Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany

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

- Germany
- Slovakia
- Ukraine

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

1133bis

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007, 2011

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Chornohora	48.14 / 24.393	2476.8	12925	15401.8	2007
Havešová Primeval Forest	49.01 / 22.339	171.3	63.99	235.29	2007
Kuziy- Trybushany	47.939 / 24.141	1369.6	3163.4	4533	2007
Maramarosh	47.937 / 24.326	2243.6	6230.4	8474	2007
Rožok	48.975 / 22.467	67.1	41.4	108.5	2007
Stužnica – Bukovské Vrchy	49.086 / 22.536	2950	11300	14250	2007
Stuzhytsia – Uzhok	49.071 / 22.05	2532	3615	6147	2007
Svydovets	48.189 / 24.227	3030.5	5639.5	8670	2007
Uholka – Shyrikyi Luh	48.306 / 23.696	11860	3301	15161	2007
Vihorlat	48.929 / 22.19	2578	2413	4991	2007
Jasmund	54.548 / 13.645	492.5	2510.5	3003	2011
Serrahn	53.34 / 13.198	268.1	2568	2836.1	2011
Grumsin	52.986 / 13.896	590.1	274.3	864.4	2011
Hainich	51.079 / 10.436	1573.4	4085.4	5658.8	2011
Kellerwald	51.145 / 8.974	1467.1	4271.4	5738.5	2011
Total (ha)		33670.1	62402.29	96072.39	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title		Link to source
Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians, maps	31/01/2006	
Ancient Beech Forests of Germany - maps of inscribed extension	29/06/2011	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Barbara Engels
 Bundesamt für Naturschutz (BfN)

Comment

The box has not enough space for the information to be provided. This Information is provided by a separate e-mail.

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

no name no name
 Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine

State Agency for Protected Areas

- Fedir Hamor Carpathian Biosphere Reserve Director
- Heike Britz

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

International Cooperation on Biological Diversity

- Manfred Grossmann Administration of the National Park Hainich Director
- Ladislav Ambros
 Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republik
 National Focal Point for CBD
- Karin Kaiser
 Hessisches Ministerium für Umwelt, ländlichen Raum und Verbraucherschutz

Comment

The box has not enough space for the information to be provided. This Information is provided by a separate e-mail.

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing) Comment

http://weltnaturerbe-buchenwaelder.de/en.html http://cbr.nature.org.ua http://unpp.com.ua http://www.sopsr.sk/nppoloniny/sk/pralesy.php

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

The 15 component parts are protected under various other conventions: EU Natura 2000/Emerald Network (all components parts) Eurpean Diploma/Council of Europe (Poloniny NP, Slovak Republic, Carpathian BR, Ukraine) UNESCO Biosphere Reserves (Carpathian BR, Ukraine, Poloniny National Park as part of the trilateral UA-SK-PL East Carpathians Biosphere Reserve, Slovak Republic and Grumsin as part of the BR Schorfheide-Chorin, Germany)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value Brief synthesis

The Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany are a serial property comprising fifteen components. They represent an outstanding example of undisturbed, complex temperate forests and exhibit the most complete and comprehensive ecological patterns and processes of pure stands of European beech across a variety of environmental conditions. They contain an invaluable genetic reservoir of beech and many species associated and dependent on these forest habitats.

Periodic Report - Second Cycle Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

Ancient Beech Forests of Germany

Criterion (ix): The Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany are indispensable to understanding the history and evolution of the genus Fagus, which, given its wide distribution in the Northern Hemisphere and its ecological importance, is globally significant. These undisturbed, complex temperate forests exhibit the most complete and comprehensive ecological patterns and processes of pure stands of European beech across a variety of environmental conditions and represent all altitudinal zones from seashore up to the forest line in the mountains. Beech is one of the most important elements of forests in the Temperate Broad-leaf Forest Biome and represents an outstanding example of the re-colonization and development of terrestrial ecosystems and communities after the last ice age, a process which is still ongoing. They represent key aspects of processes essential for the long term conservation of natural beech forests and illustrate how one single tree species came to absolute dominance across a variety of environmental parameters.

