over the past years, including the management issues and restoration concept for the

Church of the Transfiguration. The report is organised in four sections: 1. «Measures of Kizhi Pogost Maintenance» (management and boundary issues, monitoring, environment and landscape protection, historical research, tourism development activities, infrastructure development, funding); 2. restoration of the Church of the Transfiguration; 3. maintenance and protection of the Church of the Intercession of Holy Mary; 4. maintenance and protection of the Bell Tower.

The State Party reports that at the federal level, funding has been secured by State order of 7 November 2008 *“Plan of measures for protection of Kizhi Pogost and development of infrastructure of the Kizhi Federal Museum of Architecture and Cultural History”* approved by the Government of the Russian Federation. Approximately 400 million roubles have been allocated for the treatment of the Kizhi Pogost monuments in 2009-2014, 80% of which is dedicated for the Church of the Transfiguration.

This report is clear and helpful in understanding the current situation, and the forces and factors at play which need to be addressed by management, and the policies, regulations and initiatives undertaken co-operatively by various key actors at Federal, State and local levels. The report provides the clearest picture of the state of conservation of the property received by the World Heritage Centre since inscription in 1990.

The report provides clarity on many key issues such as the measures in place to monitor and to respond to the possibility of fire. The report illustrates that most of the regulations and decrees being described as in place date from 2008, 2009 and 2010. It also states that after two decades of discussion, debate, planning efforts to repair and restore the Church of the Transfiguration are finally beginning.

However, as complete as it is, the report is not organized to respond directly to the requests made by the Committee in its Decisions at the 33rd session and at earlier sessions.

A joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 5 to 7 April 2010. Recommendations and key findings are as follows:

a) Church of the Transfiguration

The mission noted that the fabric and structure of the Church of the Transfiguration are continuing to deteriorate and are now in a perilous state.

Over the course of more recent years the States Party has made significant progress in preparing for a major repair and restoration project at the church. Steps have been taken to reduce the rate of insect attack and decay and conservation work has started on the Church of the Transfiguration and a preventative maintenance program has been started on the Church of the Intercession. Predictable regular funding is now in place for 2009-2014 as a result of adoption of the Order “Plan of measures for maintenance and protection of Kizhi Pogost monuments”.

The mission observed that there has been good progress on development of the conservation project concept and on the conservation work itself. However, the mission had serious concerns about the technical approach to conservation of wood, the apparent lack of understanding of the dynamics of wood, as well as the potential for too much dismantling of the Church of the Transfiguration in one phase of the work.

Chemical preservatives are being used for stored logs, new roofs and in decayed areas. Unidentified chemical consolidants and fillers are being proposed for use for conservation work on the Church of the Transfiguration. The mission noted that the Kizhi restorers have little information about these products and estimates that these methods are of limited

effectiveness, are untested, are absolutely contrary to international standards and guidelines that are relevant to this project. The mission recommends that the State Party be urged to avoid the use of wood preservatives, consolidants and chemical fillers due to their environmental impact, short period of testing, limited effectiveness and potential to reduce durability.

In order to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the Church, the mission recommended that the approach to the repair of individual logs based on gluing and patching be modified. The mission recommended that a revised approach needs to be set out and agreed as the Conservation Approach for the building.

The mission also considered that the conservation project is strongly oriented to technical solutions without any explicit relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The importance of authenticity of materials needs to be balanced with concerns about authentic form and design. All of this should be reflected in the Integrity and Authenticity sections of a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Guiding Principles are needed that relate the conservation work to the key attributes of the property that convey its Outstanding Universal Value. Such principles will become increasingly important when they are needed to guide detailed decisions. The mission considered that it was essential for future decision making that Guiding Principles are developed on the basis of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and brought into the project.

Concerning structural stability, the mission recommended that the State Party use the temporary supplementary structural support during the project and then remove it. The mission also recommended that permanent supplementary and reinforcing structure be added to the building only if absolutely necessary, and that structural elements should be reinforced as needed rather than installing general strengthening.

In order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the mission stressed that project implementation must continue with no interruption. There is need to ensure that funding continues after 2014, as the overall restoration will not have been completed. The mission also stressed the need to prepare a capacity and skills building strategy with regular training courses involving those responsible for restoration activities in the Kizhi Museum Reserve.

The ICOMOS team during the mission prepared a set of guidelines for timber repair “Criteria for selecting log repair at Kizhi Pogost” to counter a presumption that maintaining authentic historic building fabric was the most important factor when deciding on repair methods. This was prepared to address the large numbers of individual repairs in single logs; the use of repairs which are not compatible with the shape, anatomy and natural characteristics of the wood and the use of adhesives, consolidants and other chemicals (some not yet tested).

b) Monitoring

The mission welcomed the monitoring reports reviewed, in particular “Wood-science monitoring of the Kizhi Open-air Museum Monuments” (Forest Research Institute, Karelian Research Centre, Russian Academy of Sciences, Petrozavodsk, 2009) and “Complex of land measuring on walls deformation monitoring of the Churches of Transfiguration and Intercession and the Bell tower on Kizhi” (Institute of restoration of historic and cultural monuments “Spetzprojectrestavratsija”, Moscow, 2009).

c) Boundary issues

While the boundaries for the protected zones of the Kizhi Museum-Reserve have been identified, the mission noted that the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone are still unclear. The mission recommends that the State Party clarifies this boundary issue by 1 February 2011 in a way that protects the property and its setting and relates to the protection of the whole island as a Heritage site, as is proposed. The mission also noted concern at development proposals within certain areas of the Kizhi Museum Reserve and considered that these should be immediately halted.

d) Co-ordination and management

The initiative of Kizhi Museum Reserve to establish a Special State Board to coordinate the implementation of World Heritage Committee decisions has been stopped despite the World Heritage Committee's request to the State Party to establish this Board. The mission recommends implementing this Committee's decision as a matter of urgency.

The mission noted documents (in Russian) presented by the Kizhi Museum (Master Plan of the Kizhi Museum Reserve and its protected area) that had not been submitted for review and that they did not indicate the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone. The mission expresses its concern that all protected areas regulations established within this Master Plan have been adapted to development activities and that the Kizhi Museum Reserve has the intention to develop new visitor facilities and to build a new visitor centre, in conformity with regulations of this Master Plan.

The mission recommends to halt any inappropriate development and new constructions within the property, its buffer zone and protected areas of the Kizhi Museum-Reserve, and submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, all projects for review and comments prior to any approval.

The mission noted delays in State Party efforts to respond to the Committee's request to develop a fully integrated management plan for the site, largely as a result of different interpretations by the national authorities of the intent of this request. The mission report notes in detail the issues to be addressed in the integrated management plan (including using Outstanding Universal Value as the core focus of all decision making for the site; formal inclusion of new partners and stakeholders such as the Church; the need to reference the overall context for decision-making, ensuring management and provision of facilities for dramatically increasing tourism numbers, respecting the setting of the property, balancing natural and built environment concerns, integrating provisions for risk preparedness and security, and clarifying boundary issues and protection, etc.).

The mission noted in the State Party report that the management plan and a tourism development programme will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for review and comments.

In follow-up to the above recommendations, the mission proposed a set of corrective measures to be addressed by the State Party and a timeframe for their implementation. The mission report is available on-line at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the State Party should implement the defined corrective measures as a matter of urgency.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the most critical issue at Kizhi Pogost is the seriously threatened state of the Church of the Transfiguration. In considering Sections 177-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it can be concluded that if the current loss of fabric and design features is not halted immediately the Outstanding Universal Value of the

property will be threatened. The conservation work at the church of Transfiguration has been started, and it is crucial that it continue with no further delays.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies do not consider it advisable for Kizhi Pogost to be placed on the World Heritage List in Danger at this stage. A further reactive monitoring mission is recommended in 2011 to monitor progress in responding to all the issues above, and to further report to the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, with a view to then considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are pleased to understand that repair and restoration works on the Church of the Transfiguration has now begun under stable financial conditions, and urge the authorities to continue this work, without further delays. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also underline that the current approach to timber repair must be revised to follow the guidelines document prepared by the mission following its site visit and that there is a need to define Guiding Principles for the work that relate to the authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish, in the interests of improving the co-ordination and integration of property management, to reiterate the importance of establishing the Special State Board previously requested by the Committee, and the rapid completion of an integrated management plan of the property, including monitoring activities, risk preparedness, tourism strategy and protection of the landscape setting.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.94

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.117**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes that stable funding for the property has been secured through State Order and the continuing efforts by the Kizhi Museum Reserve to improve maintenance, monitoring and presentation of the World Heritage property;*
4. *Also notes the results of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property in April 2010;*
5. *Notes furthermore the significant progress made in the management of the Kizhi Museum Reserve and the preparation and commencement of the restoration works of the Church of Transfiguration and urges the States Party to continue these efforts;*
6. *Strongly requests the State Party to revise the timber repair methods and phasing in accordance with the guidelines document provided by ICOMOS following the mission, and to define Guiding Principles for the restoration that relate to the authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Notes with concern proposals by the Kizhi Museum Reserve to develop new visitor facilities and a new visitor centre, in conformity with regulations of the Kizhi Reserve Master Plan and also urges the State Party to halt any developments within the property, its setting and protected areas of the Kizhi Museum-Reserve, and to submit*

to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, all projects for review and comments prior to any approval;

8. Also requests the State Party to implement all recommendations outlined in the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission report of April 2010, including the correctives measures identified;
9. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to:
 - a) Provide a Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as a basis for developing an Integrated Management Plan for the property, and Guiding Principles for conservation;
 - b) Prepare and implement an integrated management plan, including a tourism strategy, risk preparedness measures, archaeological resource management, protection of the landscape setting, and clear boundary and buffer zone definitions in relation to the protected areas of the Kizhi Museum Reserve, monitoring measures and mechanisms;
 - c) Establish a Special State Board in charge of coordinating the activities of the many different stakeholders and agencies involved with the overall management of the World Heritage property;
10. Encourages the State Party, and in particular the Kizhi Museum Reserve, to collaborate with the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the UNESCO Moscow office, to develop a capacity building programme for local experts involved in restoration and management activities in the Kizhi Museum Reserve;
11. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed state of conservation report, including a progress report and all relevant documents on the implementation of the corrective measures;
12. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2011 to assess the state of conservation of the property;
13. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property including a report on all issues mentioned above and all relevant documents on the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering in the absence of substantial progress the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

95. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.102; 32 COM 7B.105; 33 COM 7B.118

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 17,620 for the St Petersburg International Conference, January 2007

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,000 from the Dutch Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions:

February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January/February 2007: International Conference of Eastern and Central Europe Countries on the Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in the Management and Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List, St Petersburg; 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Quality of new design projects in the inscribed zone;
- b) High-rise development ;
- c) Confusion over definition and extent of inscribed property and its buffer zones.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/540>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) expressed its grave concern about the continuous lack of a leading management system and defined mechanisms of coordination for the management of the property. The World Heritage Committee also noted with concern, that the maps provided by the State Party define boundaries that include a significantly smaller area than that inscribed, as well as that the buffer zone proposed does not extend to encompass the landscape setting of the property and in particular the panorama along the Neva River, and requested the State Party to reconsider this buffer zone and submit it formally to the World Heritage Centre. The World Heritage Committee expressed again its grave concern that the proposed "Ohkta Centre Tower" could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requested the State Party to suspend work on this project and submit modified designs, in accordance with federal legislation and accompanied by an independent environmental impact assessment.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 29 January 2010. This report addresses the following main points:

- Submission of a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value,
- On boundary issues, the State Party reports that historical and cultural studies are being carried out by the relevant authorized organisations, and suggested that on the basis of these studies, the "boundaries of components will be adjusted" and the "relevant buffer zones will be made in accordance with the effective legislation" .
- Concerning the "Ohkta Centre Tower", the State Party reports that the project "undergoes expert city planning evaluation, and judicial investigation by the public prosecutor";
- In response to the Committee's expression of grave concern about the lack of a management system and necessary mechanisms for management coordination of the property, the State Party report proposes a multi-purpose programme to address these needs. This programme would consist of preservation measures, financing, organisational improvements, manpower training and scientific research, tourism development and exchanges with historic cities in comparable situations in other countries.

