

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- United States of America

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

198

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site	38.659 / -90.061	591	0	591	1982
Total (ha)		591	0	591	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site - Map of the inscribed property	01/03/2006	

Comment

The June 30, 1981 map has an error drawn in the boundary in the southeast part of the site. The property which was acquired in 1979 follows the SW-NE line of the Harding Ditch towards Black Lane, instead of extending straight east to Black Land and then following Black Lane to the north. There is no change to the acreage (# of hectares) subject to the World Heritage site listing. This is simply a drawing error on the map. An updated map will be provided to US NPS International Office.

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Jonathan Putnam
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs
World Heritage Program Officer

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Mark Esarey
Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site
Site Superintendant
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site](#)
- [Cahokia Mounds \(Illinois Historic Preservation Agency\)](#)
- [World Heritage in the United States](#)

Section II-Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site

Comment

current Link 3 - Illinois Historic Preservation Agency is dead. New link for this web page for Illinois Historic Preservation Agency is - http://www.illinois-history.gov/cahokia_mounds.htm

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

Comment

The Site is a US National Historic Landmark (and subject to Section 106 review) under the US National Historic Preservation Act. Historic sites are protected under the Illinois Historic Preservation Act, and Historic Sites Listing Act. Archaeology on public land in Illinois is protected by the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Protection Act. Ancient burials and burial markers (Mounds) are protected by Illinois Human Skeletal Remains Protection Act.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

Cahokia Mounds is the largest and earliest pre-Columbian settlement north of Mexico. It was occupied primarily during the Mississippian period (800–1350), when it covered over 1,600 hectares (3,950 acres) and included some 120 mounds. It is the pre-eminent example of a cultural, religious, and economic center of the Mississippian cultural tradition, which extended throughout the Mississippi Valley and the south-eastern United States. This agricultural society may have had a population of 10,000–20,000 at its peak between 1050 and 1150. Cahokia is an early and exceptional example of pre-urban structuring.

Criteria

(iii) Dating from the Mississippian period (800–1350), Cahokia Mounds is the largest pre-Columbian archaeological site north of Mexico, and also the earliest. It is the pre-eminent example of a cultural, religious, and economic center of the prehistoric Mississippian cultural tradition.

(iv) Cahokia graphically demonstrates the existence of a pre-urban society in which a powerful political and economic hierarchy was responsible for the organization of labor, communal agriculture, and trade. This is reflected in the size and layout of the settlement and the nature and structure of the public and private buildings.

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

(iii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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								
3.1.1	Housing								
3.1.2	Commercial development								
3.1.3	Industrial areas								
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								
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities								
3.3.4	Localised utilities								
3.3.5	Major linear utilities								
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric								
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)								
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage								
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses								
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								
3.10.2	Flooding								
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events								
3.11.2	Earthquake								
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)								
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	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

3.3.3 Non-renewable energy facility - there remains a small private in holding (about 0.4 hectare) property that still functions as it has for many decades as a petroleum storage facility. It is in the west central portion of the site.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is **no buffer zone**, and it is not needed

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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

The property owned by the Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site beyond the World Heritage Site boundaries but inside the US National Historic Landmark boundaries function as an informal buffer area for the World Heritage Site.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, an agency of the State of Illinois, manages the entire World Heritage site as a State Historic Site.

Currently, the sole authority for management of the World Heritage site is vested in the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. The World Heritage Site comprises about 540 hectares (over 1,300 acres) owned by the State of Illinois at the time of the World Heritage nomination in 1981. The World

Heritage site primarily consists of the central core of the site. By early 2004, the state-owned property – Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site - had expanded to over half of the 850 hectares (2,100 acres) encompassing nearly all of the northern, central, and southern portions of the site designated by the circa 1620 hectare (4,000 acre) US National Historic Landmark boundary.

The most significant protective measure has been acquisition of property. The State of Illinois acquired 144 acres, including Monks Mound in 1925, and operated it as a State Park. Several large tracts were added in the 1960s and 1970s. Designation of Cahokia Mounds as a State Historic Site in the early 1980s (20 Illinois Compiled Statutes 3410) provided the site the highest level of protection available under state law. The site is open for visitation by the general public, but State law prohibits intensive recreational use at State Historic Sites. The State Historic Site nearly doubled in size in the 1980s. In 1997, the IHPA annexed most of the state property, including Monks Mound and the Interpretive Center, into the City of Collinsville. This provided the site with local police, fire, and water service, as well as tourism promotion. Most State of Illinois archaeological protection laws were revised in 1989 and 1990. Current laws and implementing regulations are: (1) Protection of archaeological sites on public lands, required curation of artifacts from public lands, established professional qualifications for archaeologists working on public lands = Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Protection Act (20 Illinois Compiled Statutes 3435, 1990) Implementing Rule 17 IAC 4190; (2) Protection of human burials and burial artifacts on all public and private lands = Human Skeletal Remains Protection Act (20 Illinois Compiled Statutes 3440, 1989), Implementing Rule 17 IAC 4170; (3) Review potential effects to cultural heritage sites by State Funded or Permitted development projects = the Illinois State Agency Historic Resources Protection Act (20 Illinois Compiled Statutes 3420, 1990 as amended), Implementing Rule 17 IAC 4180. Should any proposed development within the National Historic Landmark boundary use or require United States government-agency funds, permits, or licenses, then federal historic preservation laws would apply. National Historic Landmark's are afforded the highest protection available to historic sites under US law.

Comment

The size (540 hectares) of the World Heritage site is incorrect in the third sentence above. The correct size is 591 hectares (about 1460 acres).

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List

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 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 **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The Master Management Plan was established in 1980, and reviewed by ICOMOS with the 1981 WHL nomination. Management plan – The Illinois Department of Conservation has adopted the Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site Master Management Plan , which will guided the future development of the site, address problems, and suggest corrective measures. The plan's objectives address the preservation, interpretation, restoration, and research of the site.

WHC Note (October 2012):

If the above mentioned Management Plan is currently in force, please provide a more detailed description.

Comment

Most goals established in the 1980 plan have been accomplished. A new Master Management Plan was completed in 2008.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

A new "Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site Master Management Plan" was completed in 2008. It is 113 pages long, with 124 pages in the Appendices. A copy is on file with the US National Park Service International Office.

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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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 being **fully** implemented and monitored

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

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	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in 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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

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

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

Nearly all of the private "in holdings" in the center of the site (circa 25 hectares) have been acquired and added to the Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site since the World Heritage Site nomination, as well as over 250 hectares of additional property with the US National Historic Landmark. All of this property is now protected under the various state and federal laws mentioned in other sections of this document.

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)	0%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	85%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	5%

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

Comment

No funding has ever been received from the World Heritage Fund.

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 medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

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

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

Concerning funding % above. Entry donations go to a State of Illinois Trust account for restricted use by Historic sites, and are included in the State of Illinois funding above. A few out-fields - both inside and outside the World Heritage boundary - are in no-till crop leases, funds from which go to the Trust account and are included in the State of Illinois Funding above. Gift shop concession lease is run by the local non-profit support group, funds may only be spent to support the site.

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

Full-time	50%
Part-time	50%

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

Permanent	50%
Seasonal	50%

Section II-Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site

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

Paid	65%
Volunteer	35%

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	Good
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
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	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

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

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**

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

Hundreds of books and articles have been published concerning Cahokia Mounds site and related sites. Bibliographic information is available at: www.cahokiamounds.org/explore/archaeology/bibliography/

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	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Excellent
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
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 **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

Section II-Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site

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	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Excellent

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

4.6.1 The status is displayed by a W.H. Site bronze plaque, a flag, on brochures, in an exhibit, and on the web site. 4.6.6.8 Other visitor services include: Site Interpreters and Volunteers, written self-guided tours, cassette tape self-guided tours for groups, I-Pod self-guided tours, Web site educational materials, teacher kits for classrooms, and a speakers bureau for off-site presentations

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Decreasing
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Decreasing

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

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor management is addressed in numerous sections of the 2008 Site Master Plan update.

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 **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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

There is **excellent 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?

No fees are collected

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

4.7.2.6 The Interpretive Center (museum) has electronic counters in the front entrance doorway that count visitors. There are no tickets, but there is a guest register. The guest register requests information about where visitors are from, how they heard about the site, and what they think about the site. 4.7.6.1 - There is no admission fee; however there is a donation box at the Interpretive Center entrance with suggested donation amounts for Individual Adults, Families and Students.

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** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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	Average
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Not applicable
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

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

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

No factor is both current and negative.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 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

The integrity is as an archaeological site.

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	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Very positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Very 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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

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

yes

Section II-Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site

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

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

Monitoring and reporting

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	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

- **Map(s)**
Reason for update: The June 30, 1981 map has an error drawn in the boundary in the southeast part of the site. The property which was acquired in 1979 follows the SW-NE line of the Harding Ditch towards Black Lane, instead of extending straight east to Black Land and then following Black Lane to the north. There is no change to the acreage (# of hectares) subject to the World Heritage site listing. This is simply a drawing error on the map. An updated map will be provided to US NPS International Office.

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

6.6 Advisory Body. ICOMOS has not offered any assistance, and none has been requested.