Integrity

The individual components of this serial property are of sufficient size to maintain the natural processes necessary for the long-term ecological viability of the property"s habitats and ecosystems. Buffer zones including surrounding protected areas (national parks, nature parks, protected landscape areas, biosphere reserves) will be managed to protect the property and enhance integrity.

Protection and management requirements

Long-term protection and management is ensured through national legal protection as territories which belong to national parks or biosphere reserves. Effective implementation of the trilateral integrated management system is required to guide the planning and management of this serial property. A strict non-intervention management applies to all component parts of the serial property. In the framework of the general management objectives the key issues of the practical management include fostering coordination and communication between the individual component parts, risk management, conservation and management of mountain meadows, river corridors and freshwater ecosystems, tourism management, research and monitoring. The component parts are engaged in international activities of capacity building to share best practices from countries included in the series, and other countries with significant primeval and ancient beech forests. In order to provide for local support to be available in the long run, specific public relations and educational work are crucial aspects of the management. Cooperative management agreements with local groups and tourism agencies are supposed to enhance the achievement of management goals and ensure local community engagement in the component parts.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(ix)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

criterion ix: - undisturbed, complex temperate forests complete and comprehensive ecological patterns and processes of pure stands of European beech across a variety of environmental conditions and altitudinal zones - primeval and ancient Beech forests characterised by high degree of naturalness, age structure, existence of special forest structures, high share of dead wood, primeval and old-growth forest species

- 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	Imp	act			Origin	1
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure					<	5
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	0		Ą	9	(a)	5
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure	•					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	0			A	•	5
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	0		A		<	5
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities				9	<	3
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals			Ą		<	5
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection			A		<	5
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production			A		• (5
3.6	Physical resource extraction	•	-	<u> </u>			
3.6.1	Mining			A		<	5
3.6.3	Oil and gas				<	5	
3.6.4	Water (extraction)			<	5		
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	0		A	9	• (5
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	0		A	À	<	6
3.9	Other human activities				-		
3.9.3	Military training	0		A		<u>•</u>	
3.13	Management and institutional factors						
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	0		A	9	<	5
3.13.3	Management activities	0		9		• (5
Legend	Current Potential Negative Positive Inside			Outs	ide		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.1	Mining	restricted	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	localised	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.3	Management activities	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

It has to be noted that the factors affecting the property differ considerably between the 15 component parts. Some factors only apply to one single component part but have been listed. The impact on the attributes has been judged in relation to the property as a whole. Unfortunately this box is too small to comment on the various factors. Comments are supplied in a separate e-mail.

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 both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs considerably. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Slovakia: boundaries and buffer zones are not unequivocally determined.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

The properties in the Ukraine are all part of the Carpathian Biosphere Reserve, the Uzhanskiy National Park, or the

trilateral (with Poland and Slovakia) East Carpathians Biosphere Reserve. They have had protection in some instances for over 100 years with increasing protection from legislation and national decrees since the 1920's. The situation is similar in the Slovakia with the nominated properties being part of either Polininy National Park or protected landscapes (Vihorlat Protected Landscape Area). In terms of their legal status and management regime all the nominated properties are equivalent to IUCN Category I or II protected areas. The surrounding buffer zones (not nominated, but considered as part of the Joint Management Plan) are a mixture of Category I, II and VI protected areas. The properties and surrounding buffer zones are also protected as NATURA 2000 sites. All properties are owned by the State and managed by their respective agencies but are also influenced by territorial governing authorities, the Prešov Self-Governing Region in Slovakia and the "General Scheme of Territory Planning" in the Ukraine. Territorial planning in Slovakia with respect to nature protection is similar to the European Ecological Network (EECONET).

In Germany, the five serial components are subject to national law and are also governed by the Länder that make up the Federal Republic of Germany.