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place from 21 to 28 March 2010, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session. The mission made recommendations in following principal areas:

a) Boundary issues

The mission recommends giving the State Party more time to choose carefully among two options for possible boundary modification/clarification of the component parts of the property within the Historic Centre:

- reducing the boundary limits of the 1990 inscription and re-nominating (as this would be a significant modification of the boundaries),
- modifying the national legal status of the property to allow the serial site, as inscribed in 1990, to be recognized as a single entity (this option would not need a re-nomination),

The mission considered that the latter option was preferable as this conserves the boundaries of the 1990 inscription and best corresponds to the landscape characteristics of the property.

Outside the Historic Centre of St. Petersburg the mission recommended finalising the clarification and the establishment of boundaries of all existing component parts.

The mission recommends that a buffer zone be established to include the landscape surrounding the Historic Centre, in particular the panorama along the Neva, and proposed specific parameters and objectives necessary to define this extended buffer zone adequately, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session. Furthermore, the mission recommends to establishing buffer zones also for the main existing component parts situated in the Leningrad Region.

The mission recommends holding an international expert forum in St. Petersburg in order to evaluate various propositions concerning the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones.

On 15 April, following the mission's request, the State Party submitted a document which represents a progress in terms of the awaited clarification of the boundaries, especially addressing for the first time an overall view of the component parts situated in the Leningrad Region. However, this document should be considered only as a first step of a phased project, as further efforts will have to be made to fully accomplish the necessary clarification of boundaries of all the component parts.

b) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The mission recommends that the State Party revise the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value submitted in its recent report to better integrate the landscape characteristics of the Historic Centre, in particular the panorama along the Neva. The mission also recommends that the World War II events related to the property be included in the text.

c) Management of the property

The mission reiterates the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, concerning designation of a principal management authority with sufficient authority to control the authenticity and integrity of the property, as well as the need to develop overall Management Plan for the property (linked to an Action Plan), including a Plan for Environmental Design and Urbanism for the entire territory, as well as a Safeguarding Plan which would define appropriate degrees of intervention for each element of the property, which would permit co-ordination among all stakeholders concerned.

d) "Ohkta Centre" Tower

The mission highlighted the potential negative impact of the proposed project of the "Ohkta" tower on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The mission notes with concern publication by the City Government of a Decree legitimizing a height of 403 meters for the

site, and further notes that the federal authority *Rossokhrankultura* has taken a strong position against construction of the tower. The mission recommends that the State Party renounces definitively the planned tower, and suggests that future construction on the territory conform to the requirements of *Rossokhrankultura* and the accompanying federal legislation, the archaeological value of the site and the need to conserve these attributes *in situ*.

On 14 April 2010, the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation requested UNESCO to provide information on the potential threat of the construction of the “Okhta” tower on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and on the consequences of such a threat if realized. On 10 May 2010, the World Heritage Centre provided to the State Party detailed information in response on this request, underlining that the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session expressed again its grave concern that the proposed “Okhta” tower could impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requested the State Party to suspend work on this project and submit modified designs, in accordance with federal legislation and accompanied by an independent environmental impact assessment. The World Heritage Centre’s response also noted the conclusions of the recent joint mission which highlighted the potential negative impact of the existing project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

On 1 June 2010, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the President of the Russian Federation had considered and approved proposals of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia for the property. The State Party reported that the Administration of the President of the Russian Federation had especially noted the decision of the World Heritage Committee which requested that work on the construction of the Okhta Centre Tower be suspended and that new designs reducing the building's height be considered.

The authorities underlined the importance of complying with the recommendations of the Committee in this regard in order to maintain a constructive dialogue. The State Party stressed that relevant guidelines were being sent to the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, the Administration of Saint-Petersburg and other organisations concerned.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has made significant progress in implementing the World Heritage Committee’s decision to abandon the current proposals for the 400 metre “Okhta Centre” Tower which would have adversely affected the historic cityscape of St Petersburg and threatened the outstanding universal value of the property. They consider that the City needs to explore other architectural solutions that will not adversely impact on the skyline of the city or its outstanding universal value, will be in line with the height limit of 40 metres for that area of the city, and will respect the archaeology layers. Furthermore any new project needs to be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment that considers the impact on outstanding universal value at the earliest possible stage.

In order to clarify the boundary of the property and its buffer zones, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies support the suggestion of the Mission to hold an expert forum to explore the two main options.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.95

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.118**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. Notes the multi-year programme proposal submitted by the State Party to address on going needs for improved property management;
4. Congratulates the State Party for its decision to suspend work on the construction of the “Okhta Centre”;
5. Requests the State Party to develop significantly modified design proposals subject to an independent heritage impact assessment, including an assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for review, before any commitment is made, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Acknowledges the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property;
7. Regrets that the State Party’s report did not address the World Heritage Committee’s requests for an extended buffer zone;
8. Also requests the State Party to explore the two following options to boundary modification/clarification:
 - a) reduce the boundary limits of the 1990 inscription and re-nominate the property, or
 - b) modify the national legal status of the property to allow the serial site, as inscribed in 1990, to be recognized as a single entity (this option would not need a re-nomination);
9. Further requests the State Party to define appropriate buffer zones for the property, including, for the Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg, the surrounding landscape, in particular the panorama along the Neva River;
10. Suggests that the State Party organise an international expert forum in Saint Petersburg in order to evaluate various proposals concerning the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones, in relation to the finalisation of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
11. Requests furthermore the State Party to revise the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
12. Also requests the State Party to address the need to provide an over-arching management framework for the property through:
 - a) designation of a principal management authority with sufficient authority to control the authenticity and integrity of the inscribed property,
 - b) development of an overall Management Plan for the property, including a Plan for Environmental Design and Urbanism for the entire territory, as well as a Safeguarding Plan which would define appropriate degrees of intervention for each element of the property, which would permit co-ordination among all stakeholders concerned;
13. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a state of conservation report for the property that addresses the above points for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

96. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.103; 32 COM 7B.106; 33 COM 7B.119

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Erection of a monument in honour of Marshal G. Zhukov;
- b) Ongoing and accelerated urban development pressures

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/545>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report for the property. In addition, requests were made for a management plan, approved buffer zones, improved legal and institutional mechanisms for the property, and a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Information and studies were also requested related to ongoing developments at the site. Unfortunately, the State Party has not submitted any state of conservation report in response to either of the requests of the World Heritage Committee in 2008 or 2009, nor any of requested information.

At its 33rd session, the Committee has already expressed its regret that the State Party has not provided a state of conservation report for the property. In the absence for the second consecutive year of the state of conservation report from the State Party and the lack of any indication that the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission have been implemented, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies are seriously concerned over the state of conservation of the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.96

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,

2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.106** and **33 COM 7B.119**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,
3. Deeply regrets that the State Party has not provided a state of conservation report for the property, nor additional information on the management plan, approved buffer zones, improved legal and institutional mechanisms, draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and information and studies related to ongoing developments at the property and its buffer zones as requested in Decisions **32 COM 7B.106** and **33 COM 7B.119**;
4. Expresses its utmost concern about the lack of any response to the previous requests of the World Heritage Committee and requests the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to write to the Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation to obtain the information referred to above;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and further progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2007 reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

97. Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
24 COM C.1

International Assistance
N/A
UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/982>

Current conservation issues

In recent years, the World Heritage Centre has been informed about issues relating to modifications in the management system and use of some World Heritage properties in the

Russian Federation, and about the intention of the Russian authorities to transfer the management of some of those properties to the religious community.

On 18 January 2010, the World Heritage Centre informed the State Party that the state of conservation of the Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery will be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session and requested it to submit a detailed report on the state of conservation of this property, including information on any development projects and intentions to change the management system or use of this World Heritage property.

On 23 April 2010, the World Heritage Centre, in its reminder letter to the State Party concerning the state of conservation report on this property, highlighted that appropriate legal measures, specific conservation, restoration and use rules and a joint management system for the World Heritage religious properties should be established and implemented by the Russian authorities in close collaboration with all stakeholders, including the religious authorities in order to prevent any negative impact of such transfers on the authenticity and integrity of the properties.

On 1 June 2010, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the draft of the Federal Law on the transfer of State or Municipal properties of religious origin to religious organizations is currently being developed in the Russian Federation, in close coordination with all authorities concerned, including the Russian Orthodox Church. The State Party reports that the provisions of the *World Heritage Convention* will be taken into account and confirms its interest to participate in the International Conference, to be held in Ukraine, on the role of religious communities in the management of World Heritage properties.

On 1 June 2010, the State Party also submitted a state of conservation report of the Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery summarizing actions implemented by the Kirillo-Belozerskii Museum-Reserve, Department of cultural heritage and fine arts of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation. This covered:

a) Management and protection:

The State Party's report very briefly mentions that the property is being managed, as part of the Kirillo-Belozerskii Museum-Reserve, by the Department of cultural heritage and fine arts of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation and Federal Agency *Rosohrankultura*. The State Party also states that the Gate Churches of the Epiphany have been handed over under lease to the Orthodox Epiphany Parish.

b) State of conservation

There are six major elements in the complex of the Ferrapontov Monastery: the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Virgin (1490), The Church of the Annunciation (1530-31) and refectory, The Treasury Chamber (1530s), The Church of St Martinian (1641), The Gate Churches of the Epiphany and St Ferrapont (1650), and The bell-tower (1680s). The State Party report concentrates on the Cathedral.

The Cathedral of the Nativity of the Virgin (1490)

This is the centre of the monastery. The entire surface of the interior is covered by the 16th century mural paintings of Dionysius. There are also paintings on parts of the exterior.

The State Party reports on extensive work that has been carried out on the fabric of the building since inscription in 2000. The State Party notes that the works were aimed at expanding tourists' visits.

The works included major interventions such as:

- Restoration of the exterior walls and surface of the drum and coating with 'protective solution'
- Reconstruction of the altar roof
- Installation of new wooden window and door assemblies
- Conservation of wall painting through decontamination and re-fixing some painted sections
- Coating lower sections of the interior walls
- Installation of 'warming' mechanisms to the arches
- Installation of electrically heated tiled floor in place of the wooden floor
- Installation of radio controlled climate control mechanisms

Other elements of the Monastery

The State Party also provides summarized information on the state of conservation of the Church of the Annunciation (1530-31) and refectory and works already implemented. The State Party underlines the need to establish a clear zone to regulate the visits of the monastery, as well as to restore the dining-room, in order to regulate temperature-moisture conditions. The State Party reports on satisfactory state of conservation of the Treasury Chamber (1530s). The State Party informs on satisfactory general state of conservation of the bell-tower (1680s) and the Church of St Martinian (1641). The State Party reports that due to the relief and soil movement, the restored in 1998 facades cracks of the Gate Churches of the Epiphany and St Ferrapont (1650) are being reopened. The State Party informs of the reconstruction project of a wooden structure of the northern parts of these Churches.

The State Party underlines that no new construction works have been carried out within the boundary of the property from 2000 to 2009 and that within the buffer zone only one monument *Prosforaya* has been reconstructed and the Church of Eliya the Prophet (1755) has been restored.

The State Party provides statistics of the tourist visits from 2000 to 2009 and notes the increase interest of national visitors.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that the State Party report provides very little information concerning the current management system and only summary information concerning the state of conservation of all components of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that major restoration projects and some reconstruction projects have been carried since inscription without any information being provided to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for review. They underline that it is the State Party's responsibility to inform the World Heritage Centre of any projects and activities which may impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List as indicated by Paragraph 172 of the *World Heritage Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the overall state of conservation of the property cannot be readily evaluated in appropriate manner on the base of the information provided, nor the impact of the recent major interventions on the authenticity of the property, and suggest that a reactive monitoring mission to the property be considered to review its state of conservation.

In addition, they consider that the establishment of effective coordination between the national and local authorities in charge of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Russian Federation and the religious authorities is a necessary step in

order to develop appropriate measures for the long-term conservation of such religious properties.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the State Party should consider the establishment of a Special Board, including all stakeholders concerned, as well as representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia, in order to develop appropriate legal measures, specific conservation, restoration, use rules and management system for the World Heritage religious properties in the Russian Federation.

Draft Decision: **34 COM 7B.97**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Strongly regrets that the State Party has not provided detailed information on the management structure, legal and institutional mechanisms and management plan of the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to develop and approve the overall management system in order to ensure that it will give priority to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in all conservation, promotion and development actions which might affect the property;*
4. *Expresses concern at the extensive restoration and reconstruction projects carried out since inscription without prior notification to, or review by, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any construction, reconstruction, restoration projects and activities which may threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List as indicated by Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.*
6. *Invites the State Party to establish a Special Board, including all stakeholders concerned, as well as representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia, in order to develop appropriate legal measures, specific conservation, restoration and use rules and a joint management system for the World Heritage religious properties in the Russian Federation;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, to assist the State Party in following-up on progress made in responding to the above requests, and in defining measures in order to prevent any activities which could represent potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;*
8. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the management structure, legal and institutional mechanisms and information or studies related to ongoing developments at the property, as well as three copies of the management plan of the property, and progress report on the implementation of above mentioned requests, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

98. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984; 2005

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.47; 32 COM 7B.108; 33 COM 7B.121

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2010: Technical expert mission (ICOMOS)

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Construction of a high-speed train tunnel

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/320>

Current conservation problems

The high-speed train line (AVE) project, Madrid-Saragossa-Barcelona-French border, resulted in the choice of planning the construction of a tunnel under the town of Barcelona. The train tunnel project goes in front of the Sagrada Familia, under the Mallorca street and in the very close vicinity of the foundations of the Cathedral's Gloria façade. The construction of its south-east porch is not currently finished. The train tunnel also passes in front of the Casa Milà, under the Provença street. At the Sagrada Familia's level, the diameter of the tunnel's axis measures 12 meters and would be approximately situated 30 meters underground. The foundation piles of the cathedral are 11 to 13 meters deep.

Decision **32 COM 7B.108** took this threat into account, considering the documents and information which mainly pointed out:

- a. The presence of cracks in various bordering buildings, where the train tunnel construction had already begun.
- b. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS expressed concern regarding the possible construction of a tunnel, threatening the integrity of the Cathedral's structure, particularly through differential displacements of the ground, greater than those planned for the Cathedral's construction project. Furthermore, subsidences of a few centimeters had already been observed, the weight of the building causing occasional crackings in its superstructures. Therefore, it is initially a high and heavy construction, with a particular fragility. The Cathedral is currently unachieved.

- c. Moreover, the vibrations linked to the tunnel boring machine going past and the repetition of trains going past in the underground could cause vibrations detrimental to the stability of the Cathedral's structures.
- d. In conclusion, the **32 COM 7B.108** decision asked « the State Party to halt the construction of the tunnel section in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia Cathedral and to consider changing the route of the proposed high-speed train tunnel, so as to avoid any potential adverse impact on the structural stability of the Cathedral » and to provide « a detailed report on the measures taken to ensure the protection of the World Heritage property ».

Decision **33 COM 7B.121** has taken the report of the State Party into account, which describes in detail the technical measures taken for the tunnel construction, aiming to safeguard the integrity of the Cathedral. The main decisions and technical measures taken are listed hereunder:

- a. The State Party does not envisage changing the train tunnel tracing in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia nor in Casa Milà's, because of the angular impossibilities linked to the area's viary network. Indeed, the law does not allow the excavation of a tunnel under existing buildings for security reasons and any re-routing of the train tunnel tracing would have induced excessive acuteness, unsuited to rail traffic;
- b. In order to completely minimize the subsidence's risk at the level of the foundations of the south-east cathedral door, the State Party plans the implantation of a bored pile wall made out of reinforced concrete, 44 meters deep and 1, 5 meters diameter, between the border of the calle Mallorca and the Sagrada Familia. It is planned that this bored pile wall will be situated between the Cathedral's foundations and the train tunnel, 1,90 meters away from the fist, and 0,8 meters from the edge of the latter. The line of piles is 233 meters long, jutting out quite widely from the cathedral, on both sides. The piles are joined at the head with a reinforced concrete assemblage, close to the surface in order to secure its cohesion. There is a 50 cm space between the piles;
- c. Borings and geological studies have been undertaken, showing, in depth, the presence of a soil which is in principle suited to react correctly when the tunnel's excavation takes place. Furthermore, an 'Earth Pressure Balance' (EPB) type tunnel boring machine has been chosen. It has a low rotation speed and a boring technology which should make the effects of transmitted vibrations insignificant during the tunnel's excavation;
- d. A hydrogeological study was carried out, in order to check that the bored pile wall is not causing a water retention effect at water table level;
- e. A ground supervision plan has been proposed, to monitor the vibrations' parameters and movements during the tunnel excavating in order to make sure they are in accordance with the previsions, fully compatible with the conservation of the Sagrada Familia;
- f. The railway systems will be mounted on blocs, which reduce vibrations. The speed of the trains will automatically be limited by the close presence of curves, imposed by the surface of viary network;
- g. In conclusion, the report aims to technically prove that the train tunnel project, its specific measures, the chosen earth boring technology and the trains going past will not induce any adverse effect to Sagrada Familia's structure. The report indicates that all experts consulted confirmed the technical feasibility of the proposed solution.

Following the receipt of important additional technical documentation provided by the State Party during winter 2009-2010, following the reactive monitoring mission of 6-11 February

2010 and a consultation meeting held at the World Heritage Centre on 16 April 2010, the State Party confirms the essence of the technical options described in the previous point.

They are currently being carried out.

- a. The tunnel boring machine is working since the month of March, from the north-east junction of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà's. It should reach the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia at the beginning of autumn and later on, the Casa Milà. It is a specific tunnel boring machine with a permanent pressure compensation mechanism, whose results have been successfully tested. A series of measures and supervision are being carried while this machine is being used, for its entire route.
- b. Three independent mathematical studies, known as « with finished elements » can predict the dynamic behavior of the grounds and anticipate the subsidence's effects or the hydrological behavior of the bored pile wall. For the project promoters, studies show the following in a categorical way: on one hand, the effects of subsidence linked to the building itself, due to its weight and on the other hand, the bored pile wall having a positive impact on the stability of the building, induced by the buttressing of its south-east side. With this existing situation, the subsidence induced by the train tunnel excavating would be insignificant;

However, less optimistic conclusions to these studies are brought forward by independent experts. They comparatively consider the results of these studies and relativize their impact in regard to the specificity and structural fragility of the Sagrada Familia and to a lesser extent that of the Casa Milà, a residential building with smaller proportions.

- c. The concrete piles are practically all in place (April 2010). However, various trustworthy sources have mentioned unexpected secondary effects. At the beginning of March, during the construction works, an 80 centimeters deep breakdown in the paving in front of the cathedral was noticed; in the immediate vicinity of the bored pile wall. Furthermore, following a storm, rainwater would not have been evacuated, making the ground abnormally soft in front of the Cathedral's south-east porch. These anomalies are considered to be surface ones and purely isolated, unrelated to implantation of the piles;
- d. The hydro geological effects have been carefully compared to natural movements of the water table and its seasonal flow variations. The effects of the bored pile wall remain very much below natural variations and neither do affect the flows nor the water table's seasonal level changes;
- e. A technical network for the monitoring of the static and dynamic behavior of the grounds in vicinity of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà has been put in place. Four automatic stations in charge of controlling the structural shape changes of the Cathedral also guarantee its supervision. It appears that the subsidence effects linked to the building, to its construction being carried out, or to the wind, must be followed-up carefully, as well as the recording of wall cracks.
- f. The State Party suggests establishing a monitoring Committee, in order to ensure the quality and supervision of construction works, including independent experts;
- g. The European precautionary norms and construction supervision norms in urban zones have been respected; and beyond.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Center and ICOMOS deeply regret that a re-routing solution of the underground plan in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà has never been seriously examined. The technical arguments of the viary network and its angles which would be too sharp in case of a re-routing seem to be denied by a simple examination of the city's planning structure. The two streets parallel to the Mallorca street, in the south-east, the Valencia and Arago streets, offer the same angular characteristics, at the price of a

slight extension of the line, in the Sagrera train station's axis. The extension, necessary for such a shunting, indeed more expensive, did not seem like an unmanageable task.

ICOMOS considers that the works that have been undertaken and the forward-looking studies provided, in the perspective of maintaining the underground line in its plan, in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà, provide elements which are in principle in favor of the projects' upholding : irrelevant subsidence effects compared to those due to the actual weight of the Cathedrals' structure, reinforcement of the Cathedrals' foundations with the bored pile wall, irrelevant hydrological effects compared to the natural variations, a ground favorable to the tunnel driving of a relative depth with no surface damage, use of boring material and use of additional techniques with low vibratory effects, highly limited speed for rail convoys, etc. Furthermore, ICOMOS considers the implementation of a Construction Monitoring Committee, including independent experts as an element of warranty. The Committee must provide a monthly report concerning all recorded events related to the effects of the tunnel's excavation, in any way connected to the conservation of the Cathedrals' structural integrity. However, ICOMOS emphasizes the following points:

The suggested creation of a Committee in charge of monitoring the construction works must be implemented and its formation must be extended – in comparison to the suggestion made to date. The point of view of the critical experts for the project must absolutely be taken into account. They especially recall the structural fragility of the Sagrada Familia, which cannot tolerate any slight risk-taking. For this reason, it would be necessary to integrate within the Construction Monitoring Committee, for instance, at least a representative of the Ministry of Culture and a representative of the Property Management Authority. This Construction Monitoring Committee must particularly be in charge of:

- On a permanent basis, collecting and interpreting results of the supervision related to the process of progress of the train tunnel and existing buildings, taking into account the various ground layers along the path ;
- Creating an independent model for the examination of buildings in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia, on the basis of monitoring outcomes ;
- Creating an independent model for the examination of buildings in the vicinity of Casa Milà, adjusting it with the outcomes of the further ground studies report and going by the monitoring results ;
- On a permanent basis, adjusting the calculation models according to the measures that have been taken and to the provisions concerning ground movements as the works progress, and take extra measures if necessary;
- Undertaking a long-term monitoring of the ground pressure increase on the tunnel, due to further constructions in the Sagrada Familia Cathedral, including a long-term monitoring of the structure originally built by Gaudi;
- Keeping the World Heritage Centre regularly updated with the outcomes.

These measures must contribute to create a permanent monitoring instrument, accepted by all members of the Building Monitoring Committee. This Committee must be able to initiate an immediate halt of the tunnel boring works, in the occurrence of proved exceeding of the physical limits, part of the global chosen indicators and examine the reasons. The Committee's remits must concern the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà.

The question of possible vibration transmissions when underground trains pass must constitute a topic for a specific, precise and regular monitoring programme. This must be added to the property's monitoring in the Management Plan, for the future high-speed train, if this itinerary is finally achieved, as well as for the metro lines 5 and 2, which pass in the immediate vicinity of the Sagrada Familia. A possible reinforcement of the vibration absorption systems inside the tunnel must be envisaged with the rail constructor. The speed of the convoys must be strictly limited.

The independent technical monitoring of the state of the ground and their possible subsidencies must be pursued after the works have been achieved, as a monitoring element of the property in its entirety, especially because of the effects due to the weight of the construction. Furthermore, the tri-dimensional monitoring models and structural analysis models of the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà must be pursued.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recall that the inscribed property, concerning the Sagrada Familia only consists in the part of the Cathedral directly built by Gaudi. It is the crypt and the Nativity façade, which are not directly on the edge of the line of reinforced cement piles. However, it is obvious that a possible damage of some importance caused to the parts situated closely would alter the exceptional universal value of the property.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.98

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined the document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling the decision **33 COM 7B.121**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Regrets that the suggestion of re-routing the fast train AVE's underground path, in the area of the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà, was not the subject of a real study concerning alternatives which would have a lower impact on the World Heritage Property;*
4. *Takes note of the technical documentation provided by the State Party, about the conditions to continue carrying out the tunnel boring works currently being undertaken;*
5. *Urges the State Party to take the following points into consideration, in order to improve the monitoring conditions of the tunnel boring works, in vicinity to the Sagrada Familia and the Casa Milà and their immediate halt at the slightest alert or slightest uncertainty of the grounds' behavior, in order to ensure the Sagrada Familia's and the Casa Milà's structural integrity:*
 - a) *Put the Construction Monitoring Committee in place and extend its formation in order to guarantee that it includes independent experts and experts possibly critical regarding the project,*
 - b) *Clarify the technical programme related to the monitoring of the tunnel boring machine's progression to the Sagrada Familia, in relation with the finest prevision possible concerning the static and dynamic consequences on the grounds and foundations of the Gaudi buildings,*
 - c) *Confirm the scientific and administrative conditions by which the Committee can suspend, with no delay and with full authority, the tunnel boring works,*
 - d) *Put in place a monitoring programme concerning the vibrations linked to underground rail usage at the level of the Sagrada Familia, for the two existing "metro" lines as well as for the future high-speed train (AVE) underground line, and consider a possible reinforcement of the vibration absorbing devices,*
 - e) *Perpetuate the Monitoring Committee after the works have been achieved, in order to ensure a monitoring programme, concerning the grounds and modelling of the structural outcomes of the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà, taking into*

account all the parameters linked to these two buildings once the works have been achieved;

6. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre regularly updated on the establishment of the Construction Monitoring Committee and its criteria, as well as the progress of the works and the monthly conclusions of such Committee;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before 1 February 2011, a report concerning the progress made with the implementation of the recommendations, so it can be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

101. Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 8B.63; 32 COM 8B.66; 33 COM 8B.53

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2005: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Volume of a new building and re-designing of the Plaza of Santa Teresa located between the Alcazar Gate in the town walls and the extra-muros Church of San Pedro;
- b) Lack of buffer zone and integrated management plan;
- c) Inadequate legal protection;
- d) Inadequate respect of the *Operational Guidelines* (para. 172) before construction and restoration were undertaken.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/348/documents/>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010, the State Party submitted a report concerning the progress of the works related to the development of the integrated Management Plan for the Old Town of Ávila with its Extra-Muros churches.

This report states that a first draft of the Special Management Plan of the registered property and its buffer zone is at the stage of revision and discussion. The plan will be based on a detailed analysis of the outstanding universal value attributes and the link between all components, in the context of their contribution to the town as an entirety.

A meeting with the Mayor of Ávila and the Director of the World Heritage Centre took place at UNESCO on 26 March 2010 to discuss the planned development of an underground car park, with a capacity of about 300 vehicles, integrated into the slope of the Northern town's wall. The aim of the new car park is to reduce traffic in the Old Town of Ávila and accompany the revitalization of the green belt surrounding the town wall. The documentation was received the 14 April 2010 and is being evaluated by ICOMOS.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.101

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 8B.53**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009,)*
3. *Notes the progress of the property's Management Plan and the documentation submitted concerning the car park project, which is being evaluated by ICOMOS;*
4. *Refers the examination of the buffer zone suggested for the Old Town of Ávila and its Extra-Muros Churches, Spain, to the State Party, in order to allow it to finalize the property's Management Plan;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic versions of the Management Plan to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**;*
6. *Also requests the State Party, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to not take any decisions concerning the car park project submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre, until receiving comments from ICOMOS concerning this project.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

107. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1984

Criteria
(iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 7B.89; 28 COM 15B.112; 32 COM 7B.120

International Assistance
USD 60,000 technical assistance for conservation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2003: ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of TRANSCARIBE, a new public transportation system and its impact on the wall;
- b) Lack of a regulatory conservation management system of the property;
- c) Impact of the harbour public works on the fortifications of Cartagena;
- d) Need of urban regulations for the protected area;
- e) Lack of a Management Plan.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/285>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report from the State Party on 29 March 2010, which included the following responses to the Committee's requests:

a) *Updated information on the boundaries of the property and buffer zones of the World Heritage property and related regulations*

The report includes a description of the property and its buffer zone, including a map with the new delimitation. The modification of the boundaries was proposed in the framework of the Special Plan for Management and Protection (PEMP - *Plan Especial de Manejo y Protección del Centro Histórico de Cartagena de Indias*) which is currently being analysed by the local government and the Ministry of Culture. In the attached map, the protected area and the buffer zone are larger than the area approved by Resolution 043 of 1994 and no explanation as to the reasons for this change was provided. However, it is stated that once the new delimitation has been approved, it will be officially submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

A clarification was made that 13 of the elements of the fortified system that are not included within the Historic Centre, have been declared Property of Cultural Interest in order to protect them by Decree 1911 of 2 November 1995 and the Law 397 of 1997 and Law 1185 of 2008. All interventions in these properties require previous authorization from the Ministry of

Culture. Since the nomination file of the property did not contain proper topographic maps at the time of inscription, it is advisable, within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process, to clarify which of the elements are included in the delimitation of the protected area and to properly identify the inscribed property and its buffer zone

b) Procedures and responsibilities concerning the establishment of urban building regulations

The report states that Law 1185 of 2008 and the Territorial Management Plan of Cartagena de Indias regulates interventions within the Historic Centre. At the local level, the institution in charge of the evaluation of interventions and the control of constructions is the Technical Committee of Historic and Cultural Heritage from the Institute of Heritage and Culture of Cartagena de Indias (IPCC), which is part of the municipality. Additional information was provided on the roles and responsibilities of these entities.

Regarding the finalization of the PEMP, the information submitted stated that the socialization of the report is pending as well as its adjustment with the municipality plans. It is foreseen the process will finalise in March 2010. A document entitled Historic Review of Cartagena, which has been prepared for the second phase of the PEMP, was attached and consists of descriptive information about the archaeological areas in the historic centre, as well as the assessments for urban analysis of the historic centre and its surroundings, public spaces, environmental conditions and a socio-economic description. The complete draft Plan was not submitted and its finalization has been pending since the reactive monitoring mission of 2006.

It was also indicated that a specific Management Plan for the other fortresses of the defence system will be drafted in coordination with the related institutions. The timeline previewed for drafting such plan was not included.

The importance of elaborating an integrated Management Plan for the entire property including all the relevant elements of the fortified system has to be underscored. The PEMP should not only include the Historic Centre and the surrounding area, but it should also take into account the fortified elements which are recognized for their heritage values and are part of one single property.

c) Updated information on the instruments for land use control, notably in the property, and policies to promote diversification of activities

According to the submitted information, the IPCC has developed a study regarding land use in the Historic Centre. Its results and the regulations included in the PEMP will converge in favour of the preservation of the housing use in the Historic Centre, to alleviate any negative impacts of the current touristic and commercial activities present in the area. The report did not provide further details on how this would be achieved.

d) Advancement of the integral study of the condition of the Fortifications' walls.

In 2008, the Ministry of Culture requested the elaboration of "Technical Studies for the Restoration of the walls placed between the Monument of the India Catalina and the Museum of Cartagena". This was the first step for the comprehensive assessment study of the complete wall, and its results and conclusions were included in the report submitted by the State Party. The comprehensive analysis highlighted conservation issues including humidity and infiltrations on the wall; the weakening of structural components of the scarps due to the loss of mortar; higher tension efforts in certain areas (*Torre del Reloj* and *San Antonio* bastions); as well as drainage problems and floods due to the high tides. The study recommended solving the construction problems related to structural consolidation and hydraulic engineering, focused on the drainage system in order to recover the original levels of the glacis and the original dimensions of the wall. Other recommendations include protection barriers against vibrations and structural reinforcements in case of seismic

activities in addition to regular protection and restoration programmes for the fabric of the wall. Regarding the impact of the Transcribe system on the walls, the study has indicated that the creation of a void between the Transcribe and the wall could interrupt any vibration waves that may affect it, and that the speed limit for Transcribe should be limited to 30km/h. The study does not include a prioritised Action Plan, with timelines and costs for implementation, to address pressing conservation issues. Recommendations are in many cases too general and need to be further developed, including technical specifications for interventions that are currently in a draft format.

e) *Other conservation issues*

A summary report on climate change issues was elaborated by the Maritime General Directorate of the Defence National Ministry and submitted to the Municipality of Cartagena. The report included predictions on potential tide rise and impacts evidenced by environmental conditions today, including deterioration due to exacerbated humidity. It has been agreed that a special emphasis on climate change should be included in the PEMP, due to the considerable impact that tidal rise and global warming may have on the property. A Coastal Zone Committee, in collaboration with the Cartagena University and the Centre of Oceanographic Studies was set up in 2009 to elaborate short-term solutions while long-term strategies are being planned. The actions proposed include the elaboration of updated cartography for the areas at risk, in order to allow the municipalities to restrict settlements on them. Other actions include the construction of locks and the installation of pumps and valves. It was recognized that the timeframe for the implementation of the mentioned measures is not ensured due to financial constraints.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned that the Special Plan for Management and Protection (PEMP) has not been finalized since it was requested in 2006. They wish to underscore the importance of integrating all elements of the inscribed property in the finalized plan, taking into account the integrity of the fortified system and of the Historic Centre.

In spite of progress made in carrying out the conservation assessment for parts of the property, no indication has been provided on when it will be finalized and no precise action plan for conservation of the property has been defined. There has been limited progress since the last reactive monitoring mission and many proposals have yet to be further developed. Detailed information on the current status of the construction of the Transcribe and the application of conservation measures to reduce its impact on the walls was not submitted. The definition of the limits of the property and its buffer zone should include all the fortified elements that are part of the defense system of the bay and that were included in the nomination file. The PEMP should also be elaborated taking into account the integrity of the fortified system and not only the Historic Centre.

In the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the “Workshop on the preparation Retrospective Inventory, Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included in the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region” took place in November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Cartagena participated and was trained on how to produce the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which were to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by **31 July 2010**.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.107

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-010/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.120**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Requests the State Party to finalize the delimitation of the property including all elements of the fortified system according to the required formats and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for consideration and review;
4. Also requests the State Party to finalize the conservation study for the full ensemble of walls and the fortified city and to submit a prioritised Action plan for their conservation, taking into account provisions made in the Special Plan for Management and Protection by **30 December 2010**;
5. Further requests the State Party to finalize the Special Plan for Management and Protection, taking into account the integrity of the fortified city and the historic centre;
6. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

110. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
06 COM XII.41; 07 COM X.36

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 200,668 for conservation and emergency programmes

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions
September 2006: UNESCO Havana Office Technical Visit.

Factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

- a) Lack of a Management Plan;
- b) Lack of a Conservation Plan;
- c) Water damage;
- d) Vandalism;
- e) Seismic activities;

- f) Lack of a Risk Preparedness Plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/180>

Current conservation issues

On 27 November 2009, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on the occasion of the “*Workshop on the preparation of the Retrospective Inventory and Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (of the properties included on the World Heritage List) and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region*” which took place in Buenos Aires, Argentina. This report informed of actions taken as a follow-up to the 2006 Technical Visit by the UNESCO Havana Office and underlined urgent concerns to be addressed. The State Party was represented by the Director of the Institute for the Preservation of the National Heritage (ISPAN).

As stated in the above mentioned report, the National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers has suffered from a number of issues, including development pressures focusing on the City of Milot, extraction of materials from the site, large numbers of visitors, vandalism, deforestation and an overgrowth in vegetation. The site is also severely affected by natural disasters in the form of earthquakes, flooding and the hurricane impacts during the season which runs from June to November each year.

On 12 January 2010, the State Party witnessed a catastrophic earthquake which resulted in structural damages to the property. After the *Preparatory Meeting for the Establishment of an International Coordination Committee (ICC) for Haitian Culture* on 16 February 2010 held at UNESCO Headquarters (Paris), discussions took place with the Ministry of Culture of Haiti, the Director of ISPAN and the Advisory Bodies to identify the following urgent actions to be undertaken at the site:

- a) an assessment of damages and structural risk,
- b) implementation of urgent conservation work,
- c) finalization of conservation, management and risk preparedness plans.

The State Party is preparing an Emergency International Assistance request for the World Heritage property, and an Inter - institutional mission is being organized by the World Heritage Centre in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.110

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its deep regret at the devastation caused by the 12 January 2010 earthquake in Haiti and thanks the State Party for providing all elements and support necessary for carrying out the emergency mission in spite of the extreme difficulties being experienced;
3. Acknowledges the efforts of the Institute for the Preservation of the National Heritage (ISPAN) in establishing a close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the

Advisory Bodies and appreciates its deep commitment to the preservation of the cultural heritage of Haiti;

- 4. Also acknowledges the key factors affecting the property as indicated by the report submitted by the State Party in November 2009;*
- 5. Further acknowledges the effective inter-institutional collaboration established between the Haitian Government, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the preparation and carrying out of the inter-institutional mission to the property;*
- 6. Encourages the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to set up an action plan and technical, institutional and financial strategies to implement all the urgent actions identified by the mission;*
- 7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and advances made in conservation, management and risk preparedness planning, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

111. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.127; 32 COM 7B.123; 33 COM 7B.138

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
November - December 2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property
a) Urban development pressures in areas surrounding the property;
b) Lack of management plan.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/414>

Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2010, the Management Plan was submitted by the State Party, including various annexes, one of which provides responses to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). On 18 March 2010, a document

entitled – State of Conservation was submitted to the World Heritage Centre. This report was not a part of previous annexes submitted on 2 February 2010 and includes information about the zoning for the site, an analysis of the social actors and existing conflicts, and information on visitors to the property.

a) *Management Plan*

The State Party submitted the finalised Management Plan. The document includes comprehensive background and general information about the property, the results of the different diagnostics carried out, proposals for the management organization, proposed management zones and their general strategies, as well as programmes for conservation, management and awareness building, including also general provisions for disaster prevention and the time frame for implementation is 2010-2015.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the finalisation of the Management Plan and the provisions made for the conservation and management of the property and its setting.

b) *Intersectorial working group*

The management plan submitted considers the forming of an inter-institutional commission that will be authorised to make agreements about the urbanization improvements, land use, improvements of the environment and tourism development in the property and its setting. A social outreach programme has also been prescribed to address conditions at the buffer zone of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note about the provisions made in the Management Plan. They particularly underscore the importance of fully operating the proposed social outreach programme and the forming of the prescribed inter-institutional commission to address the conditions assessed at the surrounding areas to mitigate threats, derived from unplanned urban expansion and land use and its effects on the landscape, on the Outstanding Universal Value and the related conditions of integrity and authenticity of the property.

c) *Other issues*

In an annex document, the State Party indicates that no additional proposals had been submitted by the tourism sector of the State of Mexico.

The State Party has submitted additional information on an Action Plan with regard to the spring solstice activities, the plan for thematic routes and traffic studies.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the finalisation of the management plan and encourage the State Party to take the provisions made from planning stages, when applicable, into full implementation and to secure the necessary resources that guarantee the sustainability of the proposed management system.

Draft Decision: **34 COM 7B.111,**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.138**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. Notes with satisfaction the finalisation of the Management Plan and encourages the State Party to implement the provisions made and to secure the required resources to guarantee the sustainability of the proposed management system;
4. Takes note that no new proposals for lighting and sound have been submitted to the concerned authorities at the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH) and invites the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, any new proposal according to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Requests the State Party to elaborate conservation guidelines for intervention according to the diagnostic provided;
6. Encourages the State Party to put into operation the inter-institutional commission proposed in the management plan to address pressing issues in the property, its buffer zone and its wider setting, particularly with regard to land use and urban development;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

112. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.122; 32 COM 7B.125; 33COM 7B.140

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 73 888 (conservation and preparatory assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2001: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission. March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration and destruction of the fabric of the property by environmental factors, lack of a maintenance programme, as well as polluted water;
- b) Erosion;
- c) Absence of management policies included in management plans;
- d) Uncontrolled urban development;
- e) Tourism pressures (in particular at Portobelo).

Current conservation issues

The State Party provided a report on the state of conservation of the property on 1 February 2010. The report provides a description of the various fortifications and includes a technical format for recording the location and description of the monuments. The report however provides no detailed technical information, nor does it include actions to be undertaken for the conservation and management of the property, or on other requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) such as the development of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

From 14 to 18 March 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out at the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135/documents/>

a. Management System

The State Party did not submit information in this respect in its report. The working plan for the recently created Patronato of Portobelo-San Lorenzo was sent in September 2009.

The mission notes that the Patronato of Portobelo-San Lorenzo, founded in 2008 and integrated by the National Institute of Culture (INAC), the National Authority for the Environment (ANAM), the Tourism Authority (ATP) and the Colon Free Zone as well as three private entities from the business sector, is the current entity in charge of the property. The operational budget comes from funds allocated by the Central Government, as well as donations from private members and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Its Executive Director was appointed in March 2010 and USD 150,000 has been allocated to commence conservation actions. Although this constitutes a positive step, because of its recent creation, the achievements have been limited. An urgent aspect to be addressed is the coordination between the different entities at the site to streamline interventions and avoid duplicity of efforts and overlapping functions. The mission also noted that the effectiveness of the entity would also depend on the decisions and commitment of the highest levels of authority and its ministries, the Province of Colon and the Municipalities. There is still no clear national policy for the preservation of Panamanian World Heritage properties and this is reflected in the lack of provisions for their coherent planning and systematic management. Additionally, capacity building will need to be conducted as currently there are no local technical bodies specialised in territorial and urban planning, or in historic preservation, and technical orientation is limited at the local level.

b. State of Conservation

The State Party reports that San Lorenzo faces serious conservation problems as identified by the previous reactive monitoring mission in 2001, qualifying the current conditions from poor to fair and indicating some of the factors that have generated decay. The report also indicates that conditions vary in the severity of deterioration and notes some critical areas for intervention. The State Party reports that the Patronato de Portobelo y San Lorenzo will implement a condition assessment to evaluate the quantitative impact of the decay phenomena. It mentioned that there is a preventive conservation programme for the removal of macro vegetation and consolidation of affected structural elements.

The mission found that the Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports, including the significant decay of building fabric, derived from both environmental factors as well as the lack of a maintenance programme, the absence of management policies,

uncontrolled urban development and tourism pressures, have not been addressed. Erosion by the sea is also evident, and some structures are in danger of collapsing. Conservation projects supported by the Inter American Development Bank (IDB), the World Monuments Fund and the Spanish Agency for Cooperation and Development (AECID) have been interrupted or not implemented, along with a number of projects and proposals for action derived from initiatives such as the UNESCO/UNDP Regional Project for Cultural Heritage and Development (1983).

The mission assessed the current state of the different components of the property and considers that the degradation of the fabric over considerable areas is in a critical state and at risk of collapse and potential loss. Although these conditions can be partially attributed to natural processes and the lack of systematic interventions and regular maintenance, the impact of unregulated human activities has also generated deterioration of the fabric and has compromised their integrity and authenticity. Development pressures in Portobelo, arbitrary and spontaneous growth and uncontrolled constructions that result from the lack of coherent territorial and urban planning, despite developed plans, constitute a significant and increasing threat. This is further exacerbated as there are still no legally defined buffer zones for the property.

The Patronato's Working Plan for 2010-2013 is a comprehensive document to address a wide variety of tasks ranging from the preservation of the monumental components of the property including both preventive and emergency actions, urban planning, orientation and control of tourism activities, education, information and research programs, management and monitoring, budget and fund raising, among the main issues. However no resources have been identified for the implementation of this Plan.

c. Other issues

The mission underscored that communities at both Portobelo and San Lorenzo have significantly differing interests and have no involvement in the protection of the property, leading to situations where conflict might easily arise. It noted that local awareness is limited and for many sectors of the community, heritage places are elements that hinder the implementation of large projects. There are currently no projects in place to stimulate community involvement and to jointly define projects to contribute to human development and an improvement in the quality of life. These are added to the various issues that threaten the physical fabric of the property.

The mission also noted that tourism is not a planned activity and there is no coherent policy currently in place for its development. Both the municipal authorities and the community indicate that derived benefits are very limited. Unplanned tourism activities, without any studies on potential impacts and means to mitigate them also constitute a significant decay factor and could exacerbate existing conditions if projects to develop additional infrastructure and facilities for tourism are implemented without holistic planning and the pertinent impact studies.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the limited recent efforts made to address the current conditions at the property, particularly the creation of the Patronato and the development of a working plan. However many necessary actions remain in the planning phase and long-time lack of systematic attention to the property, the lack of legally defined buffer zones and the discontinuity in implementation of planning tools and conservation projects, have compromised the attributes of the property and it is faced with significant threats to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity that warranted the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are strongly concerned about the state of conservation of the property and consider that the World Heritage Committee might wish to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to assist the State Party in addressing the significant threats and in garnering the support at the international,

national and local levels to ensure the conservation of the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Within the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the “Workshop on the preparation Retrospective Inventory, Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included in the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region” took place in November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Panama participated and was trained on how to produce the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which were to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 31 July 2010.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.112

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.140**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes with concern that the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party lacks sufficient detail to be considered as a full response to issues previously raised,
4. Also notes the results of the March 2010 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, endorses its recommendations and urges the State Party:
 - a) *Implement emergency conservation measures at sectors at risk of collapse as identified in the Emergency Plan,*
 - b) *Formulation and full implementation of management plan for the property,*
 - c) *Definition of boundaries and buffer zones for each of the inscribed components, including regulatory measures for their management,*
 - d) *Enactment of a policy for the property for the commitment at all levels for the conservation of the property;*
5. Expresses its deep concern regarding the state of conservation of the property, in particular the significant degradation of the building fabric, limited ongoing preservation initiatives and the general lack of a maintenance programme which directly impacts the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a proposal for the desired state of conservation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011;
7. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, a draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which should be submitted within the framework of the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Reporting exercise;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

113. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997, 2003 extension

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 8C.40; 32 COM 7B.126; 33 COM 7B.141

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2010: In occasion of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Portobelo and San Lorenzo, a technical visit to the Archaeological site of Panama Viejo and the Historic District was undertaken, as requested by the Authorities of Panama.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Severe deterioration of historic buildings that threatens the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
- b) Conflicting interests of different stakeholders with regards to the use, management and conservation of the historic centre;
- c) Limited capacity for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic structures;
- d) Deficiencies in the implementation of the legislative framework for protection;
- e) Lack of implementation of clear conservation and management policies for the property;
- f) Demolition of urban ensembles and buildings;
- g) Forced displacement of occupants and squatters;
- h) Urban development projects within the protected area (i.e. Cinta Costera).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/790>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received information regarding the state of conservation, and additional information concerning Panama Viejo on 20 October 2009. The State Party submitted an Emergency Plan for corrective measures for the property from which some information about the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's Decision can be gleaned. In addition, within the context of a reactive monitoring mission to the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama, the national authorities requested a technical visit to the property for an assessment of current conditions and issues.

The information received and the technical visit to the property highlighted concerns regarding the Historic District of Panama and how the absence of a clear policy concerning the preservation and development of the area was significantly affecting the site. There have

been cases of aggressive interventions and alterations resulting in irreversible damage to the site's integrity and authenticity. Neglected buildings are in danger of collapse and funds previously allocated by the Inter American Development Bank (IDB) for social housing have been rerouted to other projects, further compounding the poor social conditions that exist at the site.

a. Emergency Plan

ICOMOS evaluated the document submitted by the State Party and considers that it encompasses a characterization of the property, an assessment of current conditions by means of SWOT matrixes and conclusions on risks and vulnerabilities, and a list of measures focused on addressing identified risks and threats. The document reflects the efforts made in comprehensively analysing the current situation from the state of conservation of the property to the assessment of existing legislative and regulatory frameworks, which confirms concerns pointed out during the reactive monitoring and expert missions, and identified in previous Decisions of the World Heritage Committee. Notwithstanding the detailed assessment, the proposals for actions are limited and there is no indication regarding timelines, sources of funding or how corrective measures and actions will be implemented. Similarly, criteria and methods for interventions at historic buildings are lacking. The document is more focused on a long-term strategic vision for the management and conservation of the property, which would still require further work, than on the emergency action plan requested by the World Heritage Committee.

b. Legislative and regulatory measures and management arrangements for the property

The submitted plan provides a detailed analysis on the governance mechanisms for the property, however there is no indication whether existing arrangements will be revised in the near future to enhance the protection of the property and to ensure the sustainability of the management system currently in place. Measures for enforcing legal instruments are not indicated.

According to previous World Heritage Committee Decisions, there has been no significant improvement in terms of a coordinated management of the property. It was also emphasized that the management conditions of the two sites which integrate the World Heritage property are quite different: Panama Viejo is being managed by the Patronato, while the arrangements for the Historic District still need to be evaluated and organized, as suggested by previous Decisions of the World Heritage Committee, the 2009 reactive monitoring mission and the 2010 expert mission. A coordinated management system for both sites needs to be established as soon as possible.

c. Buffer zone

The document indicates that the buffer zone for the Historic District is currently under evaluation. There is no additional information on the timeframe for legal approval or on the regulatory measures foreseen.

d. Interventions at historic monuments

Regarding Panama Viejo, the document submitted by the State Party includes the proposal for the intervention at Plaza Mayor. The mission found that the Patronato continues working with efficiency and commitment. Several interventions to adapt a portion of the monumental space for new functions have been carefully implemented. The project for the new exhibition and interpretation facilities at the site was recently modified, moving its location to some distance from the old tower, following the recommendations of the 2009 mission.

With regards to the Historic Centre, information on planned and ongoing projects, including the structural changes at the Hotel Central and the impacts of the PH Plaza Independencia condominium, was not included.

The mission found that although the National Institute of Culture (Instituto Nacional de Cultura - INAC), the National Historic Heritage Directorate (DNPH) and the Historic Centre office (Oficina del Casco Antiguo - OCA) are working hard and demonstrate serious concern regarding the solutions for the issues pointed out by the World Heritage Committee, many negative aspects currently persist. Various buildings have been rehabilitated and many others are currently being restored, however there are a significant number of neglected buildings at risk of collapse. It also noted that real estate speculation and interests continue to pervade decision-making processes, leading to detrimental interventions at the property.

e. Housing policy for the Historic District

The information sent does not specify whether a decision or progress has been made in this respect. The Emergency Plan should comprise a detailed programme about the buildings to be intervened for housing purposes, the types of interventions foreseen, timelines and budgets for implementation, among others. No information regarding the implementation of some of the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission of 2009 was included, specifically with regards to the financial mobilization for public investment processes on housing and infrastructure, and the sustainable policy for the improvement of the low income families' living conditions.

The mission noted that very limited works for the provision of social housing are currently being implemented and that acute social conflicts have not decreased. It also underscored that funds allocated by the IDB for social housing have been allocated to other areas, leading to the cancellation of initiatives that had proven successful. The mission considers that the gentrification of the property has gradually increased.

f. Avenida Cincuentenario

This project concerns mainly Panama Viejo, where five alternative routes have been identified and submitted to the national authorities, and are currently being evaluated by the Ministry of Public Works and other involved entities. No evidence of an approved budget or implementation project dates has been provided. According to the 2010 expert mission, the Patronato supports the alternative proposed by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission, which would see the project being developed along one edge of the site, as this option seems to cause the least impact and will help with a better de-limitation of the property.

g. Cinta Costera

The Cinta Costera project is a coastal freeway being executed at the seaside area of Terraplan that is projected to continue along the border of the Historic Centre with plans for a tunnel beneath the Centre's core. At the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party was requested to, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guideline*, to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a final report, including the analysis and monitoring of the potential impacts of this project.

The Mission in 2010 realised that the State Party had commenced the execution of this project. No additional information could be procured regarding the social impacts, conservation requirements, impact assessments, etc. of this project. The Mission was therefore left to conclude that these assessments were not undertaken.

h. Other issues

Within the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the "Workshop on the preparation of the Retrospective Inventory, retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included on the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region" took place November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Panama participated and was trained on how to produce the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party has sent a proposal which needed to be revised and resubmitted to the World Heritage Centre by 31 July 2010.

No information on the evaluation and update of the current Master Plan and detailed regulations for the Historic District has been submitted.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the received information does not provide a definite and precise course of action to address the current threats to the property that have been highlighted in the 2009 reactive monitoring mission and in Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee. There are no clear schedules or comprehensive technical information about how critical issues, including social housing and its derived conflicts, the impacts of the Cinta Costera and the alternative route for the Avenida Cincuentenario will be addressed. The document does not evidence how the highest level of authority will commit to the conservation of the property or the definition of a clear policy for the preservation and development of the historic area.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that factoring the emergency situation as discussed in previous World Heritage Committee sessions that affect a high proportion of the buildings in the Historic District, and which encompasses a wide range of other threats, and given the very limited response observed by the various missions, it is evident that the current situation threatens the attributes of the Historic District which sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

They consider that the World Heritage Committee may wish to send a reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and to evaluate progress made in addressing the various threats with a view to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2011 if no substantial progress is made.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.113

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.141**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the Emergency Plan submitted by the State Party and urges it to:*
 - a) *Establish the buffer zone for Panama Viejo and the Historic District, including the definition of regulatory measures, and submit the information to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for consideration and review,*
 - b) *Approve the legislative proposal to enhance the protection and the regulatory measures of the property and to establish one permanent management authority to ensure the adequacy and efficiency of the management arrangements,*
 - c) *Define policies for the preservation of the historic area, including criteria for rehabilitation and new developments that could potentially impact the property,*
 - d) *Secure the required technical and financial resources to implement actions to address pressing concerns that threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to halt the Cinta Costera Project and to submit, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the necessary technical studies and impact assessments for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to approval and implementation;*

5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission in 2010 to assess the state of interventions at the historic monuments, current management arrangements, planned development projects and the state of conservation of the property;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a report on this issue above-mentioned, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

115. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1983

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 7B.98; 28 COM 15B.119; 29 COM 7B.96

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 Emergency Assistance; USD 47,000 for conservation and elaboration of a Management Plan;

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
July 2009: Technical visit DIR/WHC

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need for a Master Plan officially approved and implemented;
- b) Need for specific regulations for a risk-preparedness programme, traffic restriction studies and regulations for built heritage conservation.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/273>

Current conservation issues

During 2009, the World Heritage Centre received several press reports and information from the civil society of the city and neighbourhood associations regarding projects and constructions undertaken within the Historic Centre of Cusco, mainly the construction of a Marriot Hotel, the enlargement of the Monastery Hotel (Hotel Monasterio) and the construction of the Commercial Centre (Ima Sumaq). The evaluation of the information raised concerns that certain interventions being carried out or projected could have impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and affect the conditions of authenticity and integrity of the property. Information was requested from the State Party in compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* on 16 April 2009, 8 July 2009, 20 September 2009, 21 December 2009 and 13 January 2010.

A report, including a description of the property and an analysis of the Historic Centre's conservation concerns was received by the World Heritage Centre on 3 February 2010. The main concerns include the loss of built heritage (representing only 29.30% in 1998 versus a 51.32% calculated in previous reports); rapid changes in land use, tourism promotion and commercial activities, provoking a substantial reduction of residential use, an increase in the degradation of living conditions (76.56% of the houses have become slums), lack of heritage conservation consciousness and the need for awareness-raising programmes. Other problems that relate to the management and conservation of the property include the use of obsolete cartographic information and inventories, the changes in the urban landscape derived from illegal settlements, interventions that do not take into account the urban and architectural characteristics of the Historic Centre, loss of the traditional architectural typology due to inappropriate interventions, vehicular traffic, pollution; deficiencies in the solid waste management and a lack of an adequate tourism management plan. It was also emphasized that several political changes between 2007 and 2009 affected the implementation of the Master Plan.

In addition, the State Party submitted official information regarding the following projects:

a) *Construction of the Marriot Hotel in the Monasterio de San Agustín*

During 2009, the World Heritage Centre received multiple press reports, including information on denouncements from representatives of the Congress and civil society regarding the construction, by RIOJA S.A., of a Marriot Hotel within the Historic Centre of Cusco, more precisely in the *Antiguo Monasterio de San Agustín*, the first monastery in the City (dated from 1550).

The report indicated that during the approval process of the project, on 27 August 2008 (Dictamen N° 458-CTCP-MC, Agenda 030-2008) the resolution approving the architectural project indicated that the execution project depended on the results of an archaeological prospection to be undertaken in the presence of National Institute of Culture (INC) archaeologists. A note recalling this condition should have been included in the construction licence; nevertheless according to a copy sent in the report it was not included. The project was definitively approved on 9 October 2008 (Dictamen 559-CTPCP-MC) and obtained construction licence N°154 the same month. In June 2009, the discovery of archaeological remains halted the construction in order to request the INC's final evaluation and the Municipality's new authorization. This last resolution (N° 047-09-GDUR-MPC) was appealed by RIOJA S.A. The Municipality declared the construction "partially paralyzed" as the archaeological remains were located in one specific section of construction and there was no need to halt the whole project. According to the report the monitoring of the archaeological works has been completed; however no reports have been received as yet.

As no precise technical and graphic information was submitted by the State Party, no assessment of the impacts project has been carried out at this point.

Civil society institutions have continued to express concern at the risk of damage to the colonial and archaeological heritage. The main concerns were related to the fact that the approval processes were not sufficiently accessible.

The INC sent official information on 1 March 2010 with the final court decision from the Public Ministry on the case of the Neighbours Association of the Historic Centre of Cusco and the Juridical Commission against Corruption and Social Defence against the INC and RIOJA SRL for the approval of the project of the Marriott Hotel. The court decided that no prosecutions should be made.

b) *Enlargement of the Monastery Hotel, located in the ancient Beatario de las Nazarenas*

As in the case of the Marriott Hotel, the State Party sent a detailed chronology of the approval process for the project, which was finally accepted on 6 November 2009 (Nº 660 CTCPCP-MC) after several corrections. Up to 15 January 2010, archaeological works in Choquehuanca Street were paralyzed awaiting the constitution of the Archaeological Commission of the INC. The report stated that the pre-Columbian walls found were protected, advances have been made on the restoration works, however no detailed technical information was included.

c) *Commercial Centre Ima Sumaq*

The project was approved by Dictamen Nº276-CTPCP-MC on 25 July 2007. A brief description of the status of the construction up to 15 January 2010 was included. According to the description, the basement works have been paralyzed due to the rise in water table levels. The Inca walls that were found in Loreto Street have been restored and most of the structure of the commercial centre has been completed. No technical information was submitted to be able to assess the potential impact of the project.

The Municipality of Cusco requested the World Heritage Centre to undertake an advisory mission to the property in order to address the impact that the construction of the Monastery Hotel, the Commercial Centre Ima Sumaq and the Marriott Hotel may have on the property. A technical assessment on the implementation of the international conservation standards at the property was also requested.

d) *Management Plan and the Management Committee*

According to the report sent by the State Party, the political instability and constant changes in the municipal government from 2007 to 2009 hindered the implementation of the Management Plan. The report summarizes the process for the elaboration of a Master Plan since 1999. An abbreviated version of the final document of the Master Plan of Cusco, approved in 2005, has been included.

The report indicated that the Technical Office for the Historic Centre was created to facilitate the conservation, protection and promotion of built heritage and urban spaces within the Historic Centre of Cusco. A description of the works undertaken in 2009 was attached, consisting mainly of the improvement of public spaces and sanitary infrastructure. The report explained that in the framework of the new competencies acquired with the Municipality Organic Law (Nº 27972) and according to the Master Plan, the Municipality of Cusco has recently proposed the creation of a Management Unit for the Historic Centre in order to improve the management and conservation of the property. No further information on the creation of this Unit was sent.

In the same report the State Party indicates that a Coordination Committee for the Historic Centre was created, composed of the Mayor, the Regional Director of the INC and the District Mayor when required. The Committee will operate with the assistance of a Technical Secretariat including three representatives of three institutions (not mentioned). The main role of the Technical Secretary will be to propose actions in favour of the Historic Centre and to implement the Management Plan. The Coordination Committee had its first meeting on 18 January 2010.

It is understood that currently the Technical Office for the Historic Centre is the entity in charge of the implementation of activities regarding the conservation of the property. Nevertheless, the relation between the existing office and the creation of a Management Unit and the Coordination Committee is not clear, making it difficult to understand their role in the decision making process for the conservation of Cusco.

- e) *Other projects undertaken in the property including a map indicating the location of the projects*

The State Party sent information regarding the “Plan for the Historic Centre of Cusco (2007-2010)” which is implemented with the support of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development (AECID). An agreement has been signed in order to support the Municipality of Cusco in carrying out activities for the preservation of the Historic Centre. Most of the projects are related to the valorisation of urban public spaces and the improvement of living conditions of the inhabitants. The foreseen activities for 2010 were not specified and the relation of the activities with the Management Plan of the property is not clear.

Other activities mentioned were the implementation of the Geographic Information System (GIS) system for the cartographic register of the Historic Centre; the elaboration of a socio-economic study to be executed in three years; the opening of the Historic Centre Office; the cataloguing of buildings and urban spaces in the Historic Centre. The terms of reference for the elaboration of the socio-economic study were not included.

In the framework of the agreement with the regional government of Andalucía (*Junta de Andalucía* - Spain) the following activities were described: the updating of the Master Plan, the integral treatment of the Cuenca of Saphy –Watanay River, an architectural guide of the City of Cusco, the Housing Rehabilitation Programme and the recovery of public spaces. No calendar of activities or terms of reference for the agreement were received.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are deeply concerned about the deterioration process of urban built heritage at the inscribed property. Even though some of the problems of the Historic Centre will be addressed by the new projects, it is still not clear how the National Institute of Culture (INC) and the Municipal authority will effectively deal with the degradation of living conditions, the constant changes in land use and the loss of residential uses. Similarly, decision-making mechanisms and responsibilities for the property need to also be identified in light of existing legislative frameworks.

