

1. World Heritage Property Data**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Petäjävesi Old Church

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**State(s) Party(ies)**

- Finland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

584

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Petäjävesi Old Church	62.25 / 25.183	0	0	0	1994
Total (ha)			0		

Comment

Property area 2,98 ha; buffer zone area 48,44 ha, total 51,42 ha

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
GIS shape files	08/12/2005	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Margaretha Ehrström
National Board of Antiquities
Senior Advisor

Comment

National Board of Antiquities Stefan Wessman Senior Researcher P. O. Box 913 FIN-00101 Finland Telephone: +358 40 128 6256 Email: Stefan.Wessman@nba.fi

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Ulla RAHOLA
Site architect of Petäjävesi Old Church
Architect

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [National Board of Antiquities](#)
- [Petäjävesi Old Church, \(Petäjävesi\)](#)

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)**Comment**

There are no changes in designations/Conventions under which the property is protected since 2005

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance****Comment**

The retrospective Statement of Universal Value has been submitted to the Finnish Advisory Body in 2012 but is not yet adopted by World Heritage Center

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed (iv)**2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion**

Petäjävesi Old Church represents the wooden church architectural tradition of the North European region. (The well preserved interior with its hand-carved log surfaces and silk-fine patina and silvery sheen on the seasoned walls give it the unique atmosphere. The church was abandoned in 1879 which left it without all later technical installations. All interventions have been kept to a minimum preserving the tangible values and the spirit of the church, which is still in original use.)

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised**2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value****3. Factors Affecting the Property****3.14. Other factor(s)****3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin		
3.1	Buildings and Development									
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities									
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure									
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure									
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure									
3.3	Services Infrastructures									
3.3.1	Water infrastructure									
3.4	Pollution									
3.4.5	Solid waste									
3.4.6	Input of excess energy									
3.5	Biological resource use/modification									
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals									
3.5.5	Crop production									
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production									
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric									
3.7.2	Relative humidity									
3.7.3	Temperature									
3.7.4	Radiation/light									
3.7.5	Dust									
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)									
3.7.7	Pests									
3.7.8	Micro-organisms									
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage									
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses									
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage									
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system									
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation									
3.9	Other human activities									
3.9.1	Illegal activities									
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage									
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events									
3.10.1	Storms									
3.10.6	Temperature change									
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts									
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events									
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition									
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)									
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species									
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species									
3.13	Management and institutional factors									
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities									
3.13.3	Management activities									
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside				

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2	Relative humidity	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.7.3	Temperature	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.7.4	Radiation/light	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.7.5	Dust	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	localised	frequent	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.6	Temperature change	localised	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

The changes in the climate (mild winters/cold winters, hot summers/wet summers) are affecting the log walls of the site. It is most likely that the building must be covered by panels in the future to give it a "sacrificing layer" against the weathering.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities/landowners**.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

No comments

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)
Note WHC (July 2012): Please carefully review, complete and update the information provided below, if appropriate.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Saturday, October 29, 2005

• Question 6.02

There is a land-use and conservation plan for the area.

The church is protected according to the Church Act (which automatically protects churches built before 1917)

Comment

Master plan of the Church area has been confirmed in 2003. Land use plan of the Petäjavesi center has been confirmed in 2011. The graves under the church are protected as archeological remains. The site is also nominated as VAT-area (nationally important historic monument).

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

No comments

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

WHC Note (July 2012):

In the First Cycle of the PR it was mentioned that a Management Plan will be completed and adopted in 2006. However, the only information available at the World Heritage Centre is dating from the time of inscription of the property. If the above mentioned Management Plan is currently in force, please provide its 2 paper and electronic versions to the WHC. If a more recent Management Plan is in force, please submit 2 paper and electronic versions to WHC. In either of the above cases, the submission should be accompanied by a cover letter to DIR/WHC. Thank you for your cooperation.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Saturday, October 29, 2005

- **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group:
There are plans to set up a group in 2006
- **Question 5.05**
Overall management system of the site
 - Management by the State Party
 - Management under protective legislation

Comment

A Management Board was set 13.9.2006 to the site The Management Plan is being drafted and it will be submitted to National Advisory body in 2013. A Draft was made in 2009 and has been followed ever since.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

A Management Plan will be completed and adopted in 2013. There is no earlier version of a Management Plan.

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Poor
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Non-existent

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer

zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but **little or no cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

No comments

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

The setting of the Management Board and making the Management Plan have been great improvements in the management arrangements for the property.

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	83%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	1%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	15%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	1%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

The site has not received any International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **some** equipment and facilities but overall these are **inadequate**

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

The owner of the site does not have enough money and capacity to carry out the action needed for the excellent management of the site. The state funding is covering most of the yearly budget.

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	34%
Seasonal	66%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	11%
Volunteer	89%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Low
-------------------------	-----

Section II-Petäjävesi Old Church

Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Not available
Interpretation	Not available
Education	Low
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is in place and **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

No comments

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

Books: Jäppinen, J. 2006. Messages in the Landscape - Cultural Heritage in Central Finland. Jäppinen, J. 2010. Takeuchi, A. Thesis. 2008. A study of the Finnish wooden church in the 17th and 18th centuries - The construction and history of a Block-pillar church in the west coast area in Finland. Niiles-Hautanen, J. 2012. Treatise. Silence speaks- Petäjävesi Old Church in stories. Häyrinen, A. 2004

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

No comments.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **one location and easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is **not adequately** presented and interpreted

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Not needed
Information booths	Not needed
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

No comments.