Both governmental entities share responsibility for nature conservation protection. The component parts are protected by the Federal Nature Conservation Act (2002, amended 2008) that specifically incorporates by reference the World Heritage Convention. The Grumsin component is also a Biosphere Reserve. The Länder have laws and ordinances that incorporate both standards set by Federal law (such as for national parks) and the European Union (such as Birds and Habitats directives, etc.).

Land in the four national park component parts are owned and managed by the Länder with varying percentages of land under private ownership.

Comment

The text above needs to be updated. As this box doesn"t have enough space for the revised text, the updated version is submitted by a separate e-mail.

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?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of

Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs considerably. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Slovakia: there is conflict between legislation tools which ensure protection (nature conservation) and management (forestry).

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The Integrated Management Plan prepared for this serial nomination proposes a Joint Management Committee comprised of representatives from both countries and existing management entities to coordinate management actions and jointly manage the nominated serial property to maintain its values and integrity. While there is some provision for input from local citizens, NGOs and other interest groups (proposed as "bottom up" input), the power of the Joint Management Committee clearly lies with governmental agencies and local and regional planning regimes.

The Slovak State Nature Conservancy, Polininy National Park. Uzhanskiy National Park and the Carpathians Biosphere Reserve provide management and staff for the properties. Some sites (e.g. Vihorlat) do not have managers on-site but the other national park and biosphere reserve sites all have park or science staff in or near the properties including at visitor centres and museums at Nová Sedlica and Rakhiv. The Carpathian Biosphere Reserve has 310 staff, Uzhanskiy National Park has 110 staff, and Polininy National Park and the protected landscapes have 24 professional staff (including 8 rangers) between them and are supported by volunteer "nature guards". Staff will be supported by State Nature Conservancy officials of both countries and will coordinate management of buffer zones, where necessary, with local forestry officials as outlined in the Integrated Management Plan.

In Germany, all the component parts have existing individual management plans developed in accordance with law and policy that meet national park (or biosphere reserve) goals for both management and monitoring. Plans incorporate monitoring of environmental parameters, visitor use impacts, and other resource issues such as managed control of wildlife impacts. Park management, biosphere maintenance and development plans are directly binding for existing programs and protection goals. In addition, there are management and spatial plans by the Länder for regional spatial development, State Development Plans, Landscape Framework Plans, and so on, that incorporate park and biosphere reserve protection values and goals. All plans were developed with public involvement. Cooperative management agreements with local groups and tourism agencies contribute to the achievement of management goals. Municipal authorities are also cooperating closely.

Comment

As this text box has not enough space for the revised text, this text is submitted by a separate e-mail.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available		Link to source
Management Plan (management provisions as included in the nomination dossiers)	N/A	Available	31/01/2011	B

Comment

The documents linked here are not the present ones. The following documents will be submitted in a separate e-mail: a) the Joint Declaration of Intent as of 14th May 2014 b) the Integrated Management system as submitted in 2009 with the extension nomination. The one linked here is the one submitted in 2007 by Slowakia and Ukraine.

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 **fully 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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Fair

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

Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

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

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

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 only **some 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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs to a certain extend. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Slovakia: lack of effective communication and cooperation caused by conflicts of interests of single interested groups.

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

According to the amendatory act No. 543/2002 Coll. on Nature and Landscape Protection as amended (force of legislation since 1st January 2014) the State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic is formally delegated to manage the Slovak part of the Property, but in reality does not administer the

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)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	100%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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

Comment

No International assistance received.

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

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

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

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the mediumterm and planning is underway to secure funding in the longterm

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

Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed

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

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs considerably. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Germany: 4.4.6/4.4.7 situation is considerably better than the average.

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	

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	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good

Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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

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 fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs considerably. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Slovakia: 4.4.13/4.4.15 situation is a considerably worse than in Germany and Ukraine. Please note that Answers in question 4.4.14 only relate to the Ukrainian component parts.

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

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

As this text box doesn"t provide enough space. The list of recent relevant publications is submitted by a separate e-mail.

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

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

In many locations 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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Poor
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 adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

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

Adequate
Poor
Adequate
Poor
Adequate
Adequate
Not provided but needed
Not needed

Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

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

It is to be noted that the situation in the component parts differs considerably. The answers given above are reflecting the overall situation. Please note the following regarding the Situation in Slovakia: 4.6.3/4.6.4/4.6.6 has deficiencies in education, awareness, information programmes / activities / visitor facilities and services.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

<u></u>	
Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor management is integrated in the individual management plans of the component parts and is fully satisfactory for maintaining OUV.

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 **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

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 **some 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

Please note: Question 4.7.4: The answer reflects the average over the 15 component parts (German component parts: answer 4.7.4.4, Slovak component parts: 4.7.4.2.) Question 4.7.5: The answer reflects the average over the 15 component parts; individual answers differ. Question 4.7.6: No fees are collected in Germany and Slovakia.

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 a **comprehensive**, **integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to 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	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Implementation is underway

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

4.8.4.3.: Please refer to 37COM 7B.26 and 38COM 7B.75.

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

Please note that the answers for the 15 component parts differ considerably, the answer reflect the overall situation Question 4.8.1. and 4.8.2: no specific monitoring is taking place in the Slovak component parts. Question 4.8.3: Answers reflect Germany and Ukraine only.

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
3.5	Biological reso	urce use/modification	n				
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	ix	Controll of carrying capacity	continously	on-going	Carpathian Biosphere Reserve	none
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection	ix	Controll of carrying capacity	continously	on-going	Carpathian Biosphere Reserve	none
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	ix	Intergovernmental meetings and cooperation Meeting of the Slovak Management Committee Meetings and cooperation with relevant local stakeholders	on-going	continously	Slovak Republic: State Nature Conservancy and Ministry of Environment (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Defence, State enterprise Vojenské lesy a majetky, private landowners)	All activities are done in accordance with the valid forestry legislation or are subject to a special legislation (defences interests). The management is specified the Forest Management Plan, which is the official Documentation of Nature Protection.
3.6	Physical resou	rce extraction					
3.6.1	Mining	ix	Active control of the activity	continously	on-going	Carpathian Biosphere Reserve	none
3.8	Social/cultural	uses of heritage			_	_	
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	ix	Intergovernmental meetings and cooperation Meeting of the Slovak Management Committee Meetings and cooperation with relevant local stakeholders	on-going	continously	Slovak Republic: State Nature Conservancy and Ministry of Environment (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Defence, State enterprise Vojenské lesy a majetky, private landowners)	There is a conflict of interests in the region. Local people would like to have a financial profit from beech forests. On the other hand there are interests of nature protection (protection and security of a special management of the area).
3.13	Management and institutional factors						
3.13.3	Management activities	ix	Intergovernmental meetings and cooperation Meeting of the Slovak Management Committee Meetings and cooperation with relevant local stakeholders	on-going	continously	Slovak Republic: State Nature Conservancy and Ministry of Environment (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Defence, State enterprise Vojenské lesy a majetky, private landowners)	Management activities are closely connected with forestry activities carried out in the area of the World Heritage Property: In current Slovak conditions management activities = forestry activities.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

	, ,					
4.6 Edu	4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
		Actions		Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
	limited	Education and awareness is continuously integrated in on-going management activities.		all agencies	no comments	

Section II-Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

Not applicable (for sites inscribed exclusively under criteria vii to x)

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is intact

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

Issues relating to the State of conservation are currently addressed in the SOC-reporting process.

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

.0
Positive
Not applicable
Not applicable

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

Answers reflect the average status in the different component parts.

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	

Non Governmental Organization
Local community
External experts

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

ves

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

The current questionnaire is extremely difficult to answer for a property that encompasses 15 component parts. Answers can only reflect an average status.

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

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

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

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

Automatically generated in online version

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