There is also concern about the impacts on the property after the torrential rains and flooding that occurred in February 2010, particularly in relation to the water carrying capacity of soils and on the conservation conditions of built heritage that sustains the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

More information on how the Organic Municipal Law will affect the competencies of the Municipality and the National Government in relation to heritage preservation is needed. The elaboration of a Public Use Plan addressing touristic practices should start as soon as possible.

In response to the recent impacts of torrential rains at Cusco and Machu Picchu, a technical visit by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre was carried out in February 2010 to Lima, Peru. World Heritage Centre staff met with the Ministers of Environment and Tourism, Directors of the INC and Servicio Nacional de Areas Protegidas de Perú (SERNANP), Civil Defense organization INDECI and the National Institute of Geology and Mines and Metals. The World Heritage Centre expresses its concern about the impacts of the vast inundation that affected the water-carrying capacity of soils and the built heritage of the urban area.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.115

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,

2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.96**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Expresses its condolences to the Government of Peru for the tragic loss of life and damages caused by the February 2010 torrential rains in the area,
4. Requests the State Party to submit by **1 December 2010**:
 - a) Comprehensive technical information on the projects of the Monastery Hotel, Commercial Centre Ima Sumaq and Marriott Hotel, to assess the potential impacts of these projects on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property,
 - b) Information on the management system and its articulation with existing legislative frameworks, mainly the implications derived from the Organic Municipal Law;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the efficacy and adequacy of the management system for the inscribed property;
6. Urges the State Party to update the Master Plan for the property, including formulating a Public Use Plan, and to submit a comprehensive report on the activities to be undertaken for its review and implementation, including timelines and projected costs;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

116. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988 extension in 1991

Criteria

(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.99; 28 COM 15B.120; 33 COM 7B.145

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 48 000 for emergency works in the historic centre; USD 56,500 for conservation works.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1994: Systematic monitoring report UNDP/UNESCO; March-April 2003: Reactive monitoring mission ICOMOS; January 2010: WHC / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need of formalization of the procedures to set up a Management Coordination Unit to implement the Strategic Plan;
- b) Need of revision of the Master and Strategic Plans;
- c) New development projects within the historic centre including urban transportation systems (cable car and *Corredor Segregado*) and interventions in historical buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/500>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation of the property on 23 March 2010. The report provides information on the current state of the property, including conservation interventions at historic buildings, and information on other actions taken by the Municipality.

From 19 to 23 of January 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out at the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/500>

a) *Management system*

The report does not include specific information about the management system currently in place. It mentions agreements signed with other entities for the conservation and management of the property. For example, the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima subscribed an agreement of inter-institutional cooperation with the National COPESCO Plan to implement signposts at the property, in accordance to the Strategic Plan, to provide information about the historic property and services. Also, the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima and the Spanish Agency of International Cooperation have completed the Framework Cooperation Agreement for Development to strengthen the Office of the Historical Centre of Lima - PROLIMA and promote consultation and participation of civil society in processes of urban renewal and improvement of living conditions at the Historic Centre of Lima. The cooperation Protocol between the Ministry of Housing and Guidance in the territory of the Government of Andalusia and the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima has also been signed to promote policies for housing, architecture, territorial and urban planning and mapping.

The mission report states that the management and general condition of the Historic Centre has improved in the past years. It indicates that the protected area is physically and administratively divided by the Rimac River, situation that hinders an integrated approach for the Management of the entire property. It notes that decision-making processes for the property still lack clarity in regard to the role and responsibility of each of the involved entities and other stakeholders. There is a legally based approach rather than one based on consensus and advice from technical institutions is not included at all times, particularly in urban interventions. The mission considers that coordination between the National Institute of Culture, the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima and the Rimac Municipality needs to be enhanced to streamline planning and approval processes. It also notes that legislative and regulatory measures have to be carefully evaluated to identify potential gaps that can impact the outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity of the property.

b) *State of conservation of the property*

The Metropolitan Municipality of Lima reports that priority has been given to urban and architectural infrastructure to guarantee the quality and condition of the urban entity and its population and to integrate the protection of heritage. It has developed a database to identify properties and risk. In 2009, the Special Technical Commission of Uninhabitable Declaration and the Determination of the Ruinous Condition or Hovel of the properties of Historic Centre

of Lima, evaluated 78 properties and by resolution adopted by the Sub- Department of Urban Authorizations (RSAU) of the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima, declared uninhabitable those properties for reason such as: vulnerability of the structures and high-risk of collapse or lacks minimum conditions of safety or and the precariousness of their electrical and sanitary installations. These resolutions are put to knowledge for the owners or occupants, in order to execute projects to transform it into habitable property.

Some of the measures implemented by the Municipality for the Historic Centre include the installation of security cameras, the rehabilitation and pavement of streets and paving of sidewalks, maintenance of ornamental lighting, street furniture and green areas. The Municipality has also promoted a gastronomy circuit to promote larger investment in goods and services, improve quality of restaurants and preserve culinary traditions. Tourist circuits have also been promoted for the Historic Centre. Specific projects that were reported on by the State Party, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, are briefly discussed next:

- Municipal theatre

Work has continued on interventions to recover the Municipal Theatre after a fire affected it. The project has taken into account the qualities of the original design but considers modern systems for theatrical mechanics, lighting, sound and safety measures.

The mission has some concern regarding the division of the project into separate entities when it has to be sent to the National Institute of Culture (INC): for example the restoration project for the building has been approved and is well underway, while the structural reinforcement has not yet started and was going to be sent to the INC for evaluation. It notes that a comprehensive evaluation of the complete and finalised projects needs to be carried out before starting the works, in order to guarantee a complete overview of the projects.

- Metropolitan museum

The project, to be housed at a historic monument at the buffer zone, is currently in the feasibility analysis phase.

The mission does not have any significant concern and considers that this change of use - from an administrative function to a cultural one – does not affect the heritage character of the building and its setting, which is already the location of two other important museums of the city: the Italian Art Museum and the Lima Art Museum.

- Urban renewal of El Rastro and La Soledad Square

The project, which has been in implementation since 2003, considers the restoration of monumental areas and the construction of new housing compounds that improve the living conditions of the resident population in the area.

The mission considers that the restoration of the Casa de las Trece Puertas and its neighbourhood properties meet international conservation principles and practices and will have a very positive impact on the perception of this sector enhancing the streetscape and, because of the public function of some of those houses, encouraging life to come back to the core of the Historic Centre. It underscores the social aspects and involvement of the local population during the planning process as a key to the success of this type of intervention and to develop a sense of ownership.

The mission noted that despite the work carried out by the Municipal Government, there are still significant issues to address, including the slum condition of certain areas, insecurity and traffic. Projects defined in these areas will need to take into account requirements set forth in the Operational Guidelines and international standards for conservation.

- High Capacity Segregated Corridor (Corredor Segregado) project

The Municipality indicates that the development of the High Capacity segregated corridor has continued to manage and improve public transportation. The central corridor goes through a portion of the Historic Centre of Lima and Section II crosses through the buffer zone. The National Institute of Culture has defined criteria for the location and dimensions of stations so as to make them less aggressive to the context.

The mission expressed its concern for Section II, the decision to bring high capacity buses into the Historic Centre and that an alternative route should have been explored to preserve its character, as requested by the National Institute of Culture. It notes that designs have been modified to address observations made but underscores that the construction of the station at Jiron de la Union should not proceed because of the impact it would have on the circulation pattern, the rupture of the visual setting of the monumental area and the impact on the old canalization revealed during archaeological excavations. It regrets that the project was not discussed in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* prior to proceeding with the implementation. It was stated that during the last day of the mission, the Municipality indicated that the station at Jirón de la Unión would not be constructed.

- *The "Teleférico de Lima" (cable car) project*

This issue was not mentioned in the report submitted by the State Party however technical documentation was received on the subject and the mission conducted an analysis of the situation. The mission noted that the project consists of implementing a cable car system that would link the Parque de la Muralla - Parque Malecón del Río to the summit of Cerro San Cristobal. The objectives of this project include the creation of a commercial, recreational and tourism product, which would allow the spatial integration of important icons of Lima City. There have been several proposals presented and the INC has requested changes for the architecture of the station in the top of the San Cristobal Mountain in order to maintain its physiognomy. A new Directorial Resolution by the INC disapproved the cable car path included in the project because it does not comply with Municipal Ordinance no. 602 which states that interventions in the mountains that attempt against the natural physiognomy are forbidden and in response to the Decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission considers that implementing the project would impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by affecting the visual landscape of the historic area and the intangible values associated with the Cerro San Cristobal, considered sacred in prehispanic times and currently part of a pilgrimage route. During the mission, the Municipality expressed its acceptance to the resolution of the INC and indicated that the contract with the cable car company would be dissolved.

c. *Other issues: the Rimac River area*

The mission noted with concern the implementation of various projects along the Rimac River that have not been presented to the World Heritage Centre for consideration and review. The *Parque de la Muralla* and *Parque del Malecón del Río*, and the *Centro Habitacional La Muralla* are contemporary projects that are slowly modifying the character of the river landscape. Other projects still under consideration (a commercial centre and a recreational complex at *Parque Cantagallo in Rimac*, and a housing project at Montserrate in the *Cercado*) could all have some serious impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.

In the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the "Workshop on the preparation Retrospective Inventory, retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included on the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region" took place in November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Peru participated and was trained on how to produce the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by **31 July 2010**.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made in setting up the management system for the property but remain concerned about the lack of a holistic, systematic and concerted approach for decision-making at the property, including the limited coordination that is still prevalent among entities mandated with the conservation of the property and limited public involvement. An operational and effective management system should take this into account and also consider the integration of heritage specialists at the Municipalities to work with the National Institute of Culture in matters related to the property. They note that as private funding is available, major projects affecting the urban landscape of the property may continue to be planned. All these projects should be sent to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior execution as indicated in the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.116

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.145**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the information provided by the State Party on the actions implemented in response to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the efforts made for the conservation of heritage areas;
4. Also notes the results of the January 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and endorses its recommendations;
5. Encourages the State Party to enhance collaboration among specialized agencies to streamline decision-making processes and to secure the required resources to have a fully operational management system in place;
6. Notes with concern the implementation of infrastructure projects at the property and requests the State Party to:
 - a) Identify alternative routes for the cable car and carry out visual and environmental impact studies and develop designs that do not impact the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property,
 - b) Develop alternative designs for the High Capacity Segregated Corridor, including studies of specific transportation systems for the inscribed property, and stop construction of the station at Jirón de la Unión,
 - c) Develop appropriate guidance tools and precise policies for interventions at the historic centre both for decision-makers and for property owners,
 - d) Submit, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, new designs and technical specifications for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to approval and implementation;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations from the reactive monitoring mission and paragraphs above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