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Static

Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	Decreasing

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

A draft of Management plan (2009). Visitors are not allowed to the galleries or to the bell tower. There is always a guide in the church.

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

No comments.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is considerable monitoring but it is **not directed towards management needs** and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Poor
NGOs	Average

Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Average

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

No comments.

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

No comments.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	The traffic of the nearby mainroad 23 and the noise, lightning and shaking in due of the traffic are influencing the property negatively. Water traffic causes noise and dangerous situations.	Parish of Petājāvesi is going to apply the speed restriction for water transportation and the nearby road and measure the shaking caused by the road traffic. Efforts to try to diminish the amount of light at the nearby bridge are being made.	The movements of the belfry are measured regularly. Police is monitoring the speed restrictions.	Parish of Petājāvesi is applying the speed restriction of water transport 2013. The belfry is to be levelled in 2014.	Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment, the Foundation of the Old Church, the Management Board of Petājāvesi Old Church	Speed limitation to the 23-road has been applied.
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.3	Temperature	Mild winters add humidity and there is a growing risk of introduction of alien insects.	No actions to take so far	Visual inspections are carried out regularly.	Yearly inspections	Parish of Petājāvesi, Foundation of Petājāvesi Old Church, National Board of Antiquities	No additional comments
3.7.4	Radiation/light	High temperatures of direct sunshine damages the southern wall.	Investigate the possibility to protect the wall without risking the OUV of the site, monitoring the current state of the wall	Visual inspections, regular photographing, manual inspections of the structures of the logs on the southern side	10-20 years for the possible new paneling, yearly inspections for the logs of the southern wall	Parish of Petājāvesi, Foundation of Petājāvesi Old Church, National Board of Antiquities.	The timeframe for the new paneling is dependant on the changes in the climate
3.7.5	Dust	Visitors bring dust and sand to the floors of the Old Church.	Brushing the floor every day in the tourist season. Carpets to catch the sand have been bought to the entrance doors. Seeking other ways of diminishing the dust; for example shoe covers to visitors	Visual monitoring	Monitoring and cleaning is done daily on the tourist season, the other actions to be taken have been planned in the Management Board since 2010 and tried out in practice	Parish of Petājāvesi, Foundation of Petājāvesi Old Church, National Board of Antiquities	Shoe covers have been tried out without success so far
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	Precipitation. Northern wall stays damp long after the winter.	Overhangs, paneling of the wall	Visual monitoring, measuring the humidity of the wall	Overhangs in 1-5 years, 10-20 years for the possible new paneling	Parish of Petājāvesi, Foundation of Petājāvesi Old Church, National Board of Antiquities	The timeframe for the new paneling is dependant on the changes in the climate

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan					
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.3.10	There is little or no cooperation with industry regarding management	The matter will be considered in the Management Plan.	The Management Plan will be completed in 2013	Management Board, The Foundation of the Old Church	No comments

4.4 Financial and Human Resources					
4.4.3	The budget is inadequate for management needs	Shortages in the maintenance of the building. Difficulties in planning for a long timeline. Seeking new funding forms has began (partnership agreements with companies, sponsorships for building the visitor centre).	Seeking of sponsorships: spring 2013 onwards. Agreements with companies: spring 2013 onwards.	The Foundation of the Old Church.	No comments

4.4.6	Inadequate equipment and facilities	The lack of visitor centre and guidelines for visitors. Visitor centre and guidelines for visitors are being planned in the Wood Studio at Aalto University. New information boards will be planned.	Visitor centre summer 2014-2015. New guidelines for visitors: summer 2013. New info boards: summer 2013-2015.	The Foundation of the Old Church. Management Board. National Board of Antiquities. The Wood Studio at Aalto University.	No comments
4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects					
4.5.2	Research in the property is not planned	Finding out the needs for research. Contacting the University of Jyväskylä and seeking new ways co-operation.	2014-2015	The Foundation of the Old Church.	No comments
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme	There are different projects and guidelines but determined briefing is lacking. The Management Plan will include guidelines for education and awareness building.	Management plan: 2013	The Foundation of the Old Church. Management Board.	No comments
4.6.5	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	Retrospective OUV has been finished but is not yet implemented. The management plan will include guidelines for presenting the OUV.	Management plan: 2013	The Foundation of the Old Church. Management Board.	No comments

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

The State of Conservation for the site is good but in the future more actions to preserve it must be taken.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

The guidance for the questions was inadequate, it would be beneficial to use different words when explaining the meaning of the question than the words which are used in the question. Saving each side separately is frustrating and there is a big risk of losing information if you don't remember to save the side each time! Save -button to top of side also. Positive impacts needs to be analyzed also.

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**
Reason for update: The retrospective Statement of Universal Value has been submitted to the Finnish Advisory Body in 2012 but is not yet adopted by World Heritage Center
- **Geographic Information Table**
Reason for update: Property area 2,98 ha; buffer zone area 48,44 ha, total 51,42 ha

